Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration

The history of funerary customs in Rome contains many unanswered questions and controversial debates, especially concerning the significant developments of the second century CE. In this book, distinguished historian Barbara E. Borg employs the full range of material and written evidence to explore four key questions that change our view of Roman society and its values. For the first time, senatorial burial practices can be reconstructed and contrasted with those of other classes. Borg then explains the change from incineration to inhumation as a revival of old Roman mores that accelerated after the example set by Hadrian. In the third chapter, she argues that tombs became prime locations for promoting and displaying long family lines among the elite, which then inspired freedmen to undertake similar commemorative practices. Finally she explores the association of deceased persons with the divine and apotheosis through portraits on divine body shapes and temple tombs.

BARBARA E. BORG is Professor of Classical Archaeology at the University of Exeter. She has published widely on Greek and Roman art, archaeology and history, and her monographs include *Crisis and Ambition: Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century CE Rome* (2013). She is editor of *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic* (2004) and *The Blackwell Companion to Roman Art* (2015).

Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration

Contextual Approaches to Funerary Customs in the Second Century CE

BARBARA E. BORG
University of Exeter

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108472838
DOI: 10.1017/9781108690904

First published 2019

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ International Ltd., Padstow, Cornwall.

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Borg, Barbara, author.
Title: Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration : Contextual Approaches to Funerary Customs in the Second Century CE / Barbara E. Borg, University of Exeter.
Description: Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2019. |
Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018048990 | ISBN 9781108472838 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108460354 (pbk.)
Subjects: LCSH: Funeral rites and ceremonies – Rome. | Burial – Rome. |
Tombs – Rome. | Sepulchral monuments – Rome. | Rome – History – Antonines, 96–192.
Classification: LCC DG103.B677 2019 | DDC 393/.930937–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2018048990

ISBN 978-1-108-47283-8 Hardback

Contents

Figures and Illustrations

Figures

Illustrations

Preface

Tombs are among the best-studied remains of the Roman world. Not only are many of them very well preserved, as they are normally at least partly underground and less often overbuilt in later centuries than the cities to which they belonged, they are also an excellent source for the historian. With forensic sciences becoming more available in the study of human remains, we are gaining amazing insights into ancient diets, living and working conditions, diseases and the origins of the deceased. Nevertheless, the much larger number of tombs for which such data are not available still yield a wealth of information, especially where these tombs were deliberately designed as locations for commemoration. At Rome, this intention is often explicitly stated, for instance by calling a tomb *memoria*. Yet already the term most commonly used to describe a tomb, *monumentum*, essentially means 'that which brings to mind', which, in this context, is obviously the deceased and whatever they or those left behind wanted to communicate about the dead. Some epitaphs explain the idea in more detail. Edmund Thomas quotes a tomb stone that states:

> A rich man builds a house [*aedes*], a wise man a monument [*monumentum*]. The first is the lodging of the body, the second is his home. At the former we linger for a little while, at the latter we live.[1]

The addressees of these *monumenta* varied depending on both the patron's intention and means, but a monument really only makes sense when there is an audience to appreciate it and there was often even a competitive aspect involved in designing and building one. One testator specified in his will that his heirs should be fined if they did not erect for him a monument 'like that of P. Septimius Demetrius which stands on the via Salaria'. Ironically, the case came before the court because the heirs were unable to identify this model for the testator's tomb and wanted to know what to do to avoid the fine.[2] That the case even found its way into Justinian's *Digest*

[1] Thomas, *Monumentality*, 183–4, on an epitaph in Castle Howard; Borg et al., *Castle Howard*, 144 no. 91 pl. 77.1 (H. v. Hesberg) Cf. Lattimore, *Themes*, 245–6 with n. 244; Carroll, *Spirits*, 30–2; Ricci, 'Sepulcrum'.

[2] *Digest* 35.1.27 (Alfenus Varus); cf. Hope, *Death*, no. 2.33, for the full text.

suggests that such prescriptions were neither rare nor confined to the first century BCE, when the original case was brought. Location and shape, external and internal decoration, the containers for ashes or bones, sculpture and inscriptions all worked together to communicate those aspects of the deceased's lives that they and their families felt worth commemorating. They were, therefore, carefully chosen and designed. While the majority opted for formulae and designs that were standardised and unoriginal, this should not lead us to think that they were necessarily meaningless. Rather, they demonstrate the degree to which the diverse members of Roman society shared a common *habitus*. Moreover, this tendency to fit in with the rest of society makes the changes in funerary customs all the more significant. For all these reasons, tombs and burial customs are an excellent source that helps us gain a better understanding of ideologies and value systems, social relationships and eschatological beliefs (or the lack of these). It is in such questions that I am interested in the following chapters.

While this book's chronological focus is on the second century, it is not a sequel to my 2013 volume *Crisis and Ambition: Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century CE Rome*.[3] The research presented here originates in what was once planned as an introduction to that book, yet I do not intend a comprehensive survey of second-century funerary practices. Especially for this period, excellent surveys have been published,[4] as well as more specialist studies on many key aspects such as mortuary practices and the legal framework,[5] tomb types,[6] cinerary urns and altars,[7] sarcophagi[8] and the tombs' interior decoration.[9] There is no need to repeat these observations and conclusions here. Rather, I focus on aspects or questions that are highly controversial, hardly researched at all, or to which I hope to make a substantial contribution by disagreeing with prevailing views.

The format of this book was ultimately suggested by an invitation to deliver the 2015 Carl Newell Jackson Lectures at the Department of Classics

3 Borg, *Crisis and Ambition*.
4 Toynbee, *Death and Burial*; Carroll, *Spirits*; Hope *Death*; Hope, *Roman Death*; Hope and Huskinson (eds.), *Memory*.
5 On mortuary practices: e.g. Heinzelmann (ed.), *Bestattungsbrauch*; Scheid, *Faire*, 161–209; Graham, *Urban Poor*; Graham, 'Corporeal concerns'. On legal and practical aspects: de Visscher, *Droit*; Kaser, 'Grabrecht'; Schrumpf, *Bestattung*.
6 Hesberg, *Grabbauten*, but also many studies of individual necropoleis.
7 Boschung, *Grabaltäre*; Sinn, *Marmorurnen*.
8 The bibliography is vast, but among recent publications with further references see Elsner and Huskinson (eds.), *Life*; Zanker and Ewald, *Myths*; Birk, *Depicting the Dead*; Meinecke, *Sarcophagum posuit*; Borg, 'Leben und Tod'; Newby, *Greek Myths*, 273–319; Borg, 'No one is immortal'.
9 Feraudi-Gruénais, *Innendekoration*; Feraudi-Gruénais, 'Decoration'.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47283-8 — Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration
Barbara E. Borg
Frontmatter
More Information

at Harvard University. I am extremely grateful to Mark Schiefsky, Richard J. Tarrant and Kathleen Coleman, as well as the department as a whole, for the honour of their kind invitation, and for the challenging questions from and inspiring conversations with students and colleagues there. The present four essays are based on the four lectures I delivered, although the original audience will notice that my thoughts have developed since then, not least thanks to their feedback.

Each essay stands on its own, but the chapters are connected in several ways. One is a focus on the city of Rome and its harbour towns, Ostia and Portus. This restriction is not just borne out of necessity, in terms of the impossibility of including a multitude of types of evidence while also covering a wide range of areas around the Mediterranean. Local funerary customs with their artistic and material remains were highly diverse across the empire. Rome was special in that it was home to the emperor and his family, as well as to the central administration and the majority of the senatorial elite. Since commemorative practices could convey powerful statements about social hierarchy and status, they were a factor to reckon with when it came to maintaining or renegotiating the fragile relationship between the emperor and the rest of the Roman elite. And it was also in Rome that certain practices of the imperial family could have the easiest and most direct impact on the habits and material culture of private individuals, not least through the activities of their super-rich and powerful freedmen. Gaining a better understanding of the specifics of metropolitan Roman funerary practices will therefore help us to appreciate more fully both the commonalities and the diversity around the empire, which are sometimes obscured by studies that draw on empire-wide evidence.

A second feature that all the essays have in common is that they aim to make a more general methodological point as well as a more specific, historical claim. As the title of this book suggests, the most fundamental methodological premise is a contextual approach to the evidence. Not least for practical reasons, funerary culture has often been studied with a focus on just one type of evidence, be it tomb types, epitaphs, sarcophagi, interior decoration, consolatory literature and so forth.[10] This has resulted in a rather fragmented and sometimes even contradictory picture. I cannot claim to have integrated every type of evidence that may be relevant to a specific question, nor have I tried to do so. Nevertheless, previous specialist research has allowed me to take account of a wide range of sources that appeared to me to be the most relevant to my enquiry. As I hope will become clear in

[10] See nn. 5–9 above.

the following chapters, a contextual approach does not only result in a more comprehensive coverage of commemorative practices. It can open our eyes to data and phenomena that would be virtually invisible in the fragmented world of disciplinary specialisms; it sometimes even changes the picture entirely with regard to key questions; and it helps to reconstruct a more holistic and coherent, but at the same time more differentiated, picture of Roman commemorative practices.

Such differentiation – and this is the third aspect that joins the four essays together – in particular concerns distinctions between different social strata in society. As Franziska Feraudi-Gruénais observed with regard to senatorial tombs, scholarship has frequently resorted to the methodologically problematic resolve of filling the gaps in our evidence by reference to more lavish sub-elite tombs,[11] implicitly suggesting that there were no substantial differences between elite and sub-elite ideologies and practices. Yet is this really the case? I argue in this book that a contextual approach *does* allow us to differentiate between the choices made by members of different social classes, and that attention to class-specific interests and intents also helps better explain certain key phenomena in Roman funerary practices and their origin.

The first essay, 'In search of deceased senators', is devoted to senatorial tombs and burial customs. Given the attention that mortuary practices have received in general, and the fact that this class is normally thought to be better known than any other thanks to the biases of our literary sources, this focus may come as a surprise. And yet, literature does not tell us much about the funerary realm, especially not after the Julio-Claudian period. There is a wealth of evidence for the burial customs of the sub-elite, especially for the milieu of well-off freedmen and their descendants.[12] More recently, evidence has also increased considerably for 'poor' burials in simple shaft graves with no or very few grave goods and no grave marker that would have left any traces.[13] Ironically, what is conspicuously lacking is research on the tombs of the first two orders, and especially of the senatorial class.[14] It is the same few examples, mostly from the late first century

[11] Feraudi-Gruénais, 'Ewigkeit', 137, 140–1.

[12] E.g. Calza, *Isola Sacra*; Baldassarre et al., *Necropoli di Porto*; Heinzelmann, *Nekropolen*; Mielsch and Hesberg, *Mausoleen A–D*; Mielsch and Hesberg, *Mausoleen E–I*; Steinby, *Via Triumphalis*; Liverani and Spinola, *Necropoli Vaticana*; Liverani et al., *Necropoli Vaticane*. For interpretations see e.g. Hope, 'Roof'; Petersen, *Freedman*, 184–226; Borbonus, *Columbarium Tombs*. For further bibliography see Chapter 3.

[13] For an overview and analysis, see Griesbach, *Villen und Gräber*, 83–141 (for potential patrons, see 137–8); Graham, *Urban Poor*.

[14] For notable exceptions, see Eck, 'Rome and the outside world', 79–93, and Feraudi-Gruénais, 'Ewigkeit', on senatorial tombs, and Spalthoff, *Repräsentationsformen*, on equestrians.

BCE, that are cited over and over again, such as the enormous tumuli of Caecilia Metella or the Plautii (Figure 3.4), or the pyramid of C. Cestius.[15] However, while some epigraphists have drawn attention to the fact that – rather unsurprisingly – there are inscriptions for senators testifying to the *existence* of post-Julio-Claudian senatorial tombs in suburban Rome, the few more recent attempts at understanding later senatorial burial practices have concluded somewhat frustratingly that we do not, and cannot, know much about them beyond what their epitaphs tell us.[16] Moreover, the lack of senatorial tombs that are anywhere near as well preserved as those of the sub-elite and, perhaps more importantly, as the conspicuous elite tombs of the first century BCE, has left scholars wondering whether the former had ever been very conspicuous in the first place, and whether the elite retreated into the private sphere. Yet how does this suggestion fit with the extensive evidence for elite competition that we find in the literary sources? Other writers have turned to the above-mentioned solution of filling the gaps with examples from wealthy sub-elite tombs. However, what evidence is there to support this approach? Against these views, and based on a new collection of available evidence of various kinds, I argue that the picture of senatorial commemorative practices we gain from that evidence is much richer than it is normally considered to be, that it is remarkably consistent and differs in key aspects from sub-elite preferences. Senatorial tombs were neither modest nor removed from sight, they are merely poorly preserved. Temple tombs erected entirely of marble (thus prone to looting and destruction), which resembled the temples of the gods and imperial *divi*, were the preferred tomb type. In the decoration of tomb interiors and the containers of ashes and bones, the elite opted for monumentality and simplicity rather than busy ornamentation and emotionally charged mythological images, which were largely confined to the sub-elite. The messages conveyed through inscriptions and image decoration predominantly revolved around public offices, virtues and values that are known from, and were inspired by, imperial precedent and that demonstrated the family's superiority in the public and semi-public realms. Rather than being places of retreat, after private individuals were largely banned from promoting themselves through public buildings and honorific monuments in the public space of the city, elite mausolea became prime locations for advertising all the elements that added prestige and status to the family concerned.

15 Ditto Feraudi-Gruénais, 'Ewigkeit', 139.
16 Ibid., esp. 137, 141, 149. Meinecke, *Sarcophagum posuit*, 105–8 discusses some archaeological evidence for senatorial tombs, but makes no attempt to draw any general conclusions.

The second essay, 'Reviving tradition in Hadrianic Rome: From incineration to inhumation', offers a fresh look at, and a new interpretation of, the change from one way of disposing of the corpse to another in the second century CE. This change has long mystified scholars and has sparked much controversy, not least because our written sources are remarkably uninterested in it. Earlier scholarship had suggested as explanations religious change or influence from the Greek East, either through freedmen or else via new senatorial families from the eastern provinces. Often, the Second Sophistic is allocated a major role, the trend that made Greek culture (*paideia*) a hallmark of education, and both a marker of status for the elite and an opportunity for social advancement for the sub-elite when they had mastered the required skills and knowledge. Both these explanations have failed to convince. While there is no indication of any change in religious beliefs or practices, neither the bottom-up nor the top-down model of influence from the Greek East coincides chronologically with the phenomenon at issue, and they mistakenly connect the introduction of inhumation with that of mythological sarcophagi. Recent scholarship has either given up on the issue, or sided with Arthur Darby Nock[17] and reduced it to a change of fashion. Yet fashions are meaningful in themselves.[18] Why did it become a 'fashion' to inhume the dead? What was the attraction of doing so? And why did it happen when it did? In order to gain a better understanding of this change, I first look in more detail at evidence for inhumation over the course of the first centuries BCE and CE. I argue that inhumation never went out of use entirely in elite circles, and that it had already become increasingly popular during the later first and early second centuries CE. This confirms that the change was independent of any image decoration (and especially unrelated to mythological images). Moreover, I argue that inhumation was considered to be an old *Roman* practice linked to the kings, especially Numa Pompilius, whose sarcophagus was supposedly found at the foot of the Ianiculan Hill in 181 BCE (Livy 40.29.3–5; Pliny, *NH* 13.84 (27); Valerius Maximus 1.1.12), and some of the most respected Roman *gentes* such as the Cornelii. What we observe in the second century is therefore not radical innovation, but rather a relatively sudden acceleration of change from about 140–150 CE onwards. In a second step, I revisit a suggestion that has occasionally been made before, namely that Hadrian had an instrumental role in changing the emperors' form of burial, thus also promoting inhumation in Roman society more widely. Discussing literary

17 Nock, 'Cremation and burial', 357.
18 Davies, 'Before sarcophagi', 24.

and material evidence for imperial burial and deification ceremonies, I provide a fuller and more up-to-date argument than previous studies for Hadrian's and his successors' choice of inhumation. In contrast to other scholars who formerly allocated Hadrian a key role in the change, I argue that it was not Hadrian's philhellenism that instigated it, but his desire to link himself to Roman tradition. As in so many other areas of activity, he was not quite the radical innovator he is often made out to be, but rather someone who jumped on a bandwagon that had already gained considerable momentum and whose leap markedly accelerated its speed.

Chapter 3, 'Family matters: The long life of Roman tombs', takes issue with generally accepted views of the role of the family in commemorative practice. Following eminent scholars such as Fernand De Visscher, Max Kaser or Richard Saller and Brent Shaw,[19] it is widely believed that across all social classes the family unit that was relevant in funerary contexts was the nuclear family; that each new generation preferably established its own new tomb; and even that this focus on the nuclear family reflects a decline in the relevance of the family clan in Roman society more generally, and a growing individualism within the lower classes. Yet how does this fit with our literary sources, which attest to the elite's continued use of ancestry and family lineages in their competition for honour and status? How does it relate to the astonishing phenomenon of polynomic naming practices? And, in the case of the sub-elite, what should have been the advantage of this individualism? I argue that the widespread views are a misconception based on two fundamental flaws in the methodology applied. As a detailed study of the epigraphic evidence from individual tombs and funerary precincts reveals, tomb *tituli* are not a comprehensive record of a tomb's intended use, but first and foremost a kind of foundation deed. Statistical, non-contextual approaches to the relationship between commemorator and commemorated in epitaphs equally fail to account for both the intended and the de facto use of a tomb. While they identify relationships of close emotional or obligational links between family members, they represent only a snapshot of a moment in time, a single event in the long history of a tomb. Based on general observations and on the close examination of a range of case studies, I argue that tombs were most frequently founded as multigenerational mausolea that gained in significance with every new generation using them. In elite families, the idea of the gentilicial family clan lived on into late antiquity and, after the *atria* with their *imagines maiorum*

19 De Visscher, *Droit*; Kaser, 'Grabrecht'; Saller and Shaw, 'Tombstones'.

may have gone out of use, mausolea constituted the main location at which the longevity and dignity of a family were celebrated and commemorated.

This general idea was shared by many freedmen, even though they had to adapt it to their means and circumstances. More often than in the first order, in the mausolea of freedmen we find affection and *pietas* towards kin taking precedence over concerns for the family name. Yet even here, more was frequently at stake. A legal, and legally protected, family was not just a one-time achievement obtained with manumission, as is usually stressed. The aim was to create a family line, for which the persistence of the name was essential. Especially in the second century, freedmen emulated, as much as and as best they could, ideas embodied by the gentilicial tombs of the elite. Lacking legal ancestry and often also (surviving) offspring, they secured the survival of their name through freedmen heirs to whom, in turn, the tomb's founder and other previous generations became 'ancestry'. While the vast majority of these freedpeople seem to have failed to establish a lasting agnatic family, they made the most of the concept of *familia*, which did not distinguish between kin and non-kin, and was still a powerful institution of which to be proud. This concept was sometimes remarkably successful, with tombs and burial plots remaining in the family name for up to a hundred years or more.

The final and longest essay, 'Straddling borderlines: Divine associations in funerary commemoration', reviews this somewhat notorious phenomenon, in particular the meaning of portraits that assimilate their subjects to gods and goddesses, and of the temple tombs mentioned above. The impulse to revisit this question comes from recent research that aims, after decades of rationalist and ritualist approaches, to bring back the gods, 'belief' and even faith to Roman (and Greek) religion, and has changed views on the Hellenistic ruler cult, *consecratio*, the cult of the *divi* and questions of ancient belief in divinities more generally. These debates have been largely confined to the literature-based realm of historians (of religion and of Roman culture) and classicists.[20] In contrast, the interpretation of Roman funerary art and architecture, especially of the early and high empire, has so far taken little notice of this research. It has continued either in the rationalistic vein (although emotions have become a focus of interest in recent years)[21] or else along the lines of Franz Cumont's highly speculative eschatological interpretations of funerary symbolisms, which have recently seen some explicit attempts at rehabilitation. In his review of Janine and Jean-Charles Balty's

20 See for instance Versnel, *Coping with the Gods*; Erskine, 'Ruler cult'; Morgan, *Faith*.
21 E.g. Zanker, 'Gefühlskult'; Ewald, 'Rollenbilder'; Ewald, 'Paradigms'; Borg, 'Leben und Tod'.

reprint of, and extended commentary on, Cumont's seminal *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*, Jaś Elsner concluded that 'any attempt to reinvigorate Cumont's own interpretations' is bound to fail due to the fundamental methodological flaws on which they are based, 'but there is no doubt … that too much of the baby that Cumont so deeply cherished has been thrown out with the bathwater of his (in my view understandable and politically laudable) methodological excess'.[22] I agree with both claims, and Elsner is also right in observing that the 'substantial point of how to write the history of religious art', and especially how texts can be used (rather than mis- or overused) for the interpretation of art, needs to be addressed by more explicit methodological reflection. My chapter cannot claim to deliver on that request, as a fuller discussion of methodological issues from a theoretical point of view would have greatly exceeded its scope, and I do not propose either that the implicit methodology applied solves the general problem. What I hope to have achieved, though, is a reintegration of some specific and conspicuous artistic peculiarities with their ancient discourses as they can be reconstructed primarily through written sources, which include discourses around divinity, apotheosis and the afterlife in particular.

I argue that there is evidence for a range of different readings of both rhetorical and visual divine associations including, significantly, belief in the genuine divinity of humans, which was possible since divinity was ultimately in the eye of the beholder and – except in philosophical thought – not an ontological category. Portraits in divine costume could express such divinity, and it was precisely their potential to sit on the borderline between a range of readings that ensured their attraction and suitability for a number of different contexts and audiences. I argue further that temple tombs were inspired by and modelled on temples for the imperial *divi* and *divae*, and on the Templum Gentis Flaviae in particular, the only imperial tomb that was simultaneously a temple. The first to adopt this type of monument were powerful, exceedingly rich freedmen with particularly close connections to the imperial court, and the most decorated of senators. I review evidence for notions (rather than concepts) of potential life after death and posthumous apotheosis, concluding that – again outside of philosophical debates – they are extremely rare and mostly restricted to the idea of an immortal soul, although claims to divinity are sometimes made. They are

22 http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2016/2016-06-38.html (last accessed 22/02/2017). Elsner is particularly good at recontextualising Cumont's approach in the desperate years of the Second World War.

also, however, an indication of status, since the world beyond was envisaged as a mirror image of social relationships and hierarchies on earth. To this extent, images of apotheosis such as the deceased on an eagle, or tombs in the shape of proper podium temples, express claims to status that are meant to persist and be recognised in eternity.

I would like to add a health warning here. This book is intended for an audience from a range of different backgrounds, who will approach it with an equal variety of expectations. Some, especially those who are not classical archaeologists and the few who already know the evidence very well, may find parts of the book rather descriptive. However, as my argument is mainly developed from a re-evaluation of primary sources that are rarely discussed in context, partly poorly known and often published in such a way that some readers will find them hard to access, it was important to present the supporting evidence in a degree of detail. For instance, in order to demonstrate, against prevailing views, that we *can* tell which mausolea, sarcophagi and so on the senatorial elite preferred, I need to present the data on which we can draw. The same goes for my claim that tombs were used over multiple generations. I hope that the intermittent and final sections of conclusions will help those who want the broader picture and results, rather than the detailed argument, to find what they are interested in without the need to wade through too much specialist detail.

Acknowledgements

The research presented here has been conducted over almost ten years, mostly alongside other projects that were more or less closely connected with the present evidence and questions. Over these years, I have been very generously supported with funding and research leave by a number of institutions, including the Leverhulme Foundation, the British School at Rome, the J. Paul Getty Foundation, the Onassis Foundation and the University of Exeter. A fellowship from the Loeb Classical Library Foundation made it possible to present the book in the present form, especially with its multiple illustrations. The British School at Rome, its former director Christopher Smith and all its staff have hugely facilitated my research by providing me with a home in Rome, access to their fantastic library and the arrangement of permits to visit otherwise inaccessible archaeological sites. I am further grateful to the Archaeological Institute of the University of Heidelberg (Diamantis Panagiotopoulos and Reinhard Stupperich), the Winckelmann Institute at Berlin's Humboldt University (Susanne Muth) and the German Archaeological Institutes at Rome and Berlin for their hospitality and permission to access their library resources, without which I could not have conducted my work. I have been able to present earlier versions of the present chapters at numerous institutions that cannot be listed here in full. These occasions were instrumental in helping me focus, shape, adjust and occasionally revise my ideas, and I am thankful for my colleagues' invitations and the audiences' helpful comments and questions. I am particularly grateful to Kathleen Coleman and the Classics department at Harvard for their invitation to give the 2015 Carl Newell Jackson Lectures, and for a great week at this distinguished institution. This experience inspired me to write this book. I struggled most with the final essay on divine associations, and therefore feel particularly indebted also to Ineke Sluiter and Markus Asper for their invitation to present some of this material as a lecture in the 2016 'Forum Antiquum' series at Leiden University's Classics department, and as the 2017 August Boeckh Lecture and Seminar of the August-Boeckh-Antikezentrum at Berlin's Humboldt University. I benefited hugely from the audiences' comments and questions. Of the many individuals to whom I owe thanks I would like to mention specifically Jane Fejfer (who, with her husband Palle Soerensen, has also accommodated me in Rome over many years), John Bodel, Janet DeLaine, Marco Maiuro, Consuelo Manetta, Eric Moorman, Coen van Galen (who drew my attention to his PhD work on the importance of cognate family relationships), Marianne Bergmann, Rolf Michael Schneider and an anonymous reader for Cambridge University Press, as well as my departmental colleagues at Exeter. I am also most indebted to those colleagues and other individuals who have granted me permission without charge to use their drawings and photographs to illustrate this volume, most notably Gregor Borg, Rita Amedick, Filippo Coarelli, Alessio de Cristofaro, Hans R. Goette, Roberto Libera, Roberta Loreti and Lucia D. Simeone, Daniela Rossi, Paolo Viti, Rita Volpe, and those named and unnamed individuals and institutions who generously made available under the Creative Commons License excellent photographs of their own. The book could also not have been presented in the way it is without the careful editing of my English expression by Sally Osborn, Marcelina Gilka's meticulous editing of my Endnote library and Brigitte Parsche's skilful work on several illustrations in this volume. Last but not least, I would like to gratefully acknowledge the support and contribution by the editorial and production teams working for Cambridge University Press, and especially from Michael Sharpe.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-47283-8 — Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration
Barbara E. Borg
Frontmatter
More Information

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of titles of ancient authors follow the Oxford Classical Dictionary. In addition, the following abbreviations have been used:

AE	*L'année épigraphique*
ANRW	H. Temporini (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–)
ArchLaz	*Archeologia Laziale (Quaderni dell'Istituto di Studi Etruschi e Italici)*
ASR	C. Robert et al., *Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1890–)
BdI	*Bullettino dell'Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica*
BCom	*Bullettino della Commissione archeologica Comunale di Roma*
CIG	*Corpus inscriptionum graecarum* (Berlin: Reimer; de Gruyter, 1828–)
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (1863–)
CLE	F. Bücheler and E. Lommatzsch (eds.), *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* (Leipzig: Teubner 1895–1926)
EpGr	G. Kaibel (ed.), *Epigrammata graeca: ex lapidibus conlecta* (Berlin: Reimer, 1878)
GG	W. Peek (ed.), *Griechische Grabgedichte: griechisch und deutsch* (Schriften und Quellen der alten Welt 7) (Berlin: Akademie-Verl., 1960)
GVI	W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften Vol. I: Grab-Epigramme* (Berlin: Akademie-Verl., 1955)
IG	*Inscriptiones graecae* (1873–)
IGUR	*Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae* (Rome, 1968–)
ILS	H. Dessau (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892–1916)
LTUR	E. M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis romae* (Rome: Quasar, 1993–2006)
LTURS	A. La Regina (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum urbis romae: Suburbium* (Rome: Quasar, 2001–08)
MNR	A. Giuliano (ed.), *Museo Nazionale Romano* (Rome: De Luca, 1979–95)

Monumenti inediti	*Monumenti inediti pubblicati dell'Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica*
NSc	*Notizie degli scavi di antichità*
PIR	*Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saeculi I, II, III*, 1st edn E. Klebs and H. Dessau (1897–98); 2nd edn E. Groag, A. Stein, et al. (1933–)
RAC	E. Dassmann, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1941–)
RM	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Leiden: Brill, 1923–)
ThesCRA	*Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum, I–V + index vol.* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum 2004–14)
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*