SIRI SANDE

The “Barbarian princes” in the Ara Pacis procession and the origin and development of the so-called *Camillus* coiffure

Abstract

The procession on the Ara Pacis includes two young boys whose identity has been disputed. Their long curly hair and short tunics set them apart from the other participants. Various explanations for their presence have been given, the most popular hypotheses being that they are either barbarian princes living as hostages at the Augustan court, wearing their national costume, or that they are Augustus’ grandsons Gaius and Lucius Caesar, dressed as participants in the Trojan game. It is here proposed that they are Lucius Caesar and his younger brother Agrippa Postumus, dressed up as sacrificial servants. Their dress and coiffure influenced later representations of sacrificial servants in public and private contexts, and determined the development of the so-called *Camillus* coiffure.

Description of the children

At the beginning of this article I should like to make two propositions. The first, and most important one, regards the kind of procession that is depicted on the Ara Pacis. Several suggestions have been made. In my opinion the most convincing one is that a *supplicatio* is shown, and I take that as my point of departure. This idea was put forward already in 1960 by L. Polacco, but presented more forcefully by R. Billows in 1993.¹ A *supplicatio* would account for the lack of an altar, victims and sacrificial paraphernalia, and it would also explain the presence of women and children.

In an article from 2007, T. Hölscher, using the Ara Pacis and other, less known monuments as examples, pointed out that the inclusion of women gave an emotional impact to *supplicatio* scenes.² This observation applies to children as well. It should be noted that in non-domestic contexts, children are chiefly present in scenes where somebody wants to obtain a favour. The *clementia* scenes, where barbarians accompanied by their children implore the Roman victors for mercy, are well known. Also scenes implying hope of material gain (*alimentia*, *congiarium*) regularly feature children.³ Therefore the presence of children in a *supplicatio* scene, where the aim is to obtain favour from the gods, is meaningful.

1. Billows 1993 (especially 88-92) with earlier bibliography.

2. Hölscher 2007, 115-118.

3. See Currie 1996; Uzzi 2005, especially chap. 3 (“Imperial Largesse”) and chap. 6 (“Submission”).

My other presupposition concerns the three children on the Ara Pacis which are the subject of my article (FIGS. 1-5). They (two of them especially) wear costumes which are at variance with those worn by the other children in the procession. This has been interpreted as a sign that they are barbarians, or that they wear costumes reminiscent of the so-called Troy games. I consider these children to be dressed up for the occasion, that is, they do not wear everyday clothes. This also holds good if they are barbarians. It is unlikely that barbarian hostages or tokens (*pignoria*) at the Roman court went about in national dress. One of the purposes of keeping them in Rome was to Romanize them thoroughly, and therefore it is probable that they normally wore Roman dress, not toga, of course, but clothes which did not make them stick out, and which did not constantly recall their origins.⁴

Before discussing the identity of the children, a brief description of them is advisable. After their discovery, the reliefs from the Ara Pacis have been subject to restorations. Some of these were quite extensive, like the male heads on the northern frieze, and in certain cases they entail a change of subject. As D. Attnally Conlin has shown, the foot of a male figure behind Tiberius (no. 34 according to Koeppel and Rossini) on the south frieze has been carved into a female foot to combine with Antonia minor on the next slab (no. 35 according to Koeppel and Rossini), thus concealing the fact that there is a missing portion of the frieze between the two.⁵

I shall start with the south frieze, where one finds the first child in the procession (no. 30 according to Pollini and Rossini, no. 31 according to Koeppel), clinging to Agrippa's toga (FIGS. 1-2). His head is turned towards a woman who stands behind him, while a female figure in the background places her hand on his head. His feet, nose and upper lip are restored, as is part of the *torque*. Moreover, the hand on his head is restored.

The boy is dressed in a wide, belted tunic forming a *kolpos* covering the belt. The tunic is pulled down on the left side, exposing the shoulder. This gives associations to a *tunica exomis*. Around his neck he wears a *torque*. Though his feet are for the most part restored, enough is preserved around the ankles to show that he wore some kind of footwear. The boy's hair is fairly long and dressed in corkscrew curls, now very worn. In front of the ear a curl descends to the jaw line, while the curls are longer further back. The boy wears a ribbon around his head, which on closer inspection shows faint depressions (FIG. 2). It may well have been a braid originally, or a twisted roll. The long hair has often been regarded as a sign of "barbarian" descent, but it is not free-flowing and unkempt like the hair generally characterizing barbarians. In fact, this is an elaborate coiffure. The closest parallels (braid or ribbon combined with corkscrew locks) come from sculptures in the Severan style, or rather, from Severizing works of the Roman period (FIG. 6).

On the north frieze a child in a similar tunic is depicted (no. 34 according to Pollini, no. 35 according to Koeppel and Rossini) (FIGS. 3-4). This time the tunic is worn *exomis*, so that the whole shoulder and arm are exposed on the right side. The garment is very short, not covering the boy's buttocks. He is restored as barefoot, but like his pendant on the opposite side he may have

4. For a different opinion see Kleiner and Buxton 2008, especially 65. According to them, the foreign dress was a significant element in the ideology of Augustan imperialism.

5. Conlin 1992.

FIG. 1 – Ara Pacis, south frieze. Boy between Agrippa and Julia(?). Photo: D.A.I. Rome.

FIG. 2 – Ara Pacis, south frieze. Head of the boy in fig. 1. Photo: D.A.I. Rome.

FIG. 3 – Ara Pacis, north frieze. Toddler holding the hand of a togatus. Photo: D.A.I. Rome.

FIG. 4 – Ara Pacis, north frieze. Head of toddler in fig. 3. Photo: D.A.I. Rome.

FIG. 5 – Ara Pacis, north frieze. Boy dressed as an acolyte between two women. Photo: D.A.I. Rome.

had some footwear, possibly rendered in paint. Already he is tired and wants to be picked up, pulling at the toga of the man before him, while another man in the background holds him by his left hand. The two seem rather unconcerned about their small companion.

This child is no more than a toddler, the youngest one of those taking part in the procession. His shoulder-length locks seem appropriate to an *eros* or a *putto*, and he would doubtless have been compared to one if it were not for the twisted *torque* around his neck, which gives “barbarian” associations. He also wears a bracelet around his upper left arm.

The next child on the north frieze is a boy walking a few paces behind the toddler (no. 37 according to Pollini and Rossini, no. 38 according to Koeppel) (FIG. 5). Like him he wears a tunic forming a *kolpos* at the waist. It slides down to expose the right shoulder. It should be noted that the tunics of all three children denude the shoulder which is nearest to the spectator. It seems to have been considered important that this feature should be seen.

The third boy is older than the other two, and walks sandwiched in between two majestic women, the first of whom is shown *capite velato* (FIG. 5). Like them he wears a fringed cloak, such as is generally associated with sacrificial attendants and so-called *camilli*. Traces at the bottom of the fragment indicate that he held an object originally. It could have been a pitcher or a *patera*, as has

been suggested, but he could equally well have carried a laurel twig like other participants in the procession.⁶

Such a twig is held above his head by the woman walking behind him, as if to distinguish him. This reminds one of the gesture of the woman behind his companion on the south frieze. Her hand is restored after the not very good drawing in the *Codex Ursinianus*.⁷ One may wonder if this woman originally held a twig of laurel above his head, the leaves having been turned into fingers by the draughtsman.

The boy between the two women does not wear a *torque*, and he evidently did not wear a *bullae* either, since there is no trace of the ribbon from which the *bullae* of the other boys on the Ara Pacis are suspended. His hair, which is of normal length, is dressed in the usual manner for males of the Augustan period, with short, curving locks leaving the ears free. This boy has caused little comment except that his association with the so-called *camillus* type is generally acknowledged.⁸ Like "*camilli*" he wears a fringed cloak and a wide tunic. As remarked by Friederike Fless in her book on the personal related to sacrifices on Roman monuments, the cloak is not a *mantele*, which is worn by other sacrificial servants on the Ara Pacis, but a *ricinium*, the *mantele* being furrier in texture.⁹ The women next to him also wear *ricinia*. The two younger boys on the frieze lack the *ricinium*, but wear the same kind of tunic. Consequently, this is not a thoroughly un-Roman costume, as has been said by some scholars, but a basic Roman garment.

Theories about the identity of the children

With regard to the identification of the two younger boys, two main hypotheses have gained ground. The first, which stresses their resemblance in dress to the "*camillus*" (FIG. 5), considers them to be the two sons of Julia adopted by Augustus, Gaius and Lucius Caesar. The *torques* around their necks are explained as a reference to the Trojan ancestry of the Julian family. *Torques* appear to have been worn by the participants in the Troy game, who were led by Gaius in 13 B.C. This hypothesis was set forth by Giuseppe Moretti in his magisterial work on the Ara Pacis from 1948. It was accepted by several scholars: J. M. C. Toynbee, J. Pollini in his thesis on Augustan reliefs, M. Torelli, E. La Rocca, M. Fullerton, L. Berczelly, P. Zanker, S. Settis and others.¹⁰ Most of these authors seem to take Moretti's conclusion for granted, and add few new arguments.

A rival hypothesis was set forth by Erika Simon in 1966, and repeated in her book on the Ara Pacis from 1967.¹¹ She suggested that the two boys represented barbarian hostages or tokens

6. Pollini 1987, 25 n. 32; Koeppl 1987, 137, no. 38; Rose 1990, 463.

7. Foresta 2002, 50, fig. 10.

8. Moretti 1948, 246-248; Toynbee 1953, 88; Helbig 4 II, no. 1937, 686 (text: E. Simon); Simon 1967a, 21; Kleiner 1978, 760-761; Torelli 1982, 50; La Rocca 1983, 35; Koeppl 1987, 137 (no. 38); Pollini 1987, 25; Rose 1990, 463-467; Rose 1997, 16; Fless 1995, 51.

9. Fless 1995, 51, 53-54.

10. Moretti 1948, 270-73. Toynbee 1953, 84, 88; Pollini 1978, 106-107; La Rocca 1983, 30, 34; La Rocca 1994, 284-286; Fullerton 1985, 481; Berczelly 1985, 146; Zanker 1987, 218-219; Settis 1988, 416; Rossini 2006, 68, 77.

11. Helbig 4 II, no. 1937, 683, 686 (text: E. Simon); Simon 1967 a, 18, 21.

(*pignoria*) at the Augustan court. Since her book was short and succinct without notes, she did not elaborate on her idea. It was accepted at once by W. Gercke,¹² but generally it did not get a favourable reception (M. Torelli went as far as to term it “perfect nonsense”¹³). In 1990, Ch. B. Rose re-launched it in an article where he supported it with various archaeological and historical arguments.¹⁴ Already before his article appeared, his manuscript had convinced G. Koeppel, who repeated Rose’s conclusions in his articles on the Ara Pacis in the *Bonner Jahrbücher* from 1986 and 1987.¹⁵ Also J. Pollini changed his mind and presented the two boys as barbarian princes in his book on the portraits of Gaius and Lucius Caesar from 1987.¹⁶ Later, Rose’s hypothesis was taken up by A. Kuttner in her book on the Boscoreale cups from 1995.¹⁷ Simon’s “barbarian” theory, elaborated by Rose and Kuttner, has been accepted in more recent literature.¹⁸ It should therefore be briefly examined.

According to Simon and Rose, the woman behind the boy on the South frieze, who has a fillet above her forehead, must be an oriental queen, and the boy her son.¹⁹ Rose went as far as to identify her as the Bosporian queen Dynamis. Kuttner, for her part, chose the Commagenian queen Iotape I.²⁰ Rose compared the boy’s coiffure to that of Oriental rulers on Hellenistic coins, and his footwear to that of eastern barbarians, while Kuttner more specifically compared the shoes to those worn by two bronze statuettes in Oriental dress in New York and Baltimore respectively, which wear a long-sleeved tunic, trousers and a high diadem.²¹ Both Rose and Kuttner have compared the boy on the North frieze to a Gallic infant on one of the two silver cups from Boscoreale.²² According to Rose and Kuttner, the inclusion of these two boys alludes to Agrippa’s and Augustus’ campaigns in the East and West respectively. They represent the pacified peoples, and the *torques* which they wear, are a sign of their barbarian descent.²³

12. Gercke 1968, 136-140, considers both children to be Gallic hostages, whereas the boy generally identified with Gaius Caesar (see n. 6) in her eyes is an anonymous acolyte (135-136).

13. Torelli 1982, 60 n. 72.

14. Rose 1990, especially 455-461.

15. Koeppel 1987, 104-105, 124 (no. 31), 135 (no. 35).

16. Pollini 1987, 27.

17. Kuttner 1995, 103-123.

18. Currie 1996, 157-159; Conlin 1997, 71; Ferris 2000, 27-30; Severy 2003, 110; Uzzi 2005, 142-55; Fantham 2006, 159-160 with n. 13; Kleiner and Buxton 2008.

19. Helbig 4 II, no. 1937, 683 (text: E. Simon); Simon 1967 a, 18; Rose 1990, 456-459. It is questionable, however, whether the woman’s fillet, which is only visible above her forehead, can be called a royal diadem. As Rose himself pointed out, its closest parallels are found in Dionysiac iconography (Rose 1990, 456). It is therefore possible that the fillet has cultic connotations rather than royal ones.

20. Rose 1990, 456-59; Kuttner 1995, 103-104; Kleiner and Buxton 2008, 74. It is interesting to note that

Rose’s suggestion that the woman and boy are mother and son, seems to have become an established fact in Kleiner and Buxton.

21. Rose 1990, 456; Kuttner 1995, 103; Kleiner and Buxton 2008, 80-81. The identity of the bronze statuettes has been variously interpreted. They have been called simply “dancers”, Attis (LMC II,1, 34, no. 261, text J. Vermaseren and M. B. De Boer); more generically Phrygian deities (Hill 1949, 28); oriental princes (Kuttner 1995, 103) or more specifically Alexander Helios, son of Cleopatra and Antonius (Walker and Higgs 2001, 250-51), and even Dioskuroi (Hill 1949, 28). The identification of the statuettes’ tiaras with the caps of the Dioskuroi is certainly wrong, but Hill is right in drawing attention to the fact that the statuettes were found together and therefore constituted a pair. That should have some significance with regard to their identification.

22. Rose 1990, 460, fig. 7; Kuttner 1995, 101, figs. 20, 22.

23. Rose 1990, 461-463; Kuttner 1995, 101-107.

Another argument against the theory that the two boys represent Gaius and Lucius Caesar, has been delivered by W. Gercke in her study on the portraiture of Roman children and by John Pollini in his book on the portraits of the two princes.²⁴ They pointed out that the child on the north frieze is too small to be Lucius Caesar, born in 18 B.C. This infant is no more than a toddler. It is notoriously difficult to guess the age of children on Roman monuments, because they are often made to appear older than they were in order to manifest *dignitas* and *gravitas*. When one compares the boy on the north frieze with the boy on the south frieze who is traditionally identified with Germanicus, born in 15 B.C. (no. 36 according to Pollini, no. 38 according to Koeppel, no. 37 according to Rossini), it becomes clear that the latter is the elder of the two.²⁵ He is taller and less baby-like than the infant on the opposite side, who can therefore hardly be the three years older Lucius Caesar.

Still, if the traditional identification of the boys is incorrect, need this mean that they are barbarians? It is true that the resemblance between the toddler on the Ara Pacis and those on the Boscoreale cup is visually striking. However, one toddler is much like another, and the Boscoreale infants are shown as Gallic only by their inclusion into a group of Gauls. Their short tunics can be worn by barbarians and Romans alike, and they wear no *torques* or other ornament to distinguish them. Their longish, curly hair is appropriate to a putto as well as to a barbarian child.

The tunics

The tunic of the small boy on the North frieze makes him stand out from the other male children on Ara Pacis, most of whom wear the toga. The lack of toga would easily raise suspicions as to the boy's Roman identity, but we should perhaps first ask ourselves whether it would be natural for such a small child to wear the toga.

The children's toga, the *toga praetexta*, which was also used by magistrates, was generally abandoned by girls when they married and by boys when they donned the *toga virilis*. For the boys, this generally happened between 14 and 16 years of age, but several exceptions are known. The physical and intellectual maturity of the individual boys was probably the determining factor. As far as I know, nothing is known about the age when the children started to wear the toga. Was there a lower limit?

The toga, which is voluminous and warm, is, in fact, a garment highly unsuitable for small children. Furthermore, it restricts movement, since the draperies would slip down unless the wearer grasped them or held his arms close to the body.²⁶ A toddler would never be able to wear a toga in the proper manner. Sarcophagi showing chronological scenes from a child's life show toddlers nude or scantily clad, at most wearing a tunic.²⁷ The toga is worn in scenes connected

24. Pollini 1987, 22-24. He was not the first to remark on the boy's tender age. Both Gercke (1968, 130) and Holloway (1984, 627) assessed his age to 1-2 years. Already Toynbee 1953, 89, referred to him as "this weary infant".

25. Moretti 1948, 230, pl. XII; Gercke 1968, 129-130,

133-134, B; Pollini 1978, 107-108, S 36; Torelli 1982, 50, II.18-19; Koeppel 1987, 124-125, Cat. 5, no. 38, fig. 14; Rossini 2206, 58, 65, 72, no. 37.

26. Stone 2001, 16-17.

27. Amedick 1991a, 60-81, pls. 45, 52-65; Huskinson 1996, 10-12, pls. 1,3, 2,1, 3,1-2.

with education, where the child is seen showing off his knowledge to an adult (teacher or parent).²⁸ There may be some connection here: only when a child was old enough to embark on education, he or she would be able to wear the toga. The sarcophagi are of course later than the Ara Pacis, but there is little reason to suppose that the views on childhood had changed from one century to another. Rather, scant clothing or nudity seems to be the mark of the toddler in Roman art. On a funerary relief from Ostia with a *dextrarum iunctio*, to name but one example, a nude toddler stands between the couple. He is obviously their child, though he is no different from the putti hovering above the scene.²⁹

I therefore think that the contrast between the toddler on the north frieze on the Ara Pacis and Germanicus on the south side can be interpreted in another way than the current one: as a difference in age, not in ethnicity or social status. The toga-clad Germanicus is rendered as someone who is capable of learning, and who has embarked on the road leading to adulthood. Standing stiffly upright facing the spectators, he shows that he is aware of the solemnity of the moment, while the unconcerned toddler on the opposite side has not yet reached that stage. He turns his back to the public and is depicted scantily dressed, with characteristics which give associations to erotes or putti: long locks and jewellery. Seen in this light, Kuttner's arguments regarding the similarity between the toddler on the north frieze and those on the Boscoreale cup can be turned in the opposite direction: *he* does not resemble them because he is a barbarian, but *they* resemble him because they are depicted according to the traditional "toddler image".

The dress of the boy on the South frieze cannot be explained with arguments related to age. In addition to being older, well past toddler age, he is more distinctive than the child on the opposite side. Even if one dismisses the fanciful hypotheses about queen Dynamis or Iotaphe, whose sojourn in Rome is unsupported by historical facts, he might well be thought of as a foreigner. Rose and Kuttner followed by Kleiner and Buxton make much of his shoes (the feet are restored, however), which they compare to those of the above-mentioned statuettes in New York and Baltimore. Others have seen nothing special in these shoes, and dismissed them as *calcei*.³⁰ Footwear of this type, with a tongue (*ligula*) down the wrist, is known in Italic and Greek art, mostly in the shape of sandals, but they can also be shoes.³¹ Two wall-paintings in Pompeii show a female figure which is either removing or putting on the *ligulum* shoes of a male lyre-player (Apollo?)³² A bronze statuette in the *Gabinetto Segreto* in the Archaeological Museum of Naples wears *ligulum* shoes which are quite close to those of the boy of the South frieze, at least as they are now restored.³³ It shows an elderly drunkard with a large phallus, possibly a parody of a Cynic philosopher. Probably the *ligulum* shoes are meant to represent informal footwear. Since the boy on the South frieze is wearing a tunic, he could not have worn the formal *calcei* which go with the toga, and he is therefore depicted with a different type of shoes. It is impossible to know if the designer of the Ara Pacis had any more specific intention in showing *ligulum* shoes. The figures on the Ara

28. Amedick 1991a, 65-67, pls. 53,4, 54,2, 55,1-4, 62,5; Huskinson 1996, 113, pls. 2,1, 3,1; Wrede 2001, 53.

29. Uzzi 2005, 176-177, fig. 65.

30. Gercke 1968, 128; Koeppl 1987, 124 (no. 31).

31. Morrow 1985, 118-120.

32. *PPM* IV, 679, fig. 45; *PPM* VII, 143, fig. 4.

33. De Caro 2000, 60, with ill. p. 65. Also a statuette of Priapos in the same collection wears shoes with a *ligula* down the foot (De Caro 2000, 73-74). This statuette may be a modern copy, however.

Pacis were seen from below and stood on a ledge which partly obscured the view of their feet, at least to spectators standing close, so one may ask how easy it was to see details of the shoes.

From that point of view it seems odd that the artists of the Ara Pacis, when asked to depict an Oriental prince similar to the statuettes in New York and Baltimore, should have chosen to characterize him by his footwear, if elements like long sleeves, trousers and tiara belonged to his national dress. Such items have been entirely left out, making the boy ambiguous. His corkscrew locks are appropriate both to idealized Severizing works and certain Oriental monarchs, and his tunic could be worn by anybody.³⁴

The torques

The *torque* is not a sure sign of an Oriental either. In fact, the *torque* was worn by many of the peoples with whom the Romans came into contact. The difficulties in connecting it with specific ethnic groups may be the reason why it is surprisingly seldom worn by barbarians in Roman art,³⁵ and it rarely characterizes the many representations of *ethne* and *nationes* designed by artists in the Roman period.³⁶

The *torque* had positive connotations for the Romans, too. First of all it was a military decoration, generally awarded in pairs.³⁷ During the Principate it was given to officers of lesser rank, who could collect considerable numbers.³⁸ Normally the *torque* was worn attached to the cuirass. Because it was a common decoration, it is often seen on soldiers' gravestones, alone or together with *armillae* and *phalerae*.³⁹

Military value is a prerequisite for victory. It is therefore not surprising to find a Victoria wearing a *torque* around her neck, as she is seen in a wall-painting in Triclinium C from the so-called Edificio dei Triclini from Moregine near Pompeii.⁴⁰ The Victoria in question carries a tripod, a well-known victory symbol. Her counterpart from the opposite wall carries weapons. Though I do not believe the current theories according to which the Moregine paintings were directly linked to Nero and his family,⁴¹ I think that motifs such as the Victoria may have been borrowed from official art.

The *torque* also had a feminine side. During the Middle Republic especially, it was worn by women in Etruria and Latium.⁴² It is also seen adorning deities and mythological figures.⁴³

34. According to Kleiner and Buxton 2008, 72, the tunics are "non-Roman". There is, however, nothing non-Roman about the garment as such, but they are worn leaving a shoulder bared. As will be shown below, this is not necessarily a non-Roman feature, but rather a cultic one.

35. For examples see Krierer 1995, pls. 24:83, 25:86, 29:101,104, 38:132,134, 149:474, 151:482.

36. For an example (Gallia) see LIMC VIII,1, 595, no. 10 (text: M. Henig).

37. Maxfield 1981, 86-89.

38. Daremberg-Saglio V, s.v. *torques*, 377.

39. Maxfield 1981, pls. 2, 6-14.

40. Baldassarre, Pontrandolfo, Rouveret and Salvadori 2006, 256-257; Nava, Paris and Friggeri 2007, 71, fig. 11.

41. Nava, Paris and Friggeri 2007, 60-73.

42. Hafner 1965, 48, pl. 16,3; Comella 1982, B2 XXXII, 83, pl. 47 a; Stefani 1984, 9-10, no. 9, pl. IV c; Cristofani 1985, 273, no. 68, 274-275, nos. 70-71. Examples are found as late as the early 2nd century AD (Giuliano 1979-1995, I,9,1, 241-243, R182, text: L. Martelli).

43. Bianchi Bandinelli 1970, 33, fig. 38 (Demeter); EAA I, 632-33, fig. 8 (Ariadne); LIMC II,1, 174, no. 4 (Aphrodite/Turan); Cristofani 1985, 285-286, nos. 104-105 (Culsus and Selvans/Silvanus).

From the female sphere the connection is not difficult to that of children and youths, both real and mythological. In Roman art the *torque* can be worn by Amor,⁴⁴ erotes,⁴⁵ *putti*,⁴⁶ handsome young servants (so-called *delicati*),⁴⁷ *genii*,⁴⁸ and Attis.⁴⁹ In one case even a statuette of Hermes if fitted with a silver *torque*.⁵⁰

Besides military value and victory, the common denomination seems to be “youth and beauty”, but sometimes the meaning of the *torque* is ambiguous. Has the statuette of Hermes, which was found in Germany, been “barbarized” through the addition of a *torque* by a German? Is Attis wearing a *torque* because he is an Oriental god, or because he is young, handsome and effeminate? Does the *torque* worn by Hercules in a painting from the House of M. Lucretius in Pompeii belong to him, or has he changed attributes with the Lydian queen Omphale, who is depicted beside him wearing his lion scalp?⁵¹

In other cases, such as the arch-Roman *Genius Populi Romani*⁵² and the *Genius Augusti*, the *torque* can hardly be a sign of “barbarian” descent. The *torque* of the *Genius Populi Romani* may refer to military valour, as a Military Genius carved on a pillar at Ostia wears the same ornament.⁵³ For obvious reasons the bare-chested *genii* could not have the *torque* attached to the cuirass in the usual manner of Roman soldiers, and therefore they wore it around the neck. The iconography and general context of the figure would make it clear that this was not a barbarian.

Also in the case of the *Genius Augusti* a military interpretation of the *torque* is most likely. Of two second century statues of this type wearing the *torque*, one has features resembling those of Lucius Verus, an emperor who spent much of his time campaigning.⁵⁴ I will also give a military explanation of the *torque* worn by one of the officers next to Tiberius’ triumphal chariot on one of the Boscoreale cups.⁵⁵ In this case the lack of a cuirass and the small format are probably responsible for the *torque* being worn around the neck. In the cases quoted above, the *torque* is more a “marker” indicating military valour than an ornament worn in a realistic manner. Precisely because it was such a common and well-known military decoration, it may have been chosen for the purpose.

In connection with the *torques* mention should be made of an altar to 2 B.C. from the *Vicus*

44. LIMC III,1, 722, no. 642.

45. PPM IX, 267, fig. 188; Weeber 2003, 36; Dunbabin 2003, pl. IV.

46. Amedick 1991a, no. 14, pl. 21,1; no. 246. pl. 21,2, no. 286, pl. 16.

47. Amedick 1991a, no. 286, pl. 15, 2, 17, 3-4; no. 19, pl. 16,1.

48. LIMC VIII,1, 373, nos. 22, 30; Kunckel 1974, 48, 78, A 5, A 6, pl. 11, 108-109, CI 81, pl. 84.

49. LIMC III,1, 38-39, nos. 345, 361, 362. Nos. 361 and 362 wear a *torque* with a central element which in the text is identified with a *bullā*. In my opinion it is unlikely that this typically Italic amulet should be worn by a Phrygian god. It is more probably a jewel, which is also seen decorating *torques* in other cases.

50. Weeber 2003, 104.

51. PPM IX, 268-70, fig. 191 a-b; Kampen 1996, 236-38, fig. 99. Another Pompeian painting with the same motif from an anonymous house (Reg. VIII, ins. 4, 34) also shows Hercules with female clothes and a torque, but there he has not changed attributes with Omphale, who sits beside him, her lower body wrapped in a cloak (PPM VIII, 536, fig. 6).

52. Kunckel 1974, 73, 108, CI 74; Wrede 2001, 70, pl. 17, 1.

53. LIMC VIII, 1, 602, no. 22.

54. Kunckel 1974, 48, 78, A 5, A 6, pl. 11; Romualdi 2004, 105-107, no. 41.

55. Ryberg 1955, 141-144, pl. L, fig. 77 a-d; Zanker 1987, 229-232, fig. 181; Kleiner 1992, 152-154, fig. 129; Fless 1995, 24, 55, 71, 73, 77, 79, 80, pl. 15:1. Kuttner 1995, 145-147, considers him to be a Gallic officer.

Sandaliarius in Rome, now in Florence,⁵⁶ showing Augustus as an *augur* flanked by one of his grandsons (probably Gaius Caesar)⁵⁷ and a woman wearing a lunular diadem and a *torque*. This woman has by some scholars been identified as a member of the Imperial house, generally Livia.⁵⁸ Ch. B. Rose, however, has claimed that no woman of the Imperial family is shown wearing a diadem as early as 2 B.C., and instead suggested a priestess of Cybele.⁵⁹ The *torque* was interpreted by him as an "oriental" attribute pointing to Asia Minor, where Gaius was going on a campaign.

If Rose is right in maintaining that no Imperial woman was depicted with a diadem during the reign of Augustus, it becomes even more unlikely that a non-imperial woman should have been represented with this attribute.⁶⁰ The woman on the altar is in that case most probably a goddess or personification. She may have been associated with manly valour or the army, but it should be remembered that the *torque* was a female ornament during the Republican period. It could therefore simply represent the venerability/antiquity of the goddess or personification in question, one of the many retrospective features of the Augustan period, alluding to an image which was known to the contemporary public, but unknown to us.⁶¹

The use of the *torques* in Roman art would merit a separate study, but the list of examples given here, which is by no means exhaustive, should make it clear that there is no compelling reason to regard the *torque* as an exclusively "barbarian" ornament. Every "barbarian" feature of the children on the Ara Pacis (the *torques*, the hairstyle and the tunics) can be given a "non-barbarian" interpretation. A. Kuttner's assertion that "it is now clear beyond a shadow of doubt that children of foreign rulers marched in the processions of the Ara Pacis", therefore seems over-optimistic.⁶² What I find most difficult to accept about the "barbarian" theory, is why, in a procession staged to show the Princeps' family as an example to all, the pride of place should be given to two strangers, and barbarians at that, while the legitimate offspring of Augustus' family was relegated to positions further back in the train.⁶³ Furthermore, in the Roman triumphal procession the hostages marched together with the prisoners of war, notwithstanding the different treatment meted out to them after the procession had come to an end.⁶⁴ To a Roman public used to see the foreign hostages paraded in a position denoting humiliation, it would be very odd to find them included in a procession where they were shown on the most familiar terms with the leading men of the State such as Agrippa.

56. Polacco 1955, 76-77, pls. IX-XI; Ryberg 1955, 60-61, pl. XVI, fig. 31; Mansuelli 1958, 203-206, no. 205, fig. 198 a-d; Alföldi 1973, 32-33, pl. XII; Simon 1986, 70-73, figs. 83, 87; Hano 1986, 2338-39, cat. 2, pl. VII, 14; Zanker 1987, 128-29, fig. 101; Pollini 1987, 98, cat. 12, pl. 14, 1; Rose 1997, 104-106, cat. 33, pls. 111-13; Pollini 2012, 137, Fig. III.7.

57. For the various interpretations see Pollini 1987, 98 (under cat. 12).

58. Polacco 1955, 76; Mansuelli 1958, 204-205, Hölscher 1984, 27-28; Pollini 1978, 304-305; Pollini 1987, 31, 34; Hano 1986, 2339; Zanker 1987, 129.

59. Rose 1997, 105-106 with n. 9.

60. It is not seen in private portraiture till the second half of the 1st century A.D. (cf. Wrede 1981, 75).

61. Simon 1986, 71, suggested the goddess Iuventas.

62. Kuttner 1995, 203. See also the remarks to this assertion in Kleiner 1997, 379.

63. Based on recent historical research, Kleiner and Buxton 2008, especially 75-76, argue that Gaius and Lucius Caesar were not groomed as heirs to the empire before 6 B.C. That may well be so, but they were still his personal heirs.

64. Östenberg 2003, 161-164.

J. Diddle Uzzi uses the positions and gestures of the tunic-clad children as an argument in favour of their barbarian origin. According to her, the boy on the south frieze is typical of a non-Roman child from triumphal and violent contexts: his nearly frontal position with hands grabbing the garment of Agrippa while turning his head backwards indicates to her that he is lost and helpless among Roman adults, who do not deign him a glance.⁶⁵ But this is the case with the other children on Ara Pacis too. Only a few paces behind the so-called barbarian child one sees a toga-clad boy in a similar almost frontal position (No. 41 according to Pollini and Rossini, no. 42 according to Koeppel, often identified as Gn. Domitius Ahenobarbus) gripping the cloak of the adult in front of him (Drusus) while he turns his head to a girl behind him, presumably his sister (generally identified as Domitia).⁶⁶ A woman in the second row touches him lightly with her hand (as does the woman behind the “barbarian” boy), but she does not look at him. Nor does Drusus acknowledge his presence, but then he does not glance at his son Germanicus either. In fact, the adults on the Ara Pacis seem strangely unaware of the children in the procession: they may touch them or, in the case of very small children, hold their hand, but they never look at them. The message could be that the children could already fend for themselves and behave correctly on public occasions without needing anything more than a reassuring touch from the adults. The only exception is the whining toddler, but such a small child would feel lost and helpless in a public procession anyway, regardless of the people surrounding him. In the case of the toga-clad boy, his gestures must denote relationship. By gripping the garment of one relative and turning towards another, he indicates that he has connections to both. The toddler between the married couple on the relief from Ostia mentioned above (p. 14) performs the same gesture, touching the garment of his mother while turning to his father. On the Ara Pacis it is unlikely that very similar body language should express two completely different concepts, and I therefore think that both the toga – and the tunic – clad boy on the south frieze perform the same gesture: one of belonging to the group of surrounding adults.

Identification of the children

Still, the traditional view of Gaius and Lucius, with Gaius placed on the south side and Lucius on the north, is difficult to uphold because of the tender age of the younger boy. Who can he be? It is generally believed that one of the aims of the Ara Pacis was to show as many members of the Roman priesthoods and of Augustus’ family as possible. As Gerhard Koeppel has remarked, the designers of the Ara Pacis showed unconcern towards historical realities.⁶⁷

65. Uzzi 2005, 150-151. Already Gercke expressed a similar opinion (Gercke 1968, 140). For arguments against Uzzi see especially Kleiner and Buxton 2008, 67 with n. 37.

66. Moretti 1948, 231, pl. XII; Gercke 1968, 129-30, 134-135, C; Pollini 1978, 108-109, S 41; Torelli 1980, 50, fig. II.19; Koeppel 1987, 126, cat. 5, fig. 15, no. 42. Rossini 2006, 59. The boy has not his original head,

but the remains of the neck justifies the restoration with a backward turn. This feature is also supported by the position of the girl behind him. Her attitude suggests that there was an eye contact between the two, who are generally identified with Gn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and Domitia.

67. Koeppel 1988, 99-100.

I believe that the toddler constitutes another example of this unconcern. He is in my opinion Agrippa Posthumus, born in 12 B.C. after his father's death. In a monument to the prolificacy of the Julio-Claudian family, he is likely to have been included, but as an afterthought. The general layout of the procession would have been ready when he was born, but not the carving, so he could still be fitted in. Faced with the possibility of putting him either first or last in the procession, the designers chose the first, where he could be near his family, though not physically connected with them. The seeming indifference of his two companions is probably the result of his having been squeezed into a context where an infant was not meant to be included originally.

P. Rehak has suggested that the fourth *flamen* on the Ara Pacis was carved out of a background figure, which is why he is in lower relief than the other *flamines* and more or less hidden behind them.⁶⁸ As the number of *flamines* was complete only in 11 B.C., the fourth *flamen* cannot have been carved earlier than that year. J. Pollini has assessed the age of the toddler whom I identify with Agrippa Posthumus, as one year.⁶⁹ That means that he could also have been carved in the year 11. While the added *flamen* is a background figure, the small Agrippa is carved in high relief. My guess is that this part of the frieze was blocked out for him as soon as he was born, but, given the high infant mortality in Antiquity, the sculptors probably waited a while to see if he would survive his first year. It should be noted that almost his entire body covers that of a background figure carved in very low relief, which means that he could have been removed without damaging the other figures surrounding him. With regard to his gestures, it is interesting to compare him to other children on the Ara Pacis. While his counterpart on the south frieze grasps Agrippa's toga so that the flow of draperies is altered, the toddler merely lays his clenched fist on the surface of the togatus beside him, though from a distance he seems to tug at the garment. Germanicus on the south frieze has a firm grip on Antonia's forefinger so that it is impossible to remove his hand without maiming that of his mother. By contrast the raised hand of the toddler is only glimpsed as an amorphous mass between the thumb and forefinger of the man who holds him by the hand.

With regard to the two other boys wearing tunics, I identify the one on the south frieze with Lucius, and the *camillus* on the north frieze with Gaius.⁷⁰ Behind the latter there is a slightly younger girl whom I with Ronald Syme and others believe to be Julia minor.⁷¹ Her younger sister Agrippina was probably represented on the south frieze. The missing portion of the relief in front of Antonia minor gives room for an infant of Germanicus' size, and there I think the little girl was placed, accompanied by a male figure which has been completely obliterated thanks to the change of sex effectuated by the restorer.⁷²

68. Rehak 2001, 287-288.

69. Pollini 1987, 22. See also n. 22. For the difficulties of assessing the age of Imperial children, see below.

70. This boy has generally been regarded as an acolyte, either Gaius or an anonymous member of Augustus' family, but Kleiner and Buxton have identified him as a son of Juba II and Cleopatra Selene, born around 20/19 B.C. (Kleiner and Buxton 2008, 84-85). There is, however, no evidence that such a son ever existed, nor that the cloak of the boy is a Hellenistic royal

cloak. It looks like an ordinary *ricinium*. The fact that the boy does not wear the bulla does not automatically make him a foreigner. If he is acting as an acolyte, the amulet character of the bulla would not have been needed. As a priestly assistant, he would be under the special protection of the god or gods (Pollini 2012, 324-325).

71. Syme 1984, 588; Rossini 2006, 52, no. 40.

72. Foresta 2002, 62-63, figs. 14 b, 17 b. For the recut male figure see Conlin 1992.

Models for their attire

As for the unusual attire of the three grandsons of Augustus, I agree with the interpretations of Moretti and Toynbee, who see the boys dressed up as acolytes.⁷³ Ch. B. Rose has already pointed out the resemblance between Gaius Caesar and the “*camillus*” on the Aeneas panel on the Ara Pacis,⁷⁴ and there are good parallels in Roman art to the younger boys, too. The same type of wide tunic is worn by one of the putti on the Four Season altar in Würzburg.⁷⁵ It was identified as a cultic costume by Erika Simon. On the Würzburg altar the bared shoulder recurs, as it does in a wall-painting from the House of the Vettii at Pompei, showing a sacrificial servant.⁷⁶ The Pompeian boy has the same longish hair as the youngest of the children on the Ara Pacis. The bared shoulder occurs in other sacrificial contexts. The members of the *quindemviri sacris faciundis*, one of the priesthoods reorganized by Augustus, are represented sacrificing wearing a simple, heavy tunic with one bared shoulder.⁷⁷

A bared shoulder is especially common in representations of adherents of mystery cults, notably that of Dionysos, as has been shown by H. Wrede.⁷⁸ More recently G. Schörner has pointed out that this feature had a diffusion beyond the Dionysiac sphere, and that the bared shoulder was taken over from Hellenistic models in the Augustan period as the result of a re-formulation of the iconography of sacrificial servants.⁷⁹ The bared shoulder is common in reliefs, but it also occurs in large scale works such as the famous Girl from Anzio in the Museo Nazionale Romano.⁸⁰ Like the acolytes on the Ara Pacis, she wears clothes which are too big for her. It is difficult to say if this is a cultic feature, too, or if it is not rather a sign of young age, as children were often given over-large clothes which they could “grow into”. The last example of a bared shoulder in cultic context known to me is constituted by the Symmachorum-Nicomachorum diptych.⁸¹ The priestess on the Nicomachorum leaf and the acolyte on the Symmachorum leaf bare their right shoulder, which indicates that even as late as the end of the 4th century A.D. the meaning of this feature was understood by the adherents of the traditional Roman religion.

Not exactly a bared shoulder, but a tunic slit open to the shoulder to allow the arm maximum of movement, is exhibited by a statue found under the Quirinal, now in the Centrale Montemartini in Rome (FIG. 6). At least four examples of the type exist, three in Rome and a slightly different

73. Moretti 1948, 270-273; Toynbee 1953, 84, 88.

74. Rose 1990, 465-467.

75. Simon 1967b, 10, fig. 4. Ill. in Simon 1986, 125, fig. 166.

76. *PPM* V, 477, fig. 12; Fless 1995, 38, 57, pl. 26,1. He is one of several children depicted in the *Atrium c* in the House of the Vettii. Fless sees in these children only “servants”, but their attributes (wreath, garland, pitcher, *thymaterion*) suggest that they are engaged in a sacrifice, probably of private character, as has been remarked by other authors (Coarelli 1976, 271).

77. Stuart Jones 1912, 32-33, no. 22 a, pl. 8; Alföldi 1973, 54, pl. XXVI; Goette 1984, 578-583, figs. 5-6; Zanker 1987, 124, fig. 99.

78. Wrede 1991, 174-188.

79. Schörner 2002, especially 172-174.

80. Giuliano 1979-1995, I, 186-192, cat. 121, with further bibliography (text: L. de Lachenal). Compare also two panels from the Macellum in Pompei showing a young female sacrificial servant with a bared shoulder (*PPM* VII, 343, 348, figs. 21, 27).

81. Volbach 1976, 51, cat. 55, pl. 29; Weitzmann 1979, 187-188, cat. 166; Stutzinger *et al.* 1984, 533-535, cat. 141; Küllerich 1993, 144-149, fig. 82, all with bibliography.

FIG. 6 – Statue of a sacrificial servant. Rome, Musei Capitolini (at present in the Centrale Montemartini). Photo: D.A.I. Rome.

version in Petworth House in England.⁸² Their attributes show that they were connected with the Eleusinian cult, and it has been suggested that they represent *παῖδες ἀφεστιασ μνηθεντες*, the boys of high birth who were chosen to perform the ceremony of initiation as representatives of the Athenian youths. This type of acolyte probably furnished the model for Lucius Caesar on the Ara Pacis, whose "Severe" hairstyle with corkscrew locks and ribbon or plait could have been a wig worn for the occasion. The noble background of the boys would make them suitable as models for young members of the Augustan house. The statues of the Eleusinian boys are generally thought to copy a Greek original in the Severe style, whereas I am inclined to see in the prototype a Severizing work of the late Hellenistic period.⁸³ More important than the dating of the original is the fact that the Romans evidently thought that this is what sacrificial servants looked like in the old days, and therefore Lucius was dressed up that way.⁸⁴ The reason why he alone wears this kind of retrospective, elaborate coiffure, is probably due to his lack of attributes. Gaius, who may have held a pitcher and wears a *ricinium*, is sufficiently indicated as an acolyte.

82. Spaulding 1911, 52-62; Stuart Jones 1926, 115-116, no. 68, pl. 42; Helbig 4 II, no. 1503 (text: H. von Steuben); Ridgway 1970, 68, 75, fig. 112; Raeder 2000, 105-107, cat. 28, pls. 41,2; 42.

83. Already Spaulding 1911, 55-59, pointed out the retrospective character of the statues. She suggests that this type of retrospective representation of acolytes may have originated around the middle of the first centu-

ry B.C. in connection with the Roman interest in Eleusis, as manifested by the Lesser Propylaia, built by Appius Claudius Pulcher.

84. As has been pointed out by F. Fless, the acolytes represented in Greek Classical art wore himation, not tunic, so the typical tunic of the Roman *minister* cannot have had authentic Greek models (Fless 1985, 91-92).

As remarked by F. Fless, Gaius is probably not filling a religious function, but his dress is a sign of the prospective priesthoods which he may hold as a grown man.⁸⁵ This is also true of his two brothers. Agrippa Posthumus is thrown in as an afterthought, thus disturbing the original symmetry. Both Gaius and Lucius were probably meant to give associations to the two acolytes in sacrifice of Aeneas. Gaius' more "modern" dress (he is depicted as a contemporary sacrificial servant and wears an Augustan coiffure), may be seen in connection with the two women preceding and following him. All three wear a *ricinium*, which serves as a visual link. The *ricinium* of the women is probably of cultic nature and not a sign of widowhood. The two women have been supposed to represent Julia and Octavia as widows, but since Augustus wanted people to remarry as soon as possible (a policy he followed within his own family), it is unlikely that he should have wanted to show his nearest and dearest ones as perpetual widows, as it were. It is more probable that the *ricinia* allude to a specific cult with which the two women were associated. I would identify these women as Livia and Octavia.⁸⁶ They were often coupled, not only politically, but also visually in the shape of statues, especially in the early Augustan period.⁸⁷ I see Julia in the statuesque woman on the south frieze. It has been remarked that since she is the only woman who wears both a wreath and a veil on her head, she must be Livia, but the first woman on the north frieze is also shown *capite velato*, and she may well have worn a wreath under the veil, which was visible only above her (now missing) forehead.

In the years after Augustus' adoption of Gaius and Lucius in 17 B.C., Julia, not Livia, was the focal figure of Augustus' dynastic propaganda. It is therefore natural that she should have the most prominent position of the women on the Ara Pacis, on the south frieze like her father and placed behind her husband Agrippa. Lucius Caesar serves as another link: while grasping the toga of his father he looks back at his mother. The resemblance between Julia and the so-called Tellus on the east side of the altar has been remarked on.⁸⁸ It is probable that, just as the sacrificing Aeneas with his acolytes on the west side should invite associations to Augustus with Gaius and Lucius, so "Tellus" with the two babies in her lap should remind the spectators of the fecund Julia with the two heirs she had born.⁸⁹

The choice of dressing up Augustus' grandchildren as acolytes recalling sacrificial servants of the past (or rather, the image that one had of such servants) must be seen in connection of the Emperor's revival of ancient cults, half-forgotten cultic dances and songs and his insistence that those involved should play their part (as the *flamines* on the Ara Pacis do in their old-fashioned costumes). The rough and simple tunics of the boys are paralleled in representations of acolytes such as the one in fig. 6, but the *torques* and the long hair demand further discussions.

If one leaves out the barbarian explanation of the *torques*, one is left with three possibilities: youth and beauty, allusions to military victories or to the Trojan origins of the Princeps' family.

85. Fless 1995, 51.

86. For a similar opinion see La Rocca 2013, 244 (under VI.3.2, text: A. Taiuti).

87. Bartman 1999, 79.

88. Moretti 1948, 290 with figs. 193-194.

89. Compare Fullerton 1985, 481; Berczelly 1985, 143-149; Pollini 2012, 232.

It is natural to associate youth and beauty with children, and the *torques* could simply be seen as a means of emphasizing these qualities. I have already drawn attention to the resemblance between the toddler Agrippa Postumus and a *putto*.⁹⁰ *Putti* and *erotes* often wear jewellery, like Venus, and on the Ara Pacis it would not be surprising if Agrippa's resemblance to a *putto* was deliberate. It was said that Augustus and Livia had a great-grandchild, who died as a baby, depicted as an *eros*,⁹¹ and the *eros* riding the dolphin serving as a support for the statue of Augustus from Prima Porta has by some scholars been supposed to allude to Gaius Caesar.⁹² The boundaries between *erotes*, *putti* and children are often blurred in Roman art. The artists used children from real life as models for the mythological ones, who, in their turn, could inspire representations of real children. When the grandchildren of Augustus are shown wearing conspicuous jewellery like arm-rings and *torques*, the intention may have been to counterbalance the simplicity of the rough tunics they are wearing.

While allusions to youth and beauty through resemblances to mythological children would be generic in character, the *torques*' associations to military victories or Trojan ancestry are more specific (of course, in Augustan art, one association does not necessarily rule out others). Modern scholars' explanation of the *torques* as a Trojan attribute derives, as is well known, from Vergil's description of the Trojan games in the *Aeneid*, where the young participants wear *torques* around their necks.⁹³

However, Vergil does not say that they wear *torques* in memory of their origins. In fact, this piece of jewellery is normally not associated with Trojans in Roman art. Their attribute is the Phrygian cap. Since the Trojan games were of military character, the *torques* in the *Aeneid* could equally well allude to military valour. The fact that Augustus awarded a *torque* to a boy who had been wounded in the Trojan games, points in this direction.⁹⁴ In that case, the *torques* worn by Lucius Caesar and Agrippa Postumus may have been meant as a reference to future military victories.

Long hair is often worn by children in Greek art, both real and mythological ones. Eros especially is frequently seen with female coiffures.⁹⁵ The acolyte on fig. 6 has a coiffure with cork-screw locks and a twisted roll not unlike that of Lucius Caesar. Also the acolyte on the panel with the sacrificing Aeneas on the Ara Pacis, has long hair, a feature which is often overlooked.⁹⁶ The acolyte has a Hellenistic coiffure, where a portion of his hair has been allowed to grow and is made into a braid forming a loop at the back of his head. Also the toddler on the north frieze, whom I have identified with Agrippa Postumus, wears a braid along the top of his head. It is not long enough to form a loop, however.⁹⁷ A looped braid is worn by a bronze statuette of Eros in

90. See also Moretti 1948, 248; Pollini 1987, 22 with n. 23.

91. Suetonius, Caligula, 7.

92. Simon 1986, 55; Pollini 1987, 41.

93. *Aeneid* V, 558-2559.

94. Suetonius, Augustus, 43, 2.

95. See the many examples in LIMC III, 2, pp. 632-656. The majority are constituted by vase paintings from Southern Italy.

96. This detail is difficult to make out when the panel is photographed with the light coming from the right, but see the illustrations in Simon 1967, fig. 24; La Rocca 1983, 42; Rossini 2006, 32, and Pollini 2012, 243-245, Fig. V.32. Pollini calls this hairstyle "an invention of the Augustan period". Seeing that the looped braid is worn by statues of infants and children based on Hellenistic models, it would be more correct to call it a revival.

97. Good illustration in Rossini 2006, 77.

the Metropolitan Museum in New York.⁹⁸ The boy on each of the two so-called reconciliation cups found in Moregine near Pompei also has a looped braid. Since his head otherwise seems to be shaven, he is probably an early example of the so-called Isis boys (see below).⁹⁹ More pertinent to this article is a statue type show Hermes as a child, where one in addition to the looped braid notices the (cultic?) over-large dress with a bared shoulder.¹⁰⁰ A variant of this fashion, where the hair falls loosely down one side or the back of the head like a pony-tail, is seen on Greek funerary reliefs of the Roman period.¹⁰¹ On the so-called Warren cup in the British Museum, a silver cup with homoerotic scenes which are repeated in other media such as pottery and cameo glass, the youngest participant wears a pony-tail, as if to emphasize his tender age, while his adolescent partner on the same cup wears the same type of braid along his head as that of Agrippa Posthumus on the Ara Pacis.¹⁰²

Long hair made into braids or pony-tails in Roman art is chiefly associated with the so-called Isis boys,¹⁰³ but the custom is found in the Greek world as well. Hair could be grown in the honour of various deities and even rivers.¹⁰⁴ Also boys devoted to the Eleusinian deities had in the Roman period “Isis locks”, as testified by finds of portraits from the Athenian Agora and Eleusis.¹⁰⁵ Since the long locks or braids were typical of children, they came to be associated with youth, beauty and innocence.¹⁰⁶

The long hair of Lucius Caesar and Agrippa Postumus on the Ara Pacis is in my opinion to be seen as a “reconstruction” of hairdos worn by Greek youths. E. Simon has called the “Isis lock”

98. Richter 1915, 85-90, no. 131. For other examples see von Gonzenbach 1957, 29 with n. 58.

99. For the cups see Mastroroberto 2006. She identifies the male figures as priests of Isis, but since the latter had no hair on their heads at all, it is more reasonable to see boys dedicated to the goddess. The proportions of both the males and the so-called priestesses on the cups are appropriate to children, not adults. Rather than seeing a complicated political message on these cups I see two children, a boy with a ball and a girl with a cock, in a setting suggesting a palestra. Both the herms (probably representing athletes), the cock and the tortoise, an attribute of Hermes, are suitable to such a context.

100. Fittschen 1977, 11-15, pls. 2-3 with lists of replicas and variants of the type; Schörner 2002, 170 with n. 37.

101. Conze 1911-1922, IV, 61, no. 1973, pl. CCCXXVI, 64, no. 1987, 65, no. 1990, pl. CCCXXXI, 67-68, nos. 1999-2000, 70, no. 2010, pl. CCCXLIII, 82, no. 25058, 83, no. 2060. The locks are evidently grown in the honour of a divinity. No. 1973 is called *Isidotos*.

102. For the Warren cup and related objects see especially Clarke 1993; Clarke 1998, 59-90; Pollini 1999; Pollini 2001; Pollini 2003; Williams 2006; Moevs 2008 (she

considers the Warren cup a forgery). Because it was forbidden by Roman law to indulge in sexual intercourse with freeborn boys, the servile status of the youngest boy is taken for granted by most authors. However, erotic art is usually not preoccupied with maintaining law and order. Erotic scenes like those on the Warren cup were surely made to be fantasized about. To me, the Classicizing style of the Warren cup and details such as the cithara, the double flute and the beard of one of the participants suggest an imaginary Greek never-never-land where one was free to love whomever one wanted, young or old, slave or free (a similar explanation is given by Williams 2006, especially 58-59, and hinted at by Clarke 1993, 293). In such a context, the long hair of the boy could be seen merely as a sign of his delectable youth.

103. von Gonzenbach 1957; von Gonzenbach 1969, 918-927; Simon 1980.

104. Thompson 1948, 179; Harrison 1953, 54; von Gonzenbach 1957, 25-31; von Gonzenbach 1969, 918-927; Simon 1980, 175-176; Vorster 1982/83, 22-23, 87-88.

105. Harrison 1953, 54-56, cat. 41-42; von Gonzenbach 1969, 925-927, figs. 17-18.

106. Fless 1995, 60-63.

worn by Roman boys "a Romantic reconstruction".¹⁰⁷ I believe that the hair of the two Imperial children, and especially the complicated coiffure of Lucius, is another "Romantic reconstruction", strongly influenced by representations in the Severe and Severizing style. Like the bared shoulder, a feature taken over from Hellenistic models, it would be one of several retrospective features in the cults of the Augustan period, intended to give associations to old cults which Augustus had revived. It is probable that the boys took part in public processions dressed in such Archaizing garb, otherwise they would not have been recognized on the Ara Pacis frieze. Since they are separated from the members of the priesthood and their assistants, they are not taking active part in the religious proceedings. Therefore the explanation of F. Fless, who sees their costume as a reference to future priesthoods, is the most reasonable.¹⁰⁸ That does not mean that they could not have served as acolytes on certain occasions. Gaius is old enough to have served, at least on private occasions, in the years preceding Agrippa's death,¹⁰⁹ which is perhaps why he in contrast to his brothers is depicted in a realistic manner with the attributes of a *minister*.

In an article from 1989, P. Zanker pointed out that the classicizing taste of the Augustan period influenced not only art, but also fashions. On the South side of the Ara Pacis, the young (and presumably more fashion-conscious) female members of the Imperial family wear their clothes draped in a Classical manner, while the women on the North side follow more traditional Hellenistic models.¹¹⁰ In such a setting it would not be surprising if "reconstructions" of the costume of Greek acolytes were introduced.

Long hair worn by acolytes in the Augustan period

We may have a contemporary reflection of the coiffure of Lucius Caesar on an altar from Caere, now in the Vatican Museums, dedicated to C. Manlius by his clients.¹¹¹ On the front, which shows the sacrifice of a bull, C. Manlius is shown on the right. Beside him stands a sacrificial servant wearing tunic and *mantele* and carrying a pitcher. His hair is dressed in long, thick, sausage-shaped locks with a braid or twisted roll encircling the head. The model for the coiffure may have been a work of art such as an idealized representation of an acolyte in Severizing style (compare FIG. 6) or a figure in a public relief, but it could also be that the inspiration was more direct, and that C. Manlius' assistant actually wore such a coiffure, which had been sported in Rome during religious processions and other solemn occasions. An altar in the Vatican, dedicated to the *Lares compitales* and tentatively dated to the Augustan period or slightly later by S. Panciera, shows a

107. Simon 1980, 175. It is not seen before the second half of the 1st century B.C.

108. Fless 1995, 51. Compare also what has been said above about the *torques* as signs of future victories.

109. The death of his natural father would probably have put a stop to such performances, since freeborn boys and girls serving at religious functions were supposed to have both parents alive (cf. Fless 1995, 45-51).

110. Zanker 1989, 104. Bartman 1999, 88-90, suggests that the Greek style of dress is a means of "softening" the impact of the introduction of mortal women into a context of Roman state ceremonial.

111. Ross Taylor 1921; Ryberg 1955, 84-88, pls. XXV-XXVI, figs. 39 a-b; Helbig 4 I, no. 1058 (text: E. Simon); Torelli 1982, 16-20, pl. I, 6-8; Pollini 2002, 58-59, figs. 97-98. For the dating see Torelli 1982, 19-20.

FIG. 7 – Child and togatus, detail from a fragment of the so-called Ara Pietatis, Museo di Ara Pacis, Rome. Photo: Caroline Hannisdal.

sacrificial servant with a somewhat simpler coiffure with hair reaching to the shoulders.¹¹² If M. Torelli's dating of the Manlius altar to about 10 B.C. is correct,¹¹³ it would constitute a very early example of a sacrificial servant with long hair. The often elaborate coiffures of the youths serving at sacrifices and taking part in public processions do not become customary till later.¹¹⁴

Claudian Unisex

A fragment from the monument traditionally called "Ara Pietatis" (I shall use that name here in inverted commas, because there is no general agreement as to its real name) shows a togatus whose right hand rests on the shoulder of a child (FIG. 7). The child, who is wearing a garment (probably a tunic) which exposes the right shoulder and the upper part of the chest, is slightly

112. Panciera 1987, 73-78, figs. 8-12; Fless 1995, 38-39, 105, cat. 14; Schörner 2002, 166.

113. Torelli 1982, 19-20.

114. According to Fless, one of the *ministri* on the Ara Pacis has long hair (Fless 1985, 38, pl. 18, 1). As has been pointed out by T. Schäfer, however, the "long

hair" is in fact whiskers (Schäfer 1998, 146). The *ministri* on the Ara Pacis all seem too old for the long-haired coiffures of Lucius Caesar and Agrippa Postumus on the same monument, which are typical of children.

FIGS. 8-9 – Head from statue of a young girl from Rusellae, Grosseto, Museo Archeologico. Photo: T. Østberg.

plump with a round face, fleshy cheeks and a “Venus ring” transversing the neck. The hair, combed in a unisex-coiffure (short for a girl, long for a boy), falls in natural waves covering the ears.

E. La Rocca, who presented this fragment in an article from 1994, took it for granted that the child was a boy, and compared him (correctly, in my opinion) to the two tunic-clad children on the Ara Pacis.¹¹⁵ According to La Rocca, the child might be “un giovanissimo principe della famiglia claudia”. The way the togatus lays his hand protectively on his shoulder suggests that he was an elite child and no mere attendant.

With regard to gender, it is not obvious that the child is male. The soft features and the “Venus ring” are equally appropriate to a female. When I like La Rocca assume him to be a boy, it is because I doubt that an aristocratic Roman girl would have shown such a large part of her chest in a public procession.

The hairdo is also suited to a girl. This unisex coiffure recurs in a portrait statue of a young girl from Rusellae in Southern Tuscany. It was one of the items of the exhibition *Nerone* which was staged at the Forum Romanum in 2011 (FIGS. 8-9).¹¹⁶ The statue formed part of an Imperial Julio-

115. La Rocca 1984, 284-286. For the monument see further Torelli 1982, 66-88, figs. III.20-III.28; Koeppl 1983, 72-80, 72-80, 98-116, cat. 12-28 with bibliography; Kleiner 1992, 141-145 with further bibliography;

raphy; Kleiner 1992, 141-145 with further bibliography; Rossini 2006, 100-103.

116. Tomei and Rea 2011, 234, no. 11. For the statue see further Rose 1997, 118; Wood 1999, 284; Varner 2004, 101.

Claudian group found in the House of the Augustales.¹¹⁷ It has been identified as a portrait of Claudia Octavia, Claudius' younger daughter (most probably born in AD 40). Two pieces from an inscription found in the same building have been reconstructed by V. Saladino as [O]cta[viae A]ugus[ti f(iliae)].¹¹⁸ Other statues of members of the Julio-Claudian family were found there, among them two young togati still wearing the bulla, in all likelihood Britannicus and Nero. This would date the statues of the three children to AD 50-51, after Nero's adoption and before his assumption of the *toga virilis*.

The young girl is wearing a *toga praetexta* over a tunic reaching to the feet. The head, which was made for insertion, is recut. This is apparent on the left side, where the volume of the original head did not suffice, and a now missing slice of marble had to be attached. The left ear was never carved, again from lack of volume. Recut heads tend to repeat the gender and status of the original head, which is therefore likely to have represented an Imperial woman. By an ironic twist of fate it could have been a portrait of the girl's own mother Messalina, whose portraits were available as material after her fall in AD 48.¹¹⁹

The type of unisex coiffure shown by the children from "Ara Pietatis" and Rusellae is older than the Claudian period, since it appears on an earlier portrait of a small girl in a Swiss collection.¹²⁰ Her hair forms a fringe above the forehead reminiscent of a male coiffure, while it descends freely behind the ears. The gender of the child is ascertained by holes in the earlobes, which held earrings of metal. The publication suggests that the child is a princess of the Tiberian house. This suggestion is attractive, but cannot be corroborated by the existence of replicas. A somewhat later portrait type of a child is likely to represent a member of the Imperial house, since it is known in three replicas. R. Amedick, who published them, suggested that they portray Britannicus, the son of Claudius and Messalina.¹²¹ She was presumably influenced by the hair fringe above the forehead, which is normally found in boys' coiffures, but as K. Fittschen has shown, girls could also be represented with male hairdos.¹²² The jewelled band extending from the back of the head to the forehead is more typical of girls,¹²³ as are the thick, curling strands of hair (in German called *Kringeln*) which cover the head from the temples and back.¹²⁴ This portrait is therefore more probably female, and could represent Claudia Octavia in an earlier version than the one at Rusellae. One might even be so bold as to suggest that Caligula's daughter Julia Drusilla is meant. Her proud father, who entrusted her to the care of Minerva, would have lost no time in having images of her erected. One might object that her portraits would have been destroyed with those of her parents, but portraits of undesirable members of the Imperial house, especially childhood images, were occasionally allowed to remain if they were included in statue groups.¹²⁵

117. For the statue group see Pagnini, Paoli and Salvini 1990; Amedick 1987, 45-54; Rose 1997, 116-118 with further bibliography.

118. Saladino 1980, 222-223.

119. For the difficulties involved in recutting Messalina's portraits see Varner 2004, 97. If her head were recut into that of a child, the difficulties would be smaller because one could remove more of the marble. The fact that there was a shortage of material on the left side of the head could mean that the original head had received a blow at that point.

120. Jucker and Willers 1982, 86-87, no. 33; Fless 1995, 65.

121. Amedick 1991b, especially 373-378, pls. 95-97. Her suggestion has been accepted by Wood 1999, 285.

122. Fittschen 1992.

123. See Gonzebach 1969.

124. See Bol 1989 (text: J. Meischner), 150-153, Cat. 41, pl. 77, 1, 78, 2-3.

125. For childhood portraits of Nero see Varner 2004, 79-81.

In the case of Julia Drusilla, on the assumption that one small girl resembled another, her portraits could easily be transformed into a daughter of Claudius by the simple expedient of changing the name on the statues' bases.

There already exists a statue of a small girl which is almost unanimously considered to be a portrait of Claudia Octavia. It was found in an Imperial nymphaeum at Baiae from the Claudian period, and its publisher B. Andreae estimated her age to six years.¹²⁶ The fringe above the girl's forehead is not Claudian, but a miniature version of Nero's last portrait type, which appears on coins from AD 64 onwards.¹²⁷ Also the rather small, deeply embedded eyes give associations to Neros' portraits. I therefore suggest that the Baiae statue is an image of Nero's daughter Claudia Augusta, who was born in AD 63.¹²⁸ She lived only four months and was afterwards deified. It is of course impossible that the statue from Baiae could be a realistic representation of a child of four months. However, this is no human child, but a little goddess. Coins with the image of a temple of the deified Claudia Augusta, shows her statue standing, as befitting a divine being.¹²⁹

According to Amedick there exist two replicas of the portrait of the Baiae girl, one in a Spanish private collection and one in the Museo Civico di Storia ed Arte in Trieste.¹³⁰ Of those the former has the *coma in gradus formata* like the girl from Baiae, but the rest of the hair is much more simplified, it lacks the hair jewels and has a different profile. The Trieste portrait shows a child who looks considerably older. She has a longer face and lacks the *coma in gradus formata*. Her bangs are not unlike those of Claudia Octavia from Rusellae, but they are all combed the same way without a parting. The Trieste and Rusellae portraits have one thing in common: both were recut from an older, female head, which may have been mutilated (alternatively the added pieces on both sides of the head in Trieste mean that the portrait was mutilated and then repaired in its second phase).¹³¹ Since neither the Spanish head nor that in Trieste can be said to be replicas of other known portraits, it is better to assign them to the realm of private portraits of children with unisex coiffures. Amedick presents several in her article, and they testify to the popularity of this type of coiffure in the Claudian and Neronian periods.¹³²

On the unisex portraits discussed hitherto, the transition from the bangs to the hair further back is gradual, but there exists a variety which shows a more marked difference between front and back. A head in Cremona furnishes a good example.¹³³ The hair in front forms bangs with a sickle-shaped lock in front of each ear. A central plait ended in a metal ornament, the holes of which remain. This makes it probable that a girl is represented. At the back of the head the hair descends in long, straight strands. They are set off from the hair in front by a vertical parting running from ear to ear. A portrait of a child in Aquileia has a similar coiffure, but the strands are thinner and

126. Andreae 1984, 56-60, no. 8, figs. 156-162, 169; Andreae 1991, 259-261, figs. 16-17; Andreae 1994, 223-225, 228-229, 234-235, figs. 12, 31, 43. For the statue see further Gercke 1968, 64-65, FM 23, Amedick 1991b, 378-380, pl. 99, 1-4; Rose 1997, 82-83, cat. 4, pl. 62; Wood 1999, 283-284, figs. 69-71; La Rocca, Parisi Presicce and Lo Monaco 2011, 322-323, 5.8 (text: A. Lo Monaco).

127. Hiesinger 1975, 120-124, pl. 25; Bergmann and Zanker 1981, 326-300, figs. 9-11.

128. I suggested this already in 1985, but only in a footnote (Sande 1981, 217, n. 181).

129. See Wrede 1981, 74.

130. Amedick 1991b, 378-380, pls. 99-100. For the Trieste portrait see also Scrinari 1956, 202-203, pl. 48, 1.

131. For the deep drill holes on both sides of the head compare Varner 2004, Fig. 101.

132. Amedick 1991b, 386-395, pls. 101-104.

133. Amedick 1991b, 387-388, pl. 102; Fless 1995, 65-66; Pollini 2002, 23, 61, figs. 76-77.

FIG. 10 – Claudian funerary altar in the Museo Nazionale Romano. Photo: D.A.I., Rome.

the central plait is lacking.¹³⁴ Both portraits have been dated to the Claudian period.

It is this variant which becomes the standard for *ministri* in public contexts and for high class slaves serving at the table in the dwellings of the rich. The idea of representing long-haired acolytes is probably a throw-back to Augustan models, but the standardisation of their coiffures seems to have taken place during the reign of Claudius. The hair at the back of the head would descend in long strands, while the locks above the forehead would follow contemporary fashions. One of the panels from the *Sebasteion* in Aphrodisias shows a *minister* beside an Imperial woman (Livia?).¹³⁵ Above the forehead his hair is combed according to late Claudian/early Neronian fashions, with long locks descending on his shoulders. The idea of furnishing slaves with this kind of coiffure also seems to be connected with the reign of Claudius. An early Claudian funerary altar in the Museo Nazionale Romano shows private servants with “Camillus” coiffures (FIG. 10).¹³⁶ At the same time these slaves appear in literature as servants of the rich. To characterize them the words *delicati*, *capillati*, *comati*, *cirrati* or *crispulati* are used.¹³⁷ Since the tasks per-

134. Scinari 1956, 202-203, pl. 48, 2; Scinari 1972, 79, no. 239; Amedick 1991, 388; Fless 1995, 64-65; Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, n. 9, a.

135. Smith 1987, 125-127, no. 10, pls. XXII, XXIII, 1; Rose 1997, 166-167, pl. 210 with further bibliography. For long-haired *ministri* on monuments outside Roma, see also an altar from Carthage (Ryberg 1955, 89-90, pl. XXVII, fig. 41 d. The altar has been dated to the Neronian period by E. Simon (Simon 1986, 224).

136. Giuliano 1979-1995, I, 260-264, no. 161 (text: P.

Rendini); Boschung 1987, 108, no. 848, pl. 44; Fless 1995, 57 with n. 396; Pollini 1999, 31, 33, fig. 15; Pollini 2002, 518-519, fig. 101; Mantle 2002, 101-102, fig. 6.

137. See Fless 1995, 56-60; Pollini 2002, 53-62; Pollini 2003, 156-159; Pollini 2004, 519-521; Weeber 2003, 127-136, especially 130-131. Ancient authors like Philo and Seneca depict these slaves as being the constant prey of men with pedophile tendencies. Since these moralists had their own agenda and used the boys as examples of the general moral decadence of their times, their lot may not have been as uniformly bad as described.

formed by *ministri* on public occasions were taken over by slaves,¹³⁸ one will probably never more see an Imperial child in the costume of an acolyte on a public monument. The "Imperial" period for the "Camillus" coiffure is over, but it is going to have a long life.

Long hair worn by ministri after the Claudian period

The second half of the 1st century B.C. witnessed an increasing interest in the coiffures of long-haired boys and youths, which was probably spurred by the development of more refined male coiffures in general. The *coma in gradus formata*¹³⁹ combined with free-falling locks down the back of the head became popular. Variants of it can be followed well into the Hadrianic period.

The Arch of Titus is the first public monument to show long-haired youths in greater numbers. They are seen carrying *tabulae ansatae* on the panel showing the booty from Jerusalem, while the youths on the small frieze are carrying shields and objects which are either *candelabri* or more probably *thymateria*. They are also likely to have been long-haired, though only one is so well preserved that this feature can be clearly seen. The same objects are being carried by long-haired youths on the Arch of Trajan at Benevent.¹⁴⁰ Groups of long-haired youths flanking *thymateria* are also found on the Arch of the Argenti in Rome, erected in the honour of Septimius Severus and his family.¹⁴¹ A relief fragment from Rieti shows a long-haired child with the *coma in gradus formata*. He may also have been shown flanking a *thymaterion* or a similar element, unless he comes from a funerary monument.¹⁴²

Two of the *tabula ansata* carriers on the Arch of Titus wear the *coma in gradus formata* (FIG. 11). A particularly fine version of this coiffure, with the addition of a lunular-shaped diadem and a laurel wreath, is worn by a head which was published in 2004 by J. Pollini.¹⁴³ At the time of its publication the head was in the Antiquarium Comunale on the Caelian Hill in Rome. It must have come from an important public monument. One may guess at the Arch of Titus in the Circus Maximus, which was recently excavated.¹⁴⁴ Its height has been assessed to more than 10 metres, the width and depth to respectively 17 and 15 metres.

138. See especially Fless 1995, 56-63.

139. See Cain 1993, 58-67.

140. Rotili 1972, pls. V-X, XXVIII-XXXII; Pfanner 1983, 51, 53, 88, 89, pls. 54, 57:1, 58:1, 62:4, 65:1-2, 66:3, 80:1-4, 81:1-2, 82:6, 83:1, 3, 4-7, 87:1, 4; Fless 1995, 25-31, pls. 7:2, 8:1-2, 18:2, 21:1-2, 22:2, 23:1; Pollini 2004, 522-523, figs. 9-10.

141. Fless 1995, 26-27, pl. 8:2.

142. Reggiani Massarini 1990, 49, cat. 54, pl. XX; Fless 1995, 39 with n. 227; Pollini 2004, 518-519, figs. 7-8. The fragment cannot come from a sacrificial scene for two reasons. First, the participants in a sacrifice are

invariably shown as a as a densely packed mass, touching or overlapping each other, while the child in Rieti has ample space on both sides. Second, his head almost touches the crowning mouldings on the fragment, which means that there was no room for the sacrificant or other adult persons. The most likely context for him is a panel where he flanked a *thymaterion* or a related object with another boy further left.

143. Pollini 2004, figs. 1-6.

144. Leonini 2015.

FIG. 11 – Detail from the Arch of Titus, Rome. Photo: D.A.I., Rome.

On the Arch of Titus one of the *tabula ansata* carriers has his hair dressed in a feminine fashion,¹⁴⁵ whereas all the youths on the Arch of Trajan at Benevent have female coiffures, including the *minister* in the sacrifice shown in one of the panels in the passageway.¹⁴⁶ The sacrificial scenes on the Column of Trajan in Rome present an alteration between male and female coiffures worn by the young *ministri*.¹⁴⁷ The majority feature the high, lunular diadem-like crests of tight curls borrowed from contemporary female hair fashions.

The heyday of the long-haired coiffures was the period from Nero to Hadrian. The hairdos of *ministri* and other long-haired persons of the later second century tend to follow more or less Classicizing female models, though occasionally one sees complicated examples such as the three-tiered coiffure sported by the *minister* in the *lustratio* relief of Marcus Aurelius on the Arch of Constantine.¹⁴⁸ In general one can say that from the late Antonine period onwards the number of long-haired youths on public monuments dwindles, and their appearance becomes less refined. On the column of Marcus Aurelius *ministri* in sacrificial scenes are included only a couple of times, and they seem to be a far cry from the well-coiffed youths that Trajan insisted on bringing with him on his campaigns.¹⁴⁹ In the triumphal register on the Arch of Septimius Severus in

145. Pfanner 1983, pl. 62:4.

146. Ryberg 1955, pl. LV, fig. 83; Hassel 1966, 10-11, 20-21, pls. 1:1, 6, 7, 18, 22:1; Rotili 1972, pls. LIII-LVII; Fless 1995, pl. 43:2.

147. Ryberg 1955, figs. 64-67; Settis et al. 1988, 269, 407, 447 (male), 338-339, 411, 419, 437, 444 (female).

148. Ryberg 1967, pls. XXVII, XXIX, figs. 27, 29 b.

149. Caprino et al. 1955, pls. XX, figs. 40-41, XLVI, fig. 92. The *ministri* are in a bad state of preservation, but they appear to have had longish hair.

Rome, the elegant, long-haired carriers of *tituli*, shields and *thymateria* are completely lacking,¹⁵⁰ though they are present on the Arch of the Argentarii, as mentioned above. On the Arch of Septimius Severus at Leptis Magna a long-haired *minister* is seen beside Julia Domna in a sacrificial scene.¹⁵¹

Wavy locks descending to the shoulders become the standard on 3rd century monuments. On occasion they may look rather unkempt, as they do on the relief with a sacrificant often identified with Claudius Gothicus.¹⁵² However, this impression may be due to the shortcomings of the sculptor. The latest examples of long-haired *ministri* on public reliefs date to the beginning of the 4th century: the Decennalia base on the Forum Romanum¹⁵³ and the Arch of Galerius in Thessaloniki.¹⁵⁴ The advent of Christianity made official monuments with traditional sacrificial scenes obsolete. On a private revival from the end of the 4th century, a leaf from the Symmachorum-Nicomachorum diptych, the *minister* beside the priestess still has long hair, but it is rather modest like the pony-tail coiffures from the Hellenistic period.¹⁵⁵

Long hair worn by servants

Though the long-haired acolytes sank into oblivion in Late Antiquity, the long-haired servants did not. From a fashion point of view, they kept abreast of the development outlined above for the public *ministri*, though they never attained their degree of elegance. Despite the interest they aroused among Claudian and Neronian writers, the many contemporary paintings from Pompeii and Herculaneum showing banquets do not include them.¹⁵⁶ From the Flavian period onwards they are found on funerary urns and altars, where they are seen waiting on the deceased,¹⁵⁷ but it is only in the 3rd century that they really come into their own.¹⁵⁸ They are found on a number of sarcophagi, often in pairs or groups to emphasize their decorative value.¹⁵⁹ They are most common in scenes which show the deceased reclining on a couch, while they are comparatively rare in *sigma* meal scenes, perhaps because the *sigma* or *stibadium* was originally used for more informal meals.¹⁶⁰

The hairstyles of the 3rd century servants follow the fashion seen on the scarce public monu-

150. Compare the illustrations in Brilliant 1967, pls. 44-48.

151. Ryberg 1953, 161-162, pl. LVII, fig. 88 a; Caffarelli and Caputo 1963, 31-34, figs. 36-39; Kleiner 1992, 340-343, fig. 309, with further bibliography.

152. Ryberg 1955, 196, pl. LXVII, fig. 116 e; Giuliano 1979-1995, I, 8, 1, 288-294, VI, 2, with bibliography (text: A. Ambrogio); Fless 1995, 15-16, 33-37, 111, cat. 44, pl. 12, 2 with further bibliography; Sapelli 1998, 40-41, cat. 16; La Rocca, Parisi Presicce and Lo Monaco 2015, 400-401, IV.3 (text: A. Ambrogio).

153. L'Orange 1933, 1-34, pls. 1-4; Ryberg 1955, 117-119, pl. XLI, fig. 61 a; Kähler 1964, 8, pl. 3:1; Koeppel 1990, 7-8, 32-36, cat. 15, fig. 7; Kleiner 1992, 413-417, fig. 385; Fless 1995, 17, 50, 70, 79, 96, 111, cat. 45, pl. 24:2.

154. Ryberg 1955, 139-140, pl. XLIX, fig. 76; Laubscher

1975, 52-57, pl. 40:1; Meyer 1980, 402-403, fig. 17; Fless 1995, 15-17, 33-36, pl. 12:2.

155. For the diptychs see n. 81.

156. Compare Fless 1995, 56; Dunbabin 2003a, 151 with figs. 26-29, pls. I-III.

157. For examples see Fless 1995, 56 with n. 387, to which may be added a funerary urn in the Palazzo Corsini, Rome (Sinn 1987, 160, cat. 276, pl. 49 c).

158. Dunbabin 2003a, 150-156; Dunbabin 2003b.

159. See Amedick 1991a, pls. 9:1, 2, 4, 11:3, 14:2, 15:1-4, 17:3-4, 18:1-2, 20:5, 22:1-5, 23:1-6.

160. Dunbabin 2003, 146. For examples of *sigma* meals with long-haired servant on sarcophagi, see Amedick 1991a, pls. 29:1, 4, 33:3, 35:2. See also Dunbabin 2003a, pl. XVI. This is an illustration from the *Vergilius Romanus*, Cod. Vat. Lat. 3867, showing Dido's feast, but placed in a Late Antique setting.

ments, and therefore they are comparatively simple compared to the excesses of the preceding centuries. Basically they show two varieties, a “European” one with wavy, heavily drilled locks falling to the shoulders, and an “Afro” one with corkscrew curls arranged in tiers – the latter taking advantage of the servants’ naturally curly hair.¹⁶¹ Long-haired slaves waiting on tables are also found in Late Antique mosaics and paintings from tombs and private houses.¹⁶² On monuments from the 3rd century onwards, female servants with loose-hanging, unisex hair are found either together with the male ones or replacing them.¹⁶³ Long-haired slaves appear as *cursores*, running before or alongside their master’s wagon.¹⁶⁴ Others are seen accompanying their master or mistress to the bath, or helping them to dress.¹⁶⁵

J. Balty has pointed out the resemblance between the unisex coiffures of Late Antique servants and those of the young members of the Imperial guard, seen on several well known monuments such as the *missorium* of Theodosius in Madrid, the base of his obelisk in Constantinople and the mosaic of Justinian in S. Vitale in Ravenna.¹⁶⁶ According to her, these coiffures, which have traditionally been called “Germanic” because of the length of the hair, could have had the same origin as those of the young servants, since both they and the members of the guard were chosen for their beauty and educated in special *paedagogia* or *scholae*. There may well have been some reciprocal influence here.

Reflections of the long-haired coiffures can be found into the 6th century A.D. The mosaic panel in S. Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna representing the Last Supper originally included a long-haired wine-server next to Christ.¹⁶⁷ Two of the three servants waiting at the table during Pharaoh’s feast in the Vienna Genesis wear a variant of the 4th century unisex coiffure with bangs and straight hair.¹⁶⁸ It is interesting to note that the wine-server has the most elegant coiffure in accordance with his status. If such distinctions were maintained in the sixth century, or indeed such *delicati* were employed as late as that, is difficult to say, as it is quite possible that the painter used older models.

Women with flowing locks

Priestesses of Isis on Attic grave reliefs are characterized by long tresses descending on both sides of the neck to the shoulders.¹⁶⁹ Similar locks are worn by the ten year old Caetennia Pollitta, com-

161. For servants with corkscrew curls see Amedick 1991a, pls. 20:5, 23:1-2, Dunbabin 2003a, 154, fig. 89.

162. Mielsch 1978, pls. 87:2, 88:1; Balty 1982, 299-301, pl. XXVIII:1; Dunbabin 2003a, pls. IX, XIII, 153-155, figs. 88-90; Dunbabin 2003b, figs. 1-15; Consoli 2006, 244-245, figs. 2, 5, 6, 9, 11; Lavagne 2004 (2005).

163. Amedick 1991a, pls. 14:2, 15:2, 17:3, 18:1-2, 20:2, 35:2, 109:1; Dunbabin 2003a, 83, fig. 42; Dunbabin 2003b, figs. 11, 24.

164. Amedick 1991a, pls. 38:2, 39:2, 40: 1-3, 5, 41:1, 42:3, 43:1-2, 44:4.

165. Piazza Armerina mosaic: Barbier 1962, 24-26, figs. 15, 19; Kähler 1973, 30, 34, pls. 42 a, 48 b; Carandini *et al.* 1982, 331-334, 354, figs. 29, 200, pl. LV:135, LIX:140; Wilson 1983, 17-20, fig. 5; Dunbabin 2003b, 459-460, fig. 22. The two boys accompanying the *do-*

mina have traditionally been thought to be her sons, but see Barbier 1962, 24, 26; Balty 1982, 304-305; Fless 1995, 58; Sande 1999, 50; Dunbabin 2003b, 460. Casket of Projecta: Barbier 1962; Shelton 1981, 27-29, pls. 1-11; Dunbabin 2003b, 458-459, figs. 20-21. 4th-century tomb paintings at Silistria (Bulgaria): Frova 1941, figs. 5, 7-14; Dimitrov 1962, figs. 1, 4-9, 17, 19 b-I; Dunbabin 2003b, 461-462, figs. 23-25.

166. Balty 1982, 310-312.

167. Penni Iacco 2004, 129-130, fig. 132. The figure was eliminated during a 19th-century restoration.

168. Dunbabin 2003a, 198-199, fig. 117.

169. Walters 1988, 18-19. She suggests that the hair of the priestesses is worn loose in memory of Isis’ grieving over Osiris.

bined with bangs typical of the Trajanic period and a jewelled hairband.¹⁷⁰ Her bared shoulder has been considered a reference to Venus, but as has been shown above, it could also be of cultic nature. It is probable that both the shoulder and the locks had a religious meaning.

A funerary statue group from Apt in Provence, now in Chatsworth House, England, shows a seated matron with a girl at her side.¹⁷¹ Both have coiffures from about AD 100, but the girl's hair is falling in loose strands down the back. This group has traditionally been interpreted as mother and daughter, but D. Boschung has suggested that the girl is a slave. He supports his argumentation mainly on comparisons with Greek funerary reliefs, where seated women are often seen with a slave at their side, and suggests that the group from Apt was inspired from such reliefs. However, the traditional scheme of the group has been changed. The girl's left hand rests on the hand of the woman, a gesture suggesting a more intimate relationship between the two. Boschung therefore admits that the traditional interpretation may be right after all.¹⁷²

One of the slabs of the Great Antonine Altar from Ephesos shows a group of women with long, loose hair encircled by wreaths. They have been identified with priestesses.¹⁷³ Like Vestal virgins on Roman monuments they are not individualized, but idealized as representatives of their cult. Two Antonine portraits of young girls from Athens, the elder of whom has been tentatively identified as a priestess, wear the same kind of loose-hanging hair with a wreath of olive or laurel.¹⁷⁴ A Hadrianic portrait of a mature woman from the Campana Collection in Rome, now in St. Petersburg, shows a variant of this coiffure.¹⁷⁵ The wreath is used to hold her frontal hair in place. It is brought back to a point behind the ears, from which it descends down the nape of the neck, covering the wreath. A portrait from Athens presents long hair at the back combined with a high, sponge-like frontal crest popular in the late Flavian and Trajanic periods.¹⁷⁶ Fless presented it as a *delicatus*, but the clear signs of age in the face make it probable that it is a woman.¹⁷⁷ A portrait head from Fano with a similar coiffure may also be female.¹⁷⁸ The rather simple unisex hair worn by *ministri* and servants in the 3rd century also occasionally occurs in portraits from the same period. A bust in Boston shows a child with bangs and hair descending on both sides of the head.¹⁷⁹ It could be male, but its gender is ascertained by the *stola* it is wearing, the badge of the respectably married matron and a hint of the status the girl did not live to attain. A portrait bust in Arles, Musée Lapidaire, has a comparable unisex coiffure, and since its drapery is more suited to a *palla* than a male garment, it is probably also meant to represent a girl.¹⁸⁰ Both these busts have been dated to the early 3rd century. A third bust, once on the American art market, which may be a little later than the other two, shows a child with a short cropped fringe of hair in front and long locks

170. Gercke 1968, 31-32, R 28; Boschung 1987, 113, cat. 949, pl. 55; Kleiner 1987, 184-186, cat. 59, pl. XXXVI 3; D'Ambra 2009, 20, fig. 2.

171. Boschung, Hesberg and Linfert 1997, 46-50, no. 45, pls. 36, 38-39, with bibliography (text: D. Boschung).

172. Bartmann, who adheres to the traditional mother-daughter interpretation of the group, gives another explanation for the flowing locks of the young girl. According to her, they accentuate her preadolescent state in contrast to that of the sexually mature woman, whose hair is "controlled through wrapping, tying and braiding" (Bartmann 2001, 5).

173. Vermeule 1968, 109-110, fig. 41; Eichler 1971, 44ff., fig. 15; Oberleitner 1978, 77-78, cat. 60, fig. 57.

174. Datsouli-Stavridi 1980, 336-343, figs. 35-38.

175. Carandini 1969, 193, figs. 246-247. The portrait is wrongly identified with Sabina, but the dating seems correct.

176. Datsouli-Stavridi 1974, 187-188, pls. 106-109; Fless 1995, 68-69, pl. 35, 2.

177. Compare Datsouli-Stavridi 1974, pl. 106.

178. Fless 1995, 68-69, pls. 34, 1-2, 35, 1.

179. Kleiner and Matheson 1996, 142-143, no. 75.

180. Fittschen 1991, 305, pls. 71, 72, 1; Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, n. 9, b.

touching the shoulders.¹⁸¹ Again, its drapery would seem to identify it as a small girl. As can be seen, hairdos related to the “*camillus*” coiffures can also be worn by girls and women. This should not be surprising, seeing that the male wearers of “*camillus*” coiffures are generally very young, of an age where it is easier to adopt female or unisex elements.

The identity of the long-haired boys: slaves or free?

This short overview has shown the popularity and long life of the so-called “*camillus*” coiffures. I have used the traditional name in inverted commas,¹⁸² since I have not found a more suitable name. The term has become so deeply rooted that it will take some time to change it. This is because little research was done on these long-haired acolytes and servants. For a long time L. Spaulding’s work *The camillus in sculpture* from 1911 was the only monograph available. A connection between the long-haired acolytes in sacrificial scenes and the long-haired servants in banquet scenes was made surprisingly late.¹⁸³ A break-through came with the monograph on sacrificial personnel by F. Fless,¹⁸⁴ which also to some extent deals with representations of servants in secular contexts. Since then, other works on the theme have appeared, notably by J. Pollini.¹⁸⁵ Fless and Pollini can be said to complement each other, as the former has concentrated on public monuments, the latter on private.

Whatever one chooses to call the long-haired youths, the view of their social status has changed profoundly since Spaulding’s time. Whereas she saw her “*camilli*” as free-born youths, they are since Fless’ publication generally regarded as slaves. Another interesting point is their beauty and the effect it might have had on the Roman beholder. With regard to well-dressed and well-coiffed young servants, some authors see them chiefly as status symbol of their owners, to be paraded to guests like other objects of beauty, while others stress their potential as victims of paedophiles. The truth, as in most cases, probably lies in-between.

There is also some confusion regarding the terms *delicium* and *delicatus*. The latter was generally a boy or youth. Often ancient authors indicate that his childish and/or female characteristics were stressed and sometimes artificially prolonged through treatment of the skin (and if necessary, shaving), make-up, long, carefully done hair (which could be artificially curled) and beautiful dress.¹⁸⁶ The meaning of *delicium* is more vague. It generally denotes something for which one had a predilection, such as a pet or a young slave, but also one’s own child could occasionally be termed *delicium*.¹⁸⁷ With regard to children, *delicia* were generally slave children who had a privileged relationship with their owners. Some were born in the house (*vernae*), while others were bought for the purpose of entertaining, but *delicia* could also be free-born children taken into the home as foster-children. Of course a *delicatus* could be a *delicium* to his owner, but the *delicia*

181. Eisenberg 1985, 92, no. 205; Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, n. 9, g.

182. The term *camillus*, *camilla* is chiefly associated with the assistants of the *flamen Dialis* and the *flaminicia*. In the Imperial period the term seems to have become obsolete. See Spaulding 1911, 3-13; Pfanner 1983, 89; and especially Fless 1995, 43-51.

183. It is hinted at in Pfanner 1982, 89 with n. 380, and Balty, 1982, 312.

184. Fless 1995.

185. Pollini 1999, 2001, 2002, 2003.

186. Daremberg-Saglio, II,1, 60 (v. “*delicatus*, *delicata*”); Pollini 1999, 29-36; Pollini 2001, 115-20, 139-42; Pollini 2002, 53-62; Pollini 2003, 152-59; Pollini 2004, 519-21; Weeber 2003, 130-31; Dunbabin 2003, 150-56.

187. Daremberg-Saglio II,1, 60-61 (v. “*deliciae*, *delicium*”); Nielsen 1990.

were not necessarily boys. More than half of them were female, according to the preserved epitaphs.¹⁸⁸ Many of them appear to have been manumitted while still children, so it is often difficult to gauge their social status from the term *delicium* alone.¹⁸⁹ Sexual attraction between the *delicia* and their owners is rarely alluded to in ancient literature, and then generally to emphasize the immorality of the owner.¹⁹⁰

With regard to more recent literature, I should like to question two theses set forth by Fless and Pollini: namely that all long-haired youths were slaves, and that portraits of such slaves were made, even to be set up in public places such as sanctuaries. Fless seems to take the existence of such portraits as a matter of course, whereas Pollini is more cautious and explains them by alluding to the love of the owners of these *delicati*, which made them break the rules of propriety and display portraits of their slaves in public as if they were free children.¹⁹¹

There were certainly Romans who loved their slaves, but even so, one must distinguish between the personal feelings of the slave owner and the Romans' sense of propriety. It was not considered reprehensible to have servile lovers of either sex, or to feel affection for slave children, but if one overstepped the borders and indulged too much in them, one became the object of ridicule.¹⁹² Martial's grief at the death of his little *delicium* Erotion was criticized by a certain Paetus, who had lost his wife. Martial intimates that the grieving widower may not be sincere, as he had inherited twenty millions.¹⁹³ A story with a similar point is told by Aelian, but there, the dead darling is a tame fish.¹⁹⁴ In both cases the personal and genuine sorrow over a dead favourite is contrasted with the feigned or lacking grief over a wife, but the parallelism of the stories also shows that to many Romans, slave children did not count more than pets.¹⁹⁵ True, they got epitaphs (but so did pets), but they are seldom depicted on those epitaphs, and then only as representations of children of the most generic kind, which could on occasion be replaced by that of a dog, symbol of fidelity.¹⁹⁶

Those who played no role in public life, were generally commemorated in a more anonymous manner. Thus biographical sarcophagi, where the child is seen learning various skills such as reading, were generally made for boys, not for girls, because the latter's skills were not required for a public career.¹⁹⁷ A slave was the least public person of all, in fact, he was not a person, but a commodity. It is significant that during the feast of the *Compitalia*, when objects representing the

188. Nielsen 1990, 83.

189. Nielsen 1990, 83-84.

190. Nielsen 1990, 80. When Statius praises the male beauty of a deceased *delicatus*, claiming that there was nothing feminine in his looks, it may be to dispel any doubts that the boy was a catamite (*Silvae* II, VI, 38-45).

191. Pollini 2001, 144; Pollini 2002, 59-60; Pollini 2003, 161.

192. Joshel 1992, 191 with n. 17. For the relationship between slave and owner, especially with regard to sex, see Pollini 1999; Pollini 2001, 116-20, 139-42; Pollini 2003, 161-63; Pollini 2004, 520-21; Fitzgerald 2000, 47-55.

193. Martial V, 37, 19-24. For the episode see Fitzgerald 2000, 54-55.

194. Aelian, *de natura animalium*, VIII, 4.

195. Compare Statius' poem of consolation to Flavius Ursus, who had lost his *delicatus*. There, in the midst of lofty expressions of sorrow, the poet suddenly asks why Flavius Ursus should not grieve his over favourite, seeing that there are people who lament horses, dogs and even birds (*Silvae* II, VI, 17-20).

196. De Ruggiero et al 1886-1997, II,2 (s.v. "Delicium"), 1595 (text S. Aurigemma); Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 116-117, nos. 122-123, pl. 123. Compare also a grave relief with a dog in the J. Paul Getty Museum. It is dedicated to a certain Helena, but it is difficult to decide whether she was a dog or a female slave, though the latter assumption seems more probable (Koch 1988, 85-87, cat. 30). For epitaphs over animals see Herrlinger 1930.

197. Huskinson 1996, 114-15.

members of the household were suspended at crossroads, anonymous woollen balls symbolized the slaves, whereas the free members were represented by woollen dolls.¹⁹⁸ No wonder Roman freedmen were so eager to have their portraits made. Their funerary images, generally in the shape of frontal busts or half-figures where the individuality is concentrated in the mask of the face, the *persona*, speak about their wish to see and be seen.¹⁹⁹ Studies of portraits on tombs and funerary altars, where inscriptions identify the social status of the deceased, show that the overwhelming majority were dedicated by freedmen. Occasionally slaves could have funerary portraits made for themselves or other slaves, but there are few instances of a portrait of a slave being commissioned by his or her master.²⁰⁰

Attempts at identifying portraits of favourite slaves (*Lieblingsklaven*, as the Germans call them) have been made before. Then the candidates were boys with a long lock or braid on the right side of the head. As has been shown, the long hair of these boys had a religious significance, and they are now generally called “Isis boys” or “Horus boys”.²⁰¹ Recently, however K. Fittschen and P. Zanker have resumed the idea of “slave locks”. Building on the ideas of Fless and Pollini, who only wrote about “Camillus coiffures”, however, Fittschen and Zanker have presented lists of children’s portraits with locks growing from various parts of the head. There is, however, no evidence that all these children were slaves. The matter is too complicated to be discussed in this paper, suffice it to say that it will probably be very difficult to discern the status of a child from its hair alone.²⁰²

Portraits with “camillus” coiffures

The “camillus coiffure” is a case in point. Fittschen and Zanker have mentioned it in a note and compiled a list of examples.²⁰³ Of those that I have been able to study, three do not have the long hair starting at the top of the head and falling to the shoulders, but merely a sort of pony tail at the back of the head.²⁰⁴ Three do not have long enough hair.²⁰⁵ I have also left out two portraits with Flavian/Trajanic *toupets* which I consider to represent adult women, not children.²⁰⁶ My list of portraits with “camillus coiffures” is therefore shorter than that of Fittschen and Zanker, and comprises the following portraits:

198. Saller 1998, 87-88.

199. See Zanker 1975, especially 272-73, 307-15; D’Ambra 2002, 223-30.

200. See Kleiner 1987, 45-71; Pflug 1989, 103. A portrait bust of the young *verna* Martialis, dedicated by Ti. Claudius Vitalis (presumably his owner) is of much better quality than the average funerary monuments dedicated to slaves (Frel 1985, 182-183.) For the anonymity of slaves compare also the Augustan altars of the lares (Hano 1986; Galinsky 1996, pp. 300-312, figs. 136-146, Lott 2004, 136-146). Those dedicated by freedmen, the *vicomagistri*, generally show the latter sacrificing, either all together or represented by one person, while those dedicated by slaves (Hano 1986, 2341-42, cat. 6-7, pl. IX,19; Galinsky 1996, 308, fig. 144; Lott 2004, 137-139, fig. 11 a-b) contain only

symbolic objects and the names of the dedicants.

201. von Gonzenbach 1957, 33-54; Goette 1989.

202. To take one example: the bust of the little *verna* Martialis in the J. Paul Getty Museum (see n. 200), one of the few portrait busts which are unequivocally identified as a slave by its inscription. The boy has a long lock behind the right ear, which, from its position, must be a “Horus” or “Isis” lock, indicating that he was entrusted to the Egyptian gods. He has, however, no “slave lock”.

203. Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44-45, n. 9, a-o.

204. Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, i-k.

205. Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, b (a girl with unisex coiffure), e, f.

206. See above, n. 176-178.

- 1) Marble head in the Museo Archeologico di Aquileia. Claudian.²⁰⁷
- 2) Marble head in the Uffizi, Florence. Late Neronian/Early Flavian.²⁰⁸
- 3) Marble head, formerly in a collection in Darmstadt. Late Neronian/Early Flavian.²⁰⁹
- 4) Two bronze busts from a cache coming from a shrine dedicated to the Celtic god Cobannus, in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu. Flavian.²¹⁰
- 5) Marble head in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. Late Flavian/Trajanic.²¹¹
- 6) Marble tondo bust (*imago clipeata*) from Aphrodisias, now lost, formerly at the Evangelical School in Smyrna (Izmir). Hadrianic.²¹²

The gender of the child in Aquileia is not easy to guess. It has generally been supposed to be a girl, but it could also be a boy, and could in that case constitute a very early example of a portrait with "camillus coiffure". Also the portrait in the Uffizi has been identified as a girl, but since it wears the *coma in gradus formata* it is probably a boy. Number 3 on the list is more difficult to define. The curls above its forehead could be seen as a variant of the *coma in gradus formata*, but they are also reminiscent of female coiffures. The "Venus rings" on the neck give female associations, but the sitter could of course be a boy whose feminine side has been accentuated. The two bronze busts in the J. Paul Getty Museum also look feminine, but again, the *coma in gradus formata* speaks for the male sex of the sitters. The head in the Metropolitan Museum is the only one of the group which looks definitely male, and he seems to be older than the rest (FIG. 12). The bust formerly in Izmir wears the *bulla*, and must therefore be a boy.

This portrait is of special interest because it was found together with other portraits, and because it is the only one whose social status is unequivocally shown: the *bulla* is the sign of a free-born boy. The *imagines clipeatae* formed three pairs: two Greek poets (Menander and Pindar), two women with diadem, one of which was the Tyche of Aphrodisias (the other may have been Aphrodite), and two boys with unusual coiffures.²¹³ The second boy was not photographed, but Lippold's description in the *Einzelaufnahmen* leaves no doubt that he was a so-called Isis boy. Like the more famous gallery of *imago clipeata* busts from Aphrodisias, which was found much later,²¹⁴ the one published in the *Einzelaufnahmen* probably decorated a structure of some size, such as a school or a library of public character, as is suggested by the presence of two goddesses. With regard to the identification of the two boys, they are likely to represent members of the fami-

207. See above, n. 134.

208. Mansuelli 1961, 69, cat. 61; Cain 1993, 144, cat. 23, pls. 45-46; Simon 1986, 119, fig. 157; Fless 1995, 63-64, 66-67, pl. 31, 1-2; Pollini 1999, 34, figs. 17-18; Pollini 1999, 34, figs. 17-18; Pollini 2001, 138-39, fig. 16 a-b; Pollini 2002, 60-61, figs. 112-13; Pollini 2003, 152-53, figs. 11-12; Pollini 2004, 519, 525, fig. 14; Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, d.

209. E.A. 3744-3746; Cain 1993, 252-53, cat. 132; Fless 1995, 67, pl. 31, 1-2; Pollini 1999, 34-35, figs. 19-20; Pollini 2002, 61, figs. 114-15; Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 45, n.

210. Pollini 1999; Pollini 2002, 1-5, 15-25, 53-62, figs. 1-17; Pollini 2003, 160-61, figs. 17-22; Pollini 2004, 525-26.

211. Richter 1948, no. 61; Cain 1993, 143-144, cat. 22, pl. 47; Fless 1995, 67-68, pls. 32-33; Pollini 2003, 151-152, 163-166, figs. 7-10; Pollini 2004, 519; Fittschen and Zanker 2014, 44, h.

212. E.A. 3207 (text: G. Lippold); Squarciopino 1943, 77-78; Vermeule 1968, 55-56; Sande 1982, 60-63, 73-75, fig. 4.

213. The Pindar portrait, which had not been identified when Vermeule wrote about the group, went under the name "Julianus Apostata". Unfortunately Vermeule was influenced by the notion that the portrait should represent a Late Antique philosopher, which conditioned both his dating and identifications.

214. Smith 1990.

FIG. 12 – Male portrait head with “Camillus coiffure” in the Metropolitan Museum. Photo: Metropolitan Museum.

ly which paid for the gallery of tondo busts.²¹⁵ As for the other portraits on the list, their original setting is known only in the case of no. 4, the two busts in the J. Paul Getty Museum. They come from a sanctuary in Gaul, that is, from a public context. The Aphrodisian tondo bust cannot be used to prove that all the other portraits on the list represent freeborn boys, but it shows that freeborn boys could also be portrayed with a “*camillus*” coiffure.

As was pointed out already by L. Spaulding, not all acolytes were slaves.²¹⁶ A more recent study by I. C. Mantle also confirms this, giving examples of freeborn boys who acted as acolytes.²¹⁷ One gets the impression that this practice was usual in private contexts. By using one’s own son or another young relative one would give him insight into the ceremonies which he, as an adult, might be called on to perform. Such knowledge would be especially useful if the acolytes were the sons of priests. This could be the reason why free boys were portrayed with “*camillus*” coiffures. They are shown as being on the way to a prospective priesthood. This is in accordance with the Roman way of depicting children and youths; just as the child reading to a parent or teacher on a sarcophagus is seen as a prospective orator, so the “*camillus*” is to be seen as a prospective priest.

215. It should be remarked that Aphrodisian portrait gallery mentioned above (n. 214) also contains a portrait of a boy (Smith 1990, 146-47, cat. 9, pl. XIV. 1-3). Smith (147) considers the possibility that he was the son of a local benefactor, possibly a pupil of a philo-

sophical school housed in the building which the portrait gallery decorated.

216. Spaulding 1911, 1-13.

217. Mantle 2002, 93-97.

Another question is whether portraits of slaves were made and put on public display, as indicated by Fless and Pollini. Personally I find it doubtful the two bronze busts in the J. Paul Getty Museum represent slaves, since they were found in a sanctuary. Roman private portraits of children and youths normally represent deceased persons, and this will also be the case of the "camillus coiffures" on my list. Their long hair is unlikely to allude to *delicati*, because their mansions, such as waiting at the table, were considered undignified. The hair therefore must allude to a cultic activity, in this case to that of a *minister*. As repeatedly pointed out by J. Pollini, the owner of a *delicatus* could of course use him as a *minister* in connection with sacrifices,²¹⁸ so the long hair does not rule out the possibility that some of the "camillus" portraits actually represent slaves. They could have formed part of funerary busts originally and placed in columbaria, that is, in a private context.

The female portraits with long hair should also be considered. As I have said above, I consider most of them to represent adult women, and in that case their hair will have had a religious function. Some are, however, girls, like a portrait formerly at the New York art market²¹⁹ and the girl in the "mother and daughter group" from Apt.²²⁰ The latter statue is of particular interest since it has been interpreted as a slave girl. Unfortunately there exists no inscription which might clarify the matter, and one is left to one's personal discernment. Some authors are categorical in denying the existence of statues of slaves, for instance H. Wrede, who says: "Porträtstatuen von Dienern und Ammen fehlen in der uns erhaltenen Überlieferung und sind auch nur als Ausnahmen vorauszusetzen."²²¹ Personally I find it doubtful that a statue group as impressive as the one from Apt should include the representation of a slave, whereas others may perhaps see the inclusion of a slave as a possible exception.

The chronological span of the portraits on my list ranges from the Claudian to the Hadrianic period. This period represents a high point with regard to representations of the "camillus" coiffure in public art, as has been shown by my overview of the coiffure's development given above. But the overview also shows that in its earlier history, that is, down to the middle of the 2nd century A.D., this coiffure is not very often seen worn by servants in private contexts. Afterwards, especially in the 3rd century and later, it is frequently found, chiefly on sarcophagi and in funerary paintings.

I think this is the cause of the disappearance of the "camillus" coiffure in portraiture, in contrast to the "Isis coiffure", which continues to be worn by portraits of the 3rd and even 4th century. As long as the "camillus" coiffure was mainly associated with sacrifices and other religious motifs, even if it was worn by state slaves, it would have retained a certain lustre, which would have disappeared as soon as it was associated mainly with pretty youths waiting at the table. Had all "camillus" portraits really represented favourite house slaves, one would have expected their number to increase after the 2nd century, when such slaves became very popular judging from the frequency of their appearance in the visual arts.

218. See for instance Pollini 2002, 53-62; Pollini 2004, 519-520.

219. See above, n. 181.

220. See above, 35 with n. 171-172.

221. Wrede 1991, 179.

Conclusion

To sum up: It is my belief that the so-called “*camillus*” coiffure originated in the Augustan period as an attempt of the Princeps to reform the looks of acolytes and other participants in sacred contexts. Together with other features such as the wide tunic and the bared shoulder, the idea was to give associations to sacrificial servants of old times. For this reason Greek models were used, mainly Hellenistic (retrospective and otherwise). The choice of long hair probably lies in the latter’s associations with youth and beauty. At the beginning members of Augustus’ own family were dressed in this old-fashioned (in reality reconstructed) garb, which undoubtedly would have contributed to its popularity and diffusion.

Initially there was apparently no fixed rule for the dressing of hair except that it should be long: if the two surviving examples from Roman state monuments of the early period are to be believed, the hair could either be coiffed in stiff rolls in accordance with works of art in the Severe style (Ara Pacis), or allowed to fall freely (“Ara Pietatis”). During the Claudian period the coiffure became standardised for public *ministri*. After that there could be no question of members of the Imperial family being portrayed in the guise of acolytes, not least because quite soon these young and beautiful servants of the gods were imitated by the servants of mortals. In the public sphere the “*camillus* coiffure” came to an end with the reign of Constantine and the legalisation of Christianity. In the private sphere it flourished well into late Antiquity, in scenes showing banquets and other aspects of private life.

Siri Sande

The Norwegian Institute in Rome

University of Oslo

siri.sande@roma.uio.no

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alföldi, A. 1973: *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus* (Antiquitas, 14) Bonn.
- Amedick, R. 1991a: *Die Sarkophage mit Darstellungen aus dem Menschenleben*, 4 Vita Privata (ASR I,4), Berlin.
- Amedick, R. 1991b: "Die Kinder des Kaisers Claudius. Zu den Porträts des Tiberius Claudius Briannicus und der Octavia Claudia", *RM* 98, 373-395.
- Andreae, B. 1984: "Le sculpture", in *Baia. Il ninfeo imperiale sommerso di Punta Epitaffio*, 56-60, no. 8.
- Andreae, B. 1991: "Il ninfeo di Punta dell'Epitaffio a Baia", in *Studi in onore di A. Adriani* (Stud. Misc. 28), 237-265.
- Andreae, B. 1994: "Zu Einheitlichkeit der Statuenausstattung im Nymphäum des Kaisers Claudius bei Baiae", in V. M. Strocka (ed.), *Die Regierungszeit des Kaisers Claudius*, Mainz, 221-243.
- Baldassarre, I., Pontrandolfo, A., Rouveret, A., and Salvadori, M. 2006: *Pittura romana*, Milano.
- Balty, J. 1977: *Mosaïques antiques de la Syrie*, Brussels.
- Balty, J. 1982: "Paedagogiani – pages, de Rome à Byzance", in L. Hadermann-Misguich, and G. Raepsaet (eds.), *Rayonnement grec. Hommages à Charles Delvoye*, Brussels, 299-312.
- Barbier, E. 1962: "La signification du cortège représenté sur le couvercle du coffret de "Projecta", *CArch* 12, 7-33.
- Bartman, E. 1999: *Portraits of Livia. Imagining the Imperial Women in Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.
- Béjaoui, F. et al. 1995: *I mosaici romani di Tunisia*, Milano.
- Berczelly, L. 1985: "Ilia and the Divine Twins. A Reconsideration of two Relief Panels from the Ara Pacis Augustae", *ActaArchHist* 5, 89-149.
- Bergmann M. and Zanker, P. 1981: "'Damnatio memoriae'. Umgearbeitete Nero- und Domitiansporträts. Zur Ikonographie der flavischen Kaiser und des Nerva", *Jdl* 96, 317-412.
- Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 1970: *Rome, the centre of power*, London.
- Billows, R. 1993: "The religious procession of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Augustus' supplicatio in 13 B.C.," *JRA* 6, 80-92.
- Böhm, G. 1998: "Quid acetabularium tinnitus?" Bemerkungen zum "Musikantinnen-Mosaik" in Hama und zu einer Miniatur der sog. Wiener Genesis", *Mitteilungen zur spätantiken Archäologie und Byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte* 1, 47-74.
- Boschung, D. 1987: *Antike Grabaltäre aus den Nekropolen Roms*, Bern.
- Brilliant, R. 1967: *The Arch of Septimius Severus in the Roman Forum* (MAAR 29) (Roma).
- Caffarelli, E.V. and Caputo, G. 1963: *Leptis Magna*, Roma.
- Cain, P. 1993: *Männerbildnisse neronisch-flavischer Zeit*, München.
- Caprino, C. et al. 1955: *La Colonna di Marco Aurelio*, Roma.
- Carandini, A. 1969: *Vibia Sabina*, Florence.
- Carandini, A. et al. 1982: *Filosofiana: la villa di Piazza Armerina: immagine di un aristocratico romano al tempo di Costantino*, Palermo.
- Clarke, J.R. 1993: "The Warren Cup and the Contexts for Representation of Male-to-Male Lovemaking in the Augustan and Early Julio-Claudian Art", *ArtB* 75, 275-294.
- Clarke, J.R. 1998: *Looking at Lovemaking*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.
- Coarelli, F. (ed.) 1976: *Guida archeologica di Pompei*, Verona.
- Comella, A. 1982: *Il deposito votivo presso l'Ara della Regina*, Rome.
- Conlin, D. Atnally 1992: "The reconstruction of Antonia Minor on the Ara Pacis", *JRA* 5, 209-215.
- Conlin, D. Atnally 1997: *The Artists of the Ara Pacis*, Chapel Hill and London.
- Consoli, F. 2006: "I servi dapiferi da una domus del Celio", in Andalaro, M. (ed.), *L'orizzonte tardo-antico e le nuove immagini 312-468*, Roma, 243-246.
- Conze, A. 1911-22: *Die attischen Grabreliefs I-4*, Berlin.
- Cristofani, M. 1985: *I bronzi degli etruschi*, Novara.
- Currie, S. 1996: "The empire of adults: the representation of children on Trajan's arch at Beneventum", in Elsner, J. (ed.), *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, Cambridge, 153-181.
- D'Ambra, E. 2002. "Acquiring an Ancestor: the Importance of Funerary Statuary among the Non-Elite Orders of Rome", in Højte, J.M. (ed.), *Images of Ancestors*, Aarhus, 223-246.
- Datsouli-Stavridi, A. 1974: "Eikonistikà A", *ArchDelt* 29 A, 187-193.
- Datsouli-Stavridi, A. 1980: "Παιδικά και νεανικά πορτραίτα της Ρωμαϊκρατίας; στο Εθνικό Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Αθηνών", *AAA* 13,2, 319-50.
- De Ruggiero, E. et al. 1886-1997: *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, Rome.
- De Caro, S. (ed.) 2000: *Il gabinetto segreto del museo archeologico nazionale di Napoli*, Napoli.
- Dimitrov, D.P. 1962: "Le système décoratif et la date des peintures murales du tombeau antique de Silistra", *CArch* 12, 35-52.
- Duchèsne-Guillemin, M. 1975: Étude complémentaire de la "Mosaïque au Concert" de Hama et étude préliminaire d'une mosaïque inédite de Souveida", *RendAcclincei* 30, 99-111.
- Dunbabin, K.M.D. 1978: *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa*, Oxford.
- Dunbabin, K.M.D. 2003a: *The Roman banquet. Images of Convivality*, Cambridge.
- Dunbabin, K.M.D. 2003b: "The Waiting Servant in later Roman Art", *AJPh* 124, 443-468.
- Eichler, F. 1971: "Zum Partherdenkmal von Ephesos", *ÖJh* 49, Beiheft II, 102-136.
- Eisenberg, J.M. 1985: *Art of the Ancient World. A Guide for the Collector and Investor*, New York-Beverly Hills.
- Fantham, E. 2006: *Julia Augusti. The Emperor's Daughter*, London and New York.
- Ferris, I.M. 2000: *Enemies of Rome. Barbarians through Roman Eyes*, Sutton.

- Fittschen, K. 1977: *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen in Schloss Erbach*, Berlin.
- Fittschen, K. 1991: "Zur Datierung des Mädchenbildnisses vom Palatin und einiger anderer Kinderporträts der mittleren Kaiserzeit", *JdI* 106, 297-309.
- Fittschen, K. 1992: "Mädchen, nicht Knaben", *RM* 99, 301-305.
- Fittschen, K. and Zanker, P. 2014: *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom*, IV, Berlin/Boston.
- Fitzgerald, W. 2000: *Slavery and the Roman Imagination*, Cambridge.
- Fless, F. 1995: *Opferdiener und Kultmusiker auf stadtrömischen Historischen Reliefs*, Mainz.
- Foresta, S. 2002: "I fregi con processione dell'Ara Pacis Augustae: osservazioni sull'attuale ricostruzione", *BullCom* 103, 43-66.
- Frova, A. 1943: *Pittura romana in Bulgaria*, Rome.
- Fullerton, M. 1985: "The Domus Augusti in Imperial Iconography of 13-12 B.C.", *AJA* 89, 473-483.
- Galinsky, K. 1996: *Augustan Culture*, Princeton.
- Gercke, W. 1968: *Untersuchungen zum römischen Kinderporträt von den Anfängen bis in hadrianische Zeit*, Hamburg.
- Giuliano, A. (ed.), 1979-95: *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le sculture I/1 – I/12*, Roma.
- Goette, H.R. 1984: "Corona spinea, corona civica und Adler", *AA* 1984, 573-589.
- Goette, H.R. 1989: "Römische Kinderbildnisse mit Jugendlocken", *AM* 104, 210-217.
- Gonzenbach, V. von 1957: *Untersuchungen zu den Knabenweihen im Isiskult der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Antiquitas I,4), Bonn.
- Gonzenbach, V. von 1969: "Der griechisch-römische Scheitelschmuck und die Funde von Thasos", *BCH* 93, 885-945.
- Hafner, G. 1965: "Frauen- und Mädchenbilder aus Terrakotta im Museo Gregoriano Etrusco", *RM* 72, 41-61.
- Hano, M. 1986: "A l'origine du culte imperial: les autels des Lares Augusti. Recherches sur les themes iconographiques et leur signification", *ANRW* II, 16.3, 2333-2381.
- Harrison, E. B. 1953: *The Athenian Agora, I. Portrait Sculpture*, Princeton.
- Hassel, F.J. 1966: *Der Trajansbogen in Benevent. Ein Bauwerk des römischen Senates*, Mainz.
- Herrlinger, G. 1930: *Totenklage über Tiere in der antiken Dichtung* (Tübinger Beiträge zum Altertumswissenschaft, 8).
- Hiesinger, U. 1975: "The Portraits of the Emperor Nero", *AJA* 79, 113-124.
- Hill, D. Kent. 1949: *Catalogue of Classical Bronze Sculpture in the Walters Art Gallery*, Baltimore.
- Hölscher T. 1984: *Staatsdenkmal und Publikum: vom Untergang der Republik bis zur Festigung des Kaisertums in Rom*, Konstanz.
- Hölscher, T. 2007: "Fromme Frauen um Augustus", in F. and T. Hölscher (eds.), *Römische Bilderwelten von der Wirklichkeit zum Bild und zurück* (Archäologie und Geschichte, 12), Heidelberg, 111-131.
- Holloway, R. Ross 1984: "Who is who on the Ara Pacis?", in *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano. Studi in onore di Achille Adriani*, 3, Roma, 625-628.
- Huskinson, J. 1996: *Roman Children's Sarcophagi. Their Decoration and its social Significance*, Oxford.
- Jones, H. Stuart 1912: *The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino*, Oxford.
- Jones, H. Stuart 1926: *The Sculptures of the Palazzo dei Conservatori*, Oxford.
- Joshel, S.R. 1992: *Work, Identity and Legal Status at Rome*, Norman and London.
- Jucker, H. and Willers, D. 1982: *Geschichter. Griechische und römische Bildnisse aus schweizer Besitz*, Bern.
- Kähler, H. 1935: "Die Porta Aurea in Ravenna", *RM* 50, 172-224.
- Kähler, H. 1964: *Das Fünfsäulendenkmal für die Tetrarchen auf dem Forum Romanum*, Köln.
- Kähler, H. 1973: *Die Villa des Maxentius bei Piazza Armerina*, Berlin.
- Kampen, N.B. 1996: "Omphale and the instability of gender", in Kampen, N.B. (ed.), *Sexuality in Ancient Art*, Cambridge, 233-246.
- Kiilerich, B. 1993: *Late Fourth Century Classicism in the Plastic Arts: Studies in the so-called Theodosian Renaissance*, Odense.
- Kleiner, D.E.E. 1978: "The Great Friezes of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Greek Sources, Roman Derivatives, and Augustan Social Policy", *MEFRA* 90, 753-785.
- Kleiner, D.E.E. 1987: *Roman Imperial Funerary Altars with Portraits*, Roma.
- Kleiner, D.E.E. 1992: *Roman Sculpture*, New Haven & London.
- Kleiner, D.E.E. and Matheson, S. B. (eds.) 1996: *I, Claudia. Women in Ancient Rome*, New Haven.
- Kleiner, D.E.E. and Buxton, B. 2008: "Pledges of Empire. The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome", *AJA* 112, 57-89.
- Kleiner, F.S. 1997: "The Boscoreale cups: copies of a lost monument?" (review of Kuttner 1995), *JRA* 19, 377-380.
- Koch, G. 1988: *Roman Funerary Sculpture. Catalogue of the Collections* (The J. Paul Getty Museum), Malibu.
- Koch, G. und Sichtermann, H. 1982: *Römische Sarkophage* (Handbuch der Archäologie), München.
- Koeppel, G. 1983: "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit I. Stadtrömische Denkmäler unbekannter Bauzugehörigkeit aus augusteischer und Julisch-claudischer Zeit", *BjB* 183, 72-80, 98-116.
- Koeppel, G. 1985: "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit III. Stadtrömische Denkmäler unbekannter Bauzugehörigkeit aus trajanischer Zeit" *BjB* 185, 143-213.
- Koeppel, G. 1987: "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit V. Ara Pacis Augustae Teil 1", *BjB* 187, 101-157.
- Koeppel, G. 1988: "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit V. Ara Pacis Augustae Teil 2", *BjB* 188, 97-106.
- Koeppel, G. 1990: "Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit VII. Der Bogen des Septimius Severus, die Decennaliebasis und der Konstantinsbogen", *BjB* 190, 1-64.

- Krierer, K.R. 1995: *Sieg und Niederlage: Untersuchungen-physiognomischer und mimischer Phänomene in Kampfdarstellungen der römischen Plastik*, Wien.
- Kunckel, H. 1974: *Der römische Genius*, Heidelberg.
- Kuttner, A.L. 1995: *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus. The Case of the Boscoreale Cups*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford.
- La Rocca, E. 1983: *Ara Pacis Augustae in occasione del restauro del fronte orientale*, Roma.
- La Rocca, E. 1994: "Arcus et arae Claudii", in Strocka, V. M. (ed.), *Die Regierungszeit des Kaiser Claudius*, Mainz, 267-293.
- La Rocca, E., Parisi Presicce, C. and Lo Monaco, A. 2011: *Ritratti. Le tante facce del potere*, Roma.
- Laubscher, H.P. 1975: *Der Reliefschmuck des Galeriusbogens in Thessaloniki*, Berlin.
- Lavagne, H. 2004 (2005): "Un echo des anathèmes sur une mosaïque romaine tardive?" *Musiva & Sectilia* 1, 63-74.
- Leononi, P. 2015: "Un 'nuovo' Arco di Tito", *Archeo* July, 6-8.
- L'Orange, H. P. 1938: "Ein tetrarchisches Ehrendenkmal auf dem Forum Romanum", *RM* 53, 1-34.
- Lott, J.B. 2004, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.
- Mansuelli, G. 1958: *Galleria degli Uffizi. Le sculture, Parte I*, Roma.
- Mansuelli, G. 1961: *Galleria degli Uffizi. Le sculture. Parte II*, Roma.
- Mantle, I.C. 2002: "The roles of children in Roman religion" *GaR* 49, 85-106.
- Mastroberto, M. 2006: "Il Tesoro di Moregine e 'le coppe della riconciliazione'", in Guzzo, P.G. (ed.), *Argenti a Pompei*, Milano, 31-34.
- Maxfield, V.A. 1981: *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*, London.
- Meyer, H. 1980: "Die Frieszyklen am sogenannten Triumphbogen des Galerius in Thessaloniki", *Jdl* 95, 374-444.
- Mielsch, H. 1978: "Zur stadtrömischen Malerei des 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.", *RM* 85, 151-207.
- Moevs, M.T.M. 2008: "Per una storia del gusto: Riconsiderazioni sul calice Warren", *Bd'Arte* 146, 1-16.
- Moretti, G. 1948: *Ara Pacis Augustae*, Roma.
- Morrow, K.D. 1985: *Greek Footwear and the Dating of Sculpture*, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Nava, M.L., Paris, R. and Friggeri, R. 2007: *Rosso Pompeiano. La decorazione pittorica nelle collezioni del Museo di Napoli e a Pompei*, Milano.
- Nielsen, H.S. 1990: "Deliciae in Roman Literature and in the Urban Inscriptions", *ARID* 19, 79-88.
- Oberleitner, W. et al. 1978: *Funde aus Ephesos und Samothrake*, Wien.
- Östenberg, I. 2003: *Staging the World: Rome and the Other in Triumphal Processions*, Lund.
- Panciera, S. 1987: "Ancona tra epigrafia e topografia", in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire Ier siècle avant J.-C. – IIIe siècle après J.C.* (Collection de L'École française de Rome, 98) (Paris-Rome), 61-86.
- Penni Iacco, E. 2004: *La Basilica di S. Apollinare Nuovo di Ravenna attraverso i secoli*, Bologna.
- Pfanner, M. 1983: *Der Titusbogen*, Mainz.
- Pflug, H. 1989: *Römische Porträtstelen in Oberitalien*, Mainz.
- Polacco, L. 1955: *Il volto di Tiberio*, Roma.
- Pollini, J. 1978: *Studies in Augustan "historical reliefs"*, Ann Arbor.
- Pollini, J. 1987: *The Portraiture of Gaius and Lucius Caesar*, New York.
- Pollini, J. 1999: "The Warren Cup: Homoerotic Love and Sympotic Rhetoric in Silver", *ArtB* 81, 21-52.
- Pollini, J. 2001: "Two Bronze Portrait Busts of Slave-Boys from the Shrine of Cobannus in Roman Gaul", *Studia Varia II: Occasional Papers on Antiquities of the J. Paul Getty Museum*, 10, 73-96.
- Pollini, J. 2002: *Gallo-Roman Bronzes and the Process of Romanization. The Cobannus Hoard*, Leiden-Boston-Köln.
- Pollini, J. 2003: Slave-Boys for Sex and Religion: Images of Pleasure and Devotion", in T. Boyle and W. Dominik (eds.), *Flavian Rome: Cults, image, text*, Leiden, 149-166.
- Pollini, J. 2004: "The Caelian Hill Ministrant. A Marble Head of an Imperial Slave-Boy from the Antiquarium Comunale on the Caelian Hill in Rome", *RM* 111, 513-529.
- Raeder, J. 2000: *Die antiken Skulpturen in Petworth House*, Mainz.
- Reggiani Massarini, A.M. 1990: *Museo Civico di Rieti*, Roma.
- Rehak, P. 2001: "The fourth flamen of the Ara Pacis Augustae", *JRA* 14, 285-88.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1915: *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Greek, Etruscan and Roman Bronzes*, New York.
- Richter, G.M.A. 1948: *The Metropolitan Museum of Art: Roman Portraits*, New York.
- Ridgway, B.S. 1970: *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*, Princeton.
- Romualdi, A. (ed.) 2004: *Museo Archeologico di Firenze. I marmi antichi conservati nella Villa Corsini a Castello, I*, Livorno.
- Rose, C.B. 1990: "Princes" and Barbarians on the Ara Pacis", *AJA* 94, 453-467.
- Rose, C. B. 1997: *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* (Cambridge).
- Rossini, O. 2006: *Ara Pacis*, Milano.
- Rotili, M. 1972: *L'Arco di Traiano di Benevento*, Roma.
- Ryberg, I.S. 1955: *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art* (MAAR 22), Roma.
- Saladino, V. 1980: "Iscrizioni latine di Roselle (II)", *ZPE* 39, 215-236.
- Saller, R.P. 1998: "Symbols of Gender and Status. Hierarchies in the Roman Household", in S.R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds.), *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, London and New York, 85-91.
- Sande, S. 1982. "Bemerkungen zum sogenannten Pausanias-Porträt", *ActaAartHist* (Series altera) 2, 55-75.
- Sande, S. 1985: "Römische Frauenporträts mit Mauerkrone", *ActaAartHist* (series altera), 5, 151-245.

- Sande, S. 1999. "That's Entertainment! Athletics, Mime, and Theatre in the Piazza Armerina Villa", *ActaArtHist* (Series altera) 11, 41-62.
- Sapelli, M. 1998: *Arte tardoantica in Palazzo Massimo alle Terme*, Milano.
- Schäfer, T. 1998: Review of Fless 1995, *Gnomon* 70, 143-148.
- Schörner, G. 2002: "Aphrodisische Knaben? Zur Tradition und Bedeutung der Teilentblössung in der Antike", *RM* 109, 165-175.
- Scrinari, V. S. M. 1956: "Ritratti romani conservati al Civico Museo di Storia ed Arte di Trieste", *ACI* 8, 2, 202-209.
- Scrinari, V.S.M. 1972: *Museo Archeologico di Aquileia. Catalogo delle sculture romane*, Roma.
- Settis, S. 1988: "Die Ara Pacis", in *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik*, Berlin, 400-426.
- Settis, S. et al. 1988: *La Colonna Traiana*, Torino.
- Severy, B. 2003: *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*, New York & London.
- Shelton, K.J. 1981: *The Esquiline Treasure*, London.
- Simon, E. 1967a: *Ara Pacis Augustae*, Tübingen.
- Simon, E. 1967b: *Der Vierjahrzeiten-Altar in Würzburg*, Stuttgart.
- Simon, E. 1980: "Ein frühantoninisches Knabenbildnis", in *Eikones. Festschrift H. Jucker* (AntK Beiheft 12), Basel, 173-176.
- Simon, E. 1986: *Augustus. Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitwende*, Munich.
- Sinn, F. 1987: *Stadtrömische Marmorurnen*, Mainz.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1987: "Imperial Reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias", *JRS* 77, 88-138.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1990: "Late Roman Philosopher Portraits from Aphrodisias", *JRS* 80, 127-155.
- Spaulding, L.C. 1911: *"The Camillus"-Type in Sculpture*, Lancaster.
- Squarciapino 1943: *La scuola di Afrodizia*, Roma.
- Stefani, G. 1984: *Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Tarquinia. Terracotte figurate*, Roma.
- Stone, S. 2001: "The Toga. From National to Ceremonial Costume", in J.L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.), *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison, Wisconsin, 13-45.
- Stutzinger, D. et al. 1983: *Spätantike und frühes Christentum*, Frankfurt a. M.
- Syme, R. 1984: "Neglected Children on the Ara Pacis", *AJA* 88, 583-589.
- Thompson, H. A. 1948: "The Excavation of the Athenian Agora. Twelfth Season: 1947", *Hesperia* 17, 149-196.
- Torelli, M. 1982 *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*, Ann Arbor.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. 1953 "The Ara Pacis Reconsidered and Historical Art in the Roman Period", *Proceedings of the British Academy* XXXIX, 67-95.
- Uzzi, J. Diddle 2005: *Children in the Visual Arts of Imperial Rome*, Cambridge.
- Varner, E.R. 2004: *Mutilation and Transformation. Damnatio memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*, Leiden-Boston.
- Vermeule, C.C. 1968: *Roman Imperial Sculpture in Greece and Asia Minor*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Volbach, W.F. 1976: *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters*, Mainz.
- Vorster, Ch. 1982/83. *Griechische Kinderstatuen* (Bonn).
- Walker, S. and Higgs, P. (eds.) 2001: *Cleopatra of Egypt: from History to Myth (Catalogue)*, Princeton.
- Walters, E.J. 1988: *Attic Grave Reliefs that present Women in the Dress of Isis* (Hesperia, Suppl. 22), Princeton.
- Weeber, K.-W. 2003: *Luxus im alten Rom*, Darmstadt.
- Weitzmann, K. (ed.), 1979: *Age of Spirituality*, New York.
- Williams, D. 2006: *The Warren Cup*, London.
- Wilson, R.J.A 1983: *Piazza Armerina*, London.
- Wood, S. 1999: *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C.-A.D. 68*, Leiden-Boston.
- Wrede, H. 1981: *Consecratio in formam deorum*, Mainz.
- Wrede, H. 1991: "Matronen im Kult des Dionysos. Zur hellenistischen "Genreplastik", *RM* 98, 163-188.
- Wrede, H. 2001: *Senatorische Sarkophage Roms*, Mainz.
- Zanker, P. 1975: "Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener", *JdI* 90, 267-315.
- Zanker, P. 1987: *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, München.
- Zanker, P. 1989: "Statuenrepresentation und Mode", in S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire, Papers from the tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium* (University of London Bulletin, Suppl. 55), 102-107.