

1 | In Search of Deceased Senators

The extent to which senators’ ambition and competition were manifest in their tomb monuments during the final decades of the Republic is all too obvious, and is well researched. The social and financial elite competed for the largest, most extravagant buildings and the best locations to attract maximum attention.¹ Cicero’s search for the best location for his deceased daughter’s tomb is a good case in point: in thirty of his letters to his friend Atticus, who also acted as his agent, he considers various places that he assesses for their general beauty, their suitability for including a garden but also their visibility:²

sed nescio quo pacto celeberritatem requiro; itaque hortos mihi conficias necesse est. maxima est in Scapulae celebritas, propinquitas praeterrea urbis, ne totum diem in villam.

But somehow I want it to be in the public way; so you *must* get me a place in the suburbs. Scapula’s is very much in the public way and furthermore has the advantage of being close to town so that one would not have to spend a whole day in a country house. (*ad Att.* 12.37; transl. D.R. Shackleton Bailey)

Of the numerous tomb types available, the tumuli, round monuments topped with an earthen mound, are arguably the most conspicuous, and it therefore comes as no surprise that it was not only Augustus and Hadrian (see later Figure 2.10) who chose this shape for their family mausolea.³ Among the senatorial tumuli and cylindrical tombs, the huge mausolea of Caecilia Metella on the via Appia and of the Plautii near Tivoli (see

¹ On tomb types see: Eisner, *Typologie*; Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, 19–37, 55–181, 202–30. On tumuli: Schwarz, *Tumulat Italia tellus*. On *arae*: Kleiner, *Altars*. On the ‘streets of tombs’: Hesberg and Zanker (eds.), *Gräberstraßen*; Koortbojian, ‘Streets of tombs’; Griesbach, *Villen und Gräber*, 20–8, 143. On their role in elite competition see also Hesberg and Zanker, ‘Einleitung’, 9–12; Purcell, ‘Tomb and suburb’, esp. 32–3; Heinzelmann, ‘Einleitung’, 12–13.

² Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, 6; Schrupf, *Bestattung*, 209–10, with references in n. 526; Griesbach, *Villen und Gräber*, 28–30.

³ On the Mausoleum of Augustus, see Hesberg and Panciera (eds.), *Mausoleum*; *LTUR* III (1996), 234–9 s.v. Mausoleum Augusti (H. v. Hesberg, M. Macciocca). On Hadrian’s mausoleum, see most recently Abbondanza et al. (eds.), *Apoteosi* and Chapter 2 below.

Figure 3.4 in Chapter 3) are the best known and largest examples.⁴ Other shapes included pyramids – that of C. Cestius is best preserved⁵ – but also cubic and tower-like monuments and a few unique shapes.⁶

Most of the extravagant first-century BCE tomb types became rare after Augustus, typically featured smaller dimensions and disappeared altogether from about the middle of the first century CE,⁷ and initially they seem not to have been replaced by other types of mausolea that were similarly ambitious. It has been suggested that this was a reaction to political and social developments. In the late Republic, during the civil wars, self-representation in the funerary realm was part of the general fierce competition for acknowledgement and offices. After the establishment of the empire, offices, privileges and status no longer depended on the Roman people but largely on the emperor, so that advertising oneself to the public no longer made sense. The funerary sphere, so it is suggested, increasingly became a private affair where family, affection and personal relationships were more important than self-representation targeted at strangers. The decline of monumental senatorial tombs has often been explained by the

⁴ On Caecilia Metella: Schwarz, *Tumulat Italia tellus*, 183–5 cat. M 51; *LTURS* II (2004), 9–14 s.v. Caeciliae Metellae sepulcrum (R. Paris). On the Plautii: Schwarz, *Tumulat Italia tellus*, 217–21 cat. M 95; Impeciati, *Mausoleo dei Plauzi*. Of the seven known owners of non-imperial tumulus tombs from the environs of Rome, three belonged to the senatorial class and two to equestrians, among them the *praefectus fabrum* L. Cornelius, personal architect of the consul Q. Catulus by whom he was promoted to this office. Two owners were rich *liberti*. See Schwarz, *Tumulat Italia tellus*, 90–5 with table 12. The *liberti* tumuli (ibid., 251–2 cat. F30 and F31) are only preserved through their inscriptions. If it is strictly true that only *humiliores* mention the size of their burial plots or tombs in their inscriptions (Eck, ‘Grabinschriften’, 63 n. 12), the small tumulus on the via Collatia (5.9 x 5.9 m) must be added to this list. See Collini, ‘Via Collatina’; Schwarz, *Tumulat Italia tellus*, 204–5 cat. M 78. This view would be confirmed if a small altar with a dedication to a M. Pomponius Valens belonged to the tomb, which also differs from the majority of tumuli in having a large, round inner chamber with cinerary niches.

⁵ Eisner, *Typologie*, 138–41 cat. O1; *LTUR* IV (1999), 278–9 s.v. Sepulcrum: C. Cestius (C. Krause).

⁶ Of the 111 more conspicuous tombs from the first century BCE to the Hadrianic period collected by Eisner, at least eight and possibly eleven belonged to the senatorial and equestrian classes (Eisner, *Typologie*). In three cases, it is not entirely clear whether or not the respective inscriptions belong to the tomb: ibid., cat. Lt/Lb2; Lb3. Apart from the two possible cases in n. 4, only one monument can be attributed to an *ingenuus*, the well-known tomb of M. Vergilius Eurysaces. Its owner was a wealthy baker and official supplier of bread to the state. Whether he was a *libertus* because of his *cognomen*, as has been suggested, or was just alluding to his erudition with a mythologising name remains an open question. See ibid., cat. Lb1; *LTUR* IV (1999) 301–2 s.v. Sepulcrum: M. Vergilius Eurysaces (P. Ciancio Rossetto); Petersen, *Freedman*, 84–120.

⁷ Eisner’s *Typologie* is still the most comprehensive survey. On tumuli, see Schwarz, *Tumulat Italia tellus*, esp. 94–5; Stanco, *Acilii Glabrones*, with table 5.

assumption that the *ordo* now deliberately opted for less ostentatious burials situated in their private villas.⁸

More recently this view has been qualified to some extent, and it is now generally acknowledged that certain sectors of society continued to use their tombs for self-display at prominent locations.⁹ It also did not escape notice that the epitaphs themselves, boasting as they do of offices held and honours received, demonstrate the elite's eagerness to commemorate their achievements, and also require some visibility to make any sense at all.¹⁰ The so-called *vita romana* sarcophagi that depict their patrons in public and military roles have equally been recognised as images of the pride these patrons took in their offices. Yet they have typically been studied in isolation, with no attempt at reconciling them with the claim of the elite's retreat. So far, no study exists that would unite the different types of evidence we have for senatorial funerary monuments, exploring in a more comprehensive way the messages they were meant to convey and the audiences they addressed.¹¹ This is the purpose of the present chapter, which aims to demonstrate that, through a contextual approach, senatorial tomb types and image decorations, and the ideology on which they are based, emerge very clearly and in a remarkably rich and consistent picture.

⁸ The idea was first proposed by Hesberg and Zanker ('Einleitung', 12–16), albeit not just for the first order but as a general trend. Cf. Hesberg, 'Planung', esp. 60; Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, 37–45; Hesberg, 'Profumo', esp. 47. It has found almost general approval despite minor qualifications: e.g. Heinzelmann, 'Grabarchitektur', esp. 189, although he excludes the first order (p. 185 n. 24). Feraudi-Gruénais (*Innendekoration*, passim, esp. 209–16) rejects, however, the concept of 'internalisation' promoted by von Hesberg and Zanker (e.g. Zanker, *Macht*: 273–9; Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, 42–5, and implicitly 214–21, 229–30; Zanker and Ewald, *Myths*, 21, 27, 175–82, 189 and elsewhere); Petersen, *Freedman*, 196–7, 215 and elsewhere (with minor qualifications). De Cristofaro ('Monumento funerario', 280) regards the tomb of M. Nonius Macrinus, to be discussed below, as a rare exception.

⁹ E.g. Griesbach (*Villen und Gräber*, 146–9), although he eventually agrees with the idea of retreat into the private sphere. For his version of this trend cf. also n. 73 below; Heinzelmann, 'Grabarchitektur', 185 n. 24; Borg, 'What's in a tomb?'

¹⁰ Esp. Eck ('Senator', 3), who explicitly acknowledges the first *ordo*'s continued competitiveness.

¹¹ Mayer (*Middle Classes*, 137–42) considers a range of different types of features and comes to similar general conclusions as I do here. However, his results are largely based on evidence that has never been disputed (such as the tomb of the Scipios, Herodes Atticus' commemorative practices or the *vita romana* sarcophagi) and ranges too widely in time and space to answer our more specific questions around senatorial tombs after the Augustan period. I have discussed some of the following arguments in Borg, 'What's in a tomb?' and 'Roman cemeteries'.

Senatorial Tombs After the Late Republic: Augustus and a New Decorum

As already stated, there can be no doubt that the most conspicuous tomb types that senators used during the first century BCE experienced a steep decline after the Augustan era, and were largely abandoned after about the middle of the first century CE. Not only did the more eccentric shapes such as the pyramids disappear, but also the large, often tower-like tumuli. The few post-Augustan, first-century senatorial tombs we can identify are small in comparison, even though their outer appearance was not necessarily unassuming. Henner von Hesberg in particular has drawn attention to the remains of some highly luxurious mausolea that now employed the precious material of marble for sometimes very elaborate monuments.¹² Among such mausolea, only three can be attributed to the senatorial class, all relatively austere in design compared with Hesberg's other examples. The late Augustan or early Tiberian so-called 'tomb of the Platorini' (Figure 1.1 below), erected by M. Artorius Geminus, the son of Augustus' physician and himself *praefectus aerarii militaris* in 10–14 CE, still measured 7.44 x 7.12 m and probably had the shape of a monumental altar. It was entirely covered in marble and travertine.¹³ The slightly later tomb of L. Considius Gallus, located close to the via Tiburtina and inside the Aurelian Wall, was considerably smaller (5.3 x 4.1 m), but featured a marble front with an impressive 4.8 m-long *titulus* and travertine on its other sides.¹⁴ The original tomb of the Licinii from the Tiberian period measured just 1.5 x 3.6 m, but featured at least five statues and at least some of the above altars at its front (see Figures 3.5–3.7 in Chapter 3).¹⁵

¹² Hesberg, 'Profumo'. Yet Hesberg himself downplays the impact the outer appearance of these monuments would have made on their viewers, insisting that their more miniaturist shapes and lavishly decorated interiors would attest to a changed attitude, which focuses on seclusion and the family rather than the public. As will also become clear, I am not convinced by this conclusion, but rather see these precious interiors as an additional feature.

¹³ Ibid., 36. Hesberg rightly notes that the tomb did not look entirely like an altar but also comprised elements of a temple. Cf. Silvestrini, *Sepulcrum*; *LTUR* IV (1999) 275–6 s.v. *Sepulcrum*: M. Artorius Geminus (F. Silvestrini); Alföldy in *CIL* 6.41057 and p. 4783 on *CIL* 6.31761, on the inscriptions and patronage.

¹⁴ *CIL* 6.31705 with pp. 4776–7 (G. Alföldy); Feraudi-Gruénais, 'Ewigkeit', 142 with no. 25; *LTUR* IV (1999) 280 fig. 128 s.v. *Sepulcrum*: L. Considius L. f. Gallus (C. Lega), with bibliography. Gallus' identity, and thus the date of the tomb, are not entirely clear, but he is most likely the *praetor* of 31 CE mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* 5.8; *PIR* C 1280).

¹⁵ See below pp. 33, 41, 58–66, and Chapter 3. *CIL* 6.41086 is a remarkable fragment with *litterae aureae*, which was found in foundations of Ponte Umberto on the right bank of the Tiber. If Alföldy's date in the first century CE, based on the letter shape, is accepted (*ad loc.*; cf. Feraudi-Gruénais, *Ewigkeit*, no. 45), this tomb must be added to the list. Eisner also dates two small



Figure 1.1 Tomb of the Platorini (of Artorius Geminus), originally on the right bank of the Tiber near the pons Agrippae, turn of first century BCE/CE. Rome, Museo Nazionale delle Terme

anonymous tumuli to the late Tiberian/early Claudian and the Claudian period, respectively, and a slightly larger one to the late Claudian/early Neronian period: Eisner, *Typologie*, 206–7, on P/T1 (5.9 x 5.9 m; cf. above n. 4), F4 (5.35 x 5.35 m) and T6 (9.3 x 9.3 m). Similar dates are proposed in Schwarz, *Tumulus Italia tellus*, cat. M 78, F 33. New excavations on the via Flaminia have brought to light a further anonymous tumulus tomb with a rectangular base measuring 9.2 x 9.2 m, which can be dated to the Claudian or Neronian period: Chiocci and Zaccagnini, 'Mausoleo B', with p. 183 on the date; Gasseau, 'Mausoleo B'.

The contrast in size to the first-century BCE monuments is striking, but whether this change was due to a lack of interest in competition and self-representation in favour of inward-looking concern for private matters is less clear. In that case, would we not expect a longer process of gradual decline? Instead, as Werner Eck has observed, the speed of this decline is strongly reminiscent of the equally abrupt cessation of public portrait monuments.¹⁶ During the Republic, huge numbers of statues were erected to honour and promote both major and minor dignitaries. About the same time as the tombs in question disappeared, honorific statues ceased to be erected in public spaces, except for a few endorsed by the emperor in special cases for their *pietas immobilis erga principem*, and often only after the honouree's death. The emperor had claimed these public spaces for himself.¹⁷ The same applies to most types of public buildings, which used to double up as even more noticeable monuments to their patrons.¹⁸

Restrictions concerning the amount of display in funerary contexts are well known from various periods, including the Augustan.¹⁹ Burial in prominent places in the Campus Martius needed permission from the emperor,²⁰ and the same may have been true for other conspicuous locations, and possibly for tomb types as well. Cicero, in 45 BCE, mentions a surcharge for tombs that exceeded certain limits of size, and a *columnarium*, a special tax on columns, which apparently only applied in particular prominent locations.²¹ The last public *pompa funebris* of a private individual is attested

¹⁶ Eck, 'Self-representation' and elsewhere in his later publications.

¹⁷ Lahusen, 'Ehrenstatuen' and *Untersuchungen*, 97–107; Eck, 'Self-representation', 143–8; Alföldy, 'Pietas immobilis'; Eck, 'Emperor', 94–9.

¹⁸ Eck, 'Self-representation', 138–42, 'Emperor', 92–3 and 'Senatorische Häuser', 208–9. However, in a recent paper Robert Coates-Stevens has drawn attention to the fact that private individuals still could and did attach their names to buildings, either, to a limited extent, when they held offices connected with public building or, more importantly, when erecting baths and commercial buildings.

¹⁹ An inscription on the Pyramid of Cestius records that the *aediles* prohibited the deposition of expensive carpets in the tomb with reference to a sumptuary law: *CIL* 6.1375 (= Dessau 917a); cf. Cicero, *Leg.* 2.23.58–2.27.69. At 2.25.62, Cicero complains that in his time there were no restrictions on the lavishness of tomb buildings; he was wrong, though, as he soon found out when he intended to build the *fanum* for his daughter (*Att.* 12.35). See also Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, 10–13; Verzár-Bass, 'Mausolei', 403. On sumptuary laws, see Engels, *Grabluxusgesetze*, 155–87, with bibl., and the contributions to *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome – Antiquité* 128.1, 2016 (eds. J. Andreau and M. Coudry), none of which, nevertheless, focuses on funerary activities.

²⁰ Wesch-Klein, *Funus publicum*, 108–9.

²¹ Cicero, *Att.* 12.35, 12.36; 13.6.1. The territory of his villa seems to exempt him from fines while leaving him anxious about a change of ownership. Cf. Engels, *Grabluxusgesetze*, 172; Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, 10–13; Verzár-Bass, 'Mausolei', 403.

for 22 CE.²² While it is unlikely that Augustus formally introduced a specific sumptuary law on them,²³ tombs were another major means of bestowing honour upon a deceased and his or her family, and one had to strike the right balance in order to avoid appearing to rival the emperor in this respect. According to Tacitus, the ‘tomb erected for Otho was modest, and therefore likely to endure’, and prior to his death the short-lived emperor had warned his nephew: ‘never forget or too constantly remember that Otho was your uncle.’²⁴ It is therefore probably safe to assume that the social and financial elite steered away from the most ostentatious traditional tomb types and locations, not entirely under their own impetus.²⁵

This view is supported by the exceptions to the rule, among which the most powerful imperial freedmen feature prominently. In one of his letters, Pliny complains about the pretence of M. Antonius Pallas, one of Claudius’ particularly powerful freedmen, who boasted in his tomb inscription about *ornamenta praetoria* and other honours granted him by the senate *ob fidem pietatemque erga patronus* (‘for the loyalty and piety towards his patron’, i.e. the emperor) in a language that is strongly reminiscent of honorific inscriptions for the most deserving members of the aristocracy.²⁶ His tomb at the beginning of the via Tiburtina was close enough to the road for Pliny to be able to read the text. Only one inscribed block survives from the tomb of Nero’s notorious freedman Epaphroditus, which was situated in his *horti* north of the via Praenestina on the later course of the Aurelian Wall, but it is impressive enough. The full length of this inscription, which detailed Epaphroditus’ various extraordinary achievements, was 5 m and the largest letter size – used for his name – was 23 cm, matching that of imperial

²² Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.76.1–2. Cf. Wesch-Klein, *Funus publicum*, 19–38; Bodel, ‘Death on display’, 271.

²³ For the informal nature of restrictions imposed on senatorial self-display, see esp. Eck, ‘Emperor’.

²⁴ Tacitus, *Hist.* 2.49.4 (*Othoni sepulchrum exstructum est modicum et mansurum*) and 2.48.2 (*neu patrum sibi Othonem fuisse aut oblivisceretur umquam aut nimium meminisset*). Both passages also cited by Kragelund, ‘Emperors’, 202–3 with nn. 65 and 68.

²⁵ Similarly, Eck (‘Self-representation’, 148 with nn. 158–9 and ‘Emperor’, 105–10), Engels (*Grabluxusgesetze*, 173) and Verzár-Bass (‘Mausolei’, 412–15) even suggested for the highly competitive first century BCE that some chose locations on their *praedia* in the wider environs of Rome when they wanted to build particularly pretentious tombs and avoid sanctions (ditto Griesbach, *Villen und Gräber*, 28–30). On the need for emperors to exceed the rest of the Roman elite in honour, and their attempts to monopolise appreciation by the common people, cf. Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 107–75. Weisweiler (‘Honorific statues’, 321–4) explains why a ban on public monuments in Rome became the almost inevitable consequence of the emperor’s self-fashioning as first among *equals* and the need to be *princeps*.

²⁶ Eck, ‘Grabinschriften’, 76–7 on Pliny, *Ep.* 7.29, 8.6.

inscriptions on public monuments.²⁷ The tomb that Domitian's freedman Abascantus dedicated to his wife Priscilla at the second mile of the via Appia must equally have been an outstanding monument in a particularly prominent location, and is again explained by its owner's special relationship with the emperor.²⁸ Of the monuments discussed by von Hesberg,²⁹ at least two were also erected by non-elite persons with excellent connections to the imperial court. A marble aedicula tomb with the statues of its patron and his wife at the fourth milestone of the Appia commemorated M. Servilius Quartus. Servilius was probably the freedman who is also known from his ambitious dedication of the interior decoration of a room in Diana's sanctuary at Nemi amid the earlier senatorial dedications.³⁰ T. Claudius Secundus Philippianus, another of Nero's freedmen and his *coactor argentarius* (money receiver), whose son had already been made an *eques* before he reached the age of ten, erected his monument a little further down the road.³¹ The details of this rectangular structure are not entirely clear, but it was *c.* 6.5 m wide and at least its front was built of marble.³²

The image that emerges is therefore very similar to that for the use of portrait monuments and public buildings. Only under certain conditions could individuals be honoured in public spaces, in or near Rome, by ostentatious monuments of a traditional kind, with special permission from the senate and approval by the emperor.

Is it still correct to say, then, that the elite retreated into the private sphere and had modest tombs, even if not entirely deliberately? This may indeed be

²⁷ The block was found reused in the so-called 'Temple of Minerva Medica': *NSc* (1913), 466–7 (G. Mancini). Cf. Eck, *Grabinschriften*, 77–8 pl. 8b and 'Grabmonumente', 171–3 fig. 4.

²⁸ For references and detail, see Chapter 4, pp. 251–3.

²⁹ See above p. 4 with n. 12.

³⁰ For an Augustan date of the Nemi dedication, see Green, *Roman Religion*, 34. Vincenzi ('Il mosaico') notes that the interior decoration and mosaic could be dated to any time between the late first century BCE and the end of the Julio-Claudian era, and is not contemporary with the room itself, which dates most likely to the mid-first century BCE. On the tomb, see Hesberg ('Profumo', 41 figs. 7–8), who dates it to the Tiberian age on account of its decorative details. His reconstruction has been corrected following new excavations by Fancelli and Tomaro ('Antonio Canova'). Cf. Spera and Mineo, *Bovillae*, 123–4 figs. 110–11; *LTURS* 5 (2008), 67–8 s.v. M. Servilii Quarti sepulcrum (A. Bianchi); *CIL* 6.26426. That Servilius stresses in his epitaph that he paid for the tomb from his own funds rules out his being a member of the elite.

³¹ Hesberg, 'Profumo', 37 fig. 3. *LTURS* 2 (2004), 111–13 s.v. Ti. Claudii Aug. lib. Secundi Philippiani sepulcrum (A. Bianchi), also for further links of this patron to prominent individuals and potential family members.

³² Hesberg (*Profumo*, 37) suggests that it featured statues of the deceased on inscribed bases, but Bianchi (*LTURS* 2 (2004), 111–13 s.v. Ti. Claudii Aug. lib. Secundi Philippiani sepulcrum) identifies the 'bases' as altars and notes that, in any case, the statues attributed to the monument by Canina, who excavated the monument and put together the pasticcio we now see, do not belong.

true to some extent for much of the first century CE. However, we should not forget that many senators were born not in Rome but elsewhere in Italy and, increasingly, in the provinces. From Trajan onwards, senators were obliged to invest a certain percentage of their capital in Rome, but even then many of them never lost touch with their home town. They appreciated the opportunity to stand out as local benefactors and ‘celebrities’ in these places, which provided them with greater opportunities for self-display than did the metropolis. Accordingly, many senators chose to be buried in their home town.³³

Secondly, we must keep in mind that a typical senatorial tomb would normally serve not only an individual or the generation who built it, but generations to come, so that there was no need to build new tombs for the old Roman families. In fact, the continued use of family mausolea over generations is an important aspect of senatorial funerary practice, which deserves fuller coverage and will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Senatorial Tombs of the Second Century

From around the turn of the second century, we have evidence again for newly built senatorial tombs of more impressive size and design. Some of them revived and enhanced building types known from the previous century. The designated consul M. Antonius Antius Lupus, for instance, was honoured in 193/94 by a free-standing altar on a tall podium that displayed the insignia of the deceased’s offices as well as his *cursus*.³⁴ He had been put to death by Commodus, but two years later his *memoriae* and *honores* were restored to him in a *senatus consultum* under Pertinax.³⁵ A few late first- to second-century tumuli also exist, although only one can be attributed with certainty to a member of the *ordo amplissimus*. It was recently excavated on the via Flaminia, and consisted of a tall tambour decorated with *fascies*

³³ Eck, ‘Rome and the outside world’; Eck, ‘Emperor’, 106–10. Heinzelmann (*Nekropolen*, 57 with n. 213) equally points to the continuation of ostentatious tombs in the rest of Italy.

³⁴ Schäfer, *Imperii insignia*, 272–80 cat. 19 pls. 40–3. The tomb was destroyed by Pope Sixtus V and the marble used for S. Maria Maggiore (ibid., 273 n. 242).

³⁵ *CIL* 6.1343 (tomb inscription); *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, *Commodus* 19.2; *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, *Pertinax* 6.8; Cassius Dio 73.5.2; Schäfer, *Imperii insignia*, 277 with n. 280. Four similarly impressive altar monuments dated to the Hadrianic to early Antonine period had been erected on the via Tiburtina close to Ponte Lucano, but they remain anonymous: Eisner, *Typologie*, 108–10 nos. T3 and T4 pls. 42.1–5 and 43.1–3; Mari, *Tibur IV*, 211–19 no. 233 figs. 332–46; Mari, ‘Tivoli’, 193–6 figs. 29–35.

and axes that sat on a rectangular base of c. 12 x 12 m.³⁶ The majority of patrons, however, opted for new types of monuments, free-standing brick and marble tombs, of which the temple tombs with their imitation of full-fledged podium temples are the most ambitious variety.³⁷

One of the earliest preserved newly established senatorial tombs after the Julio-Claudian period is the likely mausoleum of C. Valerius Paullinus, consul in 107, whose father, like himself, originated from Forum Iulii (Fréjus) and was promoted to senatorial rank by Vespasian. The family most likely purchased their estate on the via Latina not much later. They considerably enlarged, modified and redecorated the villa and built a family mausoleum right next to its entrance, conventionally called the ‘Tomba dei Pancratii’ after an association that used the tomb in the later third century (Figure 1.2).³⁸ The tomb chambers are exceptionally well preserved and particularly impressive (Figures 1.3 and 1.4). They consist of a vestibule and a large, richly decorated burial chamber. In its centre still stands an enormous marble sarcophagus with a roof-like lid, which was divided into two

³⁶ Chiocci and Zaccagnini, ‘Mausoleo A,’ with 210 on the date; Gasseau, ‘Mausoleo A.’ Another large, round monument in a very prominent position on the Flaminia, marble fragments of which were found built into the ancient Porta Flaminia, belonged to the Gallonii of the mid-second century. However, it is unclear whether the inscription was added to a pre-existing tumulus, which must then have been inherited over generations, or whether it was newly erected (*CIL* 6.31714, cf. p. 4778; *LTUR* IV (1999), 289 s.v. sepulcrum: Gallonii (E. Papi); cf. Chapter 3, pp. 147–8 for a fuller bibliography and discussion). Note also the curved inscribed blocks from a monument of the equestrian P. Valerius Priscus that bordered on the via Casilina, which dates to the first half of the second century (*CIL* 6.3654; Quilici, *Collatia*, 704–6 n. 625; *LTURS* V (2008) 228 s.v. P. Valerii Prisci sepulcrum (S. Evangelisti)). It is generally assumed that the inscription belongs to a tumulus, the remains of which have been found in the same location. Yet as Hesberg (*Grabbauten*, 109) observes, the tumulus is probably much earlier than the epitaph. Since Valerius was from Hispania and his family is unlikely to have possessed a family mausoleum in Rome, and since elements from other round monuments have been found nearby (Quilici, *Collatia*, 706), it is most likely that his epitaph belonged to one of those.

³⁷ Scholars have used the term ‘temple tomb’ for a range of different tomb types that feature elements of temple architecture. For clarity, I am restricting the term to only those monuments that have a free-standing front porch and podium, thus resembling the most prominent types of temples to the gods.

³⁸ Coarelli, ‘Lurbs,’ 47–9; Vorster, *Römische Skulpturen*, 161–77; *LTURS* II (2004) 198–9 s.v. Demetriae praedium (D. De Francesco). The lead pipe attesting the family’s ownership of the villa mentions the daughter of Paullinus, but extensive building activities and the tomb’s interior decoration of the later Flavian period suggest that she inherited the estate from her father and only continued the building. On the tomb, cf. esp. Petersen, ‘Secondo sepolcro’; Feraudi-Gruénais, *Innendekoration*, 108–14 no. K48; Filippi (ed.), *Archeologia e giubileo*, 290–2; *LTURS* III (2005) 165–7 figs. 133–4, 139–43 s.v. Latina via (F. Montella). See also below pp. 35–9 on its interior decoration and date.