REVIEW ARTICLES

Images of Power:
Memory, Myth and Monuments in the Roman Republic

Karl -J. Hölkeskamp

Peter J. Holliday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 310 pp. ISBN 0-521-81013-2.

1. Approaches – theoretical and methodological[1]

In these (post-)modern days, thanks to Michel Foucault, the axiomatic declaration that visual and other representations of power — or rather the specific ways, media and modes of representing it in a given society or culture — are part and parcel of the structure, 'fabric' or 'discourse' of power itself and its concrete character in that culture seems to be nothing but a truism. In an innovative and thought-provoking study, Peter Holliday (henceforth H.) shows that there may be more empirical truth(s) in this rather general, if vague dogma than meet the mere theorist's eye. This is not to say that H.'s interpretations of concrete monuments and 'readings' of visual themes and pictorial *topoi* (H.'s notion of this term will need some further discussion) are not imbued with theoretical and methodological reflections — on the contrary. H. is impressively well read in modern cultural studies: Clifford Geertz, Roland Barthes, Pierre Bourdieu and the aforementioned intellectual icon of the eighties and nineties as well as Hayden White, Stephen Greenblatt, Umberto Eco and even some of the German intellectual initiators of modern literary criticism such as Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss figure more or less prominently in the text and notes (not only) of H.'s dense and programmatic preface (xv-xxv) and his general conclusions (195-219).[2] What is more, H. does not pay mere lip-service to the extravagances and idiosyncrasies of a trendy academic 'discourse' — once again, on the contrary. It is certainly welcome that H. not only takes the trouble to make his general assumptions and working hypotheses clear right at the beginning, but time and again goes out of his way to reflect upon the framework of concrete concepts and categories as and when he sees fit to introduce them into his analysis.

---

[1] My title (and my approach) owes much to P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor, 1988 (= *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*, Munich, 1987); cf. E. Muir, 'Images of Power: Art and Pageantry in Renaissance Venice', *AHR* 84, 1979, 16-52; D. Freedberg, *The Power of Images. Studies in the History and Theory of Response*, Chicago, 1989; A.P. Gregory, '"Powerful Images": responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome', *JRA* 7, 1994, 80-99, and H. himself, e.g. 218. Cf. (not only) for the subtitle M.I. Finley, 'Myth, Memory and History', *History and Theory* 4, 1965, 281-302 (= id., *The Use and Abuse of History*, London, 1975, 11-33).

[2] Cf. also his 'Introduction' in P.J. Holliday (ed.), *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, Cambridge, 1993, 3-13.

To begin with H.'s basic assumptions: being unashamedly Geertzian, he subscribes to 'a semiotic concept of culture as an interlocked system of construable signs' (xxi). Moreover, these 'signs' and their systemic interrelations are 'not merely superstructural consequences of the material processes by which societies shape their world' (xxiii). Rather, 'culture is itself the primary agency of the social constitution of the real' — in other words, 'not only must we read all culture as an act of symbol-making, but such creation is itself the primary category of historical action' (xxi). Culture — or, to be more precise, 'cultural production' of any kind, ranging from literary texts to the arts in the shape of sculpture, temples and other monuments — is thus to be seen as 'socially formative' (H.R. Jauss), as much as what H. names 'material production': 'wars of conquest, building cities' and 'imposing order' as well as 'commissioning works of art' are taken as 'material processes' that 'possess a palpable force and an intentional purposiveness' (a formulation which, at least to this reviewer's taste, suggests a little too much intentionality and determinism). Anyway, to sum up, these 'consequential and determinative acts of material production' on the one hand and the 'production' of culture 'are related not as base and superstructure but rather as two forms of cultural activity per se' (xxiii).

Related they are indeed, and in a very complex and multilayered way: on the one hand, as H. rightly, but in this context rather generally, states, material processes are 'enacted in terms of and made known by symbolic forms' — and these forms, to push his argument a little further, not only include the creation of texts and monuments, but also a wide range of cultural activities of different kinds, such as festivals, sacrifices and other rituals and ceremonies. On the other hand, if 'cultural productions' (in the broadest possible sense of the concept) are considered as 'active ingredients of the social matrix' and 'socially formative products in their own right' (xxii)[3], their function is above all 'the engendering of ideology', or, to put it in the form of an axiom once again: 'cultural productions at once express and constitute ideology' (xxiii; xxv) — and this particular 'activity' once again includes a spectrum of intertwined processes such as the formation, change (or manipulation) of perceptions, views and judgments and, last but not least, the representation, articulation and affirmation of the current system of normative values and the concomitant code of behaviour that is considered to be valid and binding in a given society. H. is well aware that it is the complexity of these relations that 'demands a contextualized approach' — after all, the very 'fact that art is a social practice' necessarily means that it is not only 'serving the ends of historically distinct societies and rooted in their lived experiences' and that it addresses 'that society's concerns' (xxi), but also that it is fundamentally 'conditioned by social forces that remain outside its own articulation' (xxii).

The concept of 'social forces' leads us back to my initial witticism and, at the same time, directly to the core of the problem and the concrete topic of the book — power in its different manifestations and guises: it is power that underlies hierarchies of status, rank and reputation and that pervades asymmetrical social relations of all kinds; and it is power that needs legitimacy and acceptance on the part of the ruled, and that means a

---

3   In this context, H. follows A. Stewart, *Faces of Power. Alexander's Image and Hellenistic Politics*, Berkeley, 1993. Cf. the recent reviews of H.'s book by Sh. Hales, *JRS* 94, 2004, 227-8, and U. Walter, *Gymnasium* 112, 2005, 187-9.

range of specific media at the disposal of a given culture or society (and the groups 'in power') with which to represent, (re-)affirm and reproduce the legitimacy of economic privilege, social prestige, claims to political leadership and cultural ascendancy. H. plainly and unequivocally makes clear that, in the final analysis, 'material' as well as 'cultural productions' consist of nothing but 'the actions of élites' and that the latter in particular serve but one overarching end, namely 'to sustain the dominance' of ruling classes (xxiii).

In particular, as H. goes on to narrow down the range of media just mentioned, it is artefacts and other works of what he calls 'historical art' that 'function iconically as emblems of power and authority' (xviii) — and he frequently returns to this basic idea (e.g. 17). According to his definition of this subcategory, 'historical art commemorates persons and events important to the community', and therefore 'representations' must be 'clearly individuated' and 'feature recognizable protagonists' (xvii); 'historical works' of any kind 'often have a narrative character and tend to celebrate meaningful events'. What is more, and this brings us back to the problem of power and its representation, 'historical' or 'commemorative art' is 'characteristic of civilizations that feature distinctively ceremonial characteristics' as well as, above all, 'a predominant emphasis on personal and dynastic power' (xviii).

It is precisely at this stage of the development of his argument that H. could have profited from a recent discussion between representatives of (ancient) history, (classical) archaeology, (comparative) literary criticism and quite a few other fields which share an interest in a modern concept of a social history of culture — or, for that matter, a cultural history of (pre-modern) societies. What I mean is the debate about the concept, contents and concrete applicability of 'collective memory' or — to introduce the concept coined by Jan Assmann and others[4] — 'cultural memory'. Generally speaking, the concept refers to the collectively shared knowledge of a given society, the peculiar set of certainties and convictions it has about itself and, in particular, about its historical roots. The collective memory helps a group or a society as a whole to articulate an awareness of its defining characteristics and its unity, and therefore forms an essential basis for its self-image and identity. More specifically, this means that the 'cultural memory' is the main source of patterns of perception, of conceptions of order, right and wrong, and of the framework in which to interpret one's own contemporary *Lebenswelt*.

This implies that the stored body of cultural knowledge can never be arbitrary, is never selected in a haphazard fashion: for, on the one hand, it has an educational function, disciplining and integrating the members of a society and thereby reinforcing its cohesion; and, on the other, a society's shared cultural knowledge possesses a normative dimension as it contains binding 'instructions' about how to act in the present and in the future. And this means that the 'cultural memory' does not simply serve as a storehouse of a static or even dead stock of memories and (hi)stories that have found their way into a gallery of figures and feats — rather, it is selective, because it retains protagonists and events, heroes and their deeds only if, and as long as, they remain 'meaningful' (in H.'s sense) in, and for, the present of a society (or a particular group), its actual needs and

---

4   J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich, 1992; id., *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis. Zehn Studien*, Munich, 2000; J. Assmann, T. Hölscher (eds.), *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt, 1988.

concerns. The 'cultural memory' thus permanently and continuously (re-)constructs the 'history' of the society that it has to serve.[5]

In order to fulfill these functions of founding and reinforcing collective identity in practice, the 'cultural memory' does not depend on the antiquarian storage of its contents in archives or, for that matter, in the writings of learned specialists such as professional historians. Rather, it needs entirely different forms of cultivation, a broad spectrum of ways, modes and media of preservation, regeneration and transmission. Fixing cultural knowledge in writing, in the form of historiographical narratives, epic poetry or other canonical texts, is by no means the only or even the most obvious method for doing this — depending on the society in question, other media are equally or even more important: oral transmission, memorial days, festivals, ceremonies, rituals of all sorts, preserved for generations, as well as the topographical and social spaces in which they take place, including the buildings and monuments that mark such 'memorable' locations, in addition to the locations themselves — the dimension of 'spatiality', by the way, is a fundamental aspect of 'processions' as rituals, which are a particularly prominent feature of Roman political culture and will therefore be discussed again.

The spectrum of forms, institutions and places through which a 'cultural memory' may find its articulation and permanence, the relative importance of these forms and, above all, the specific, synergetic connections of messages and media, rituals and locations that result in 'systems' or 'landscapes' of memory are characteristic of a specific society. In fact, they are themselves integral components of its cultural memory. These general definitions lead to another central aspect of the concept: memory, in particular 'cultural' memory, needs spaces and places. According to Pierre Nora, these places include not just memorials and other locations of memory fixed in physical space: his 'lieux de mémoire' comprehend festivals and other rituals, monuments, visual images as well as texts of different kinds.[6] His notion of 'memory domains' overlaps with the concept of a 'cultural memory'. In ancient city-states in particular, well-defined 'public spaces' take on particular importance: they form the concrete venues in which the formal processes of political decision-making and other civic rituals, religious festivals and everyday communication among the citizens take place. The political culture of classical city-states is therefore on a structural level shaped by a specific logic of space and spatiality, directness and density.[7] In short, we have to assume that every group which has an image of itself as a group aims to occupy and, as it were, 'colonize' specific, meaningful locations, which are symbols of its identity and fixed points of reference for its memory; that, in other words, memory tends towards spatiality and that we therefore have to reckon with a special significance and function of such memory domains. This is a fundamental aspect of a comprehensive conceptual framework for the analysis of 'commemoration' as a cultural practice that seems to be underestimated in H.'s otherwise impressive programme — even if he alludes to the city of Rome as an 'urban text' and its 'public spaces' (e.g. 20; 167).

---

5   Cf. already Finley, Myth (n. 1), 27f.

6   P. Nora, 'Entre histoire et mémoire. La problématique des lieux', in id. (ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire*, Paris, 1984, XV-XLII.

7   T. Hölscher, *Öffentliche Räume in frühen griechischen Städten*, Heidelberg, 1998, is now fundamental.

2. Republican Rome and her 'culture of commemoration' — a case in point

Any theory that deserves the investment of intellectual energy has not only to provide some specific explanatory potential, but also to stand the crucial test of empirical applicability — and that is certainly also true for the debate on 'cultural memory' as well as for H.'s concept of 'historical', that is 'commemorative art'. Once again, H. rightly spells out his fundamental assumptions on the specific modes and messages of the specifically Roman Republican variant(s) of 'historical commemoration' (as a process of cultural production) or 'commemorations' (as a repertoire of stock topics, media and strategies, narrative or other), and again his observations deserve attention, although he relies rather heavily on (partly dated) handbooks[8] and a rather Anglocentric selection of specialized literature published in the eighties and early nineties and he seems not to be familiar with recent research on the Roman Republican political culture.[9]

H. knows well that 'Roman history' is 'not necessarily reliable in its presentation of the "facts"' (xxii) — that is putting it mildly. 'The historical tradition of the Roman Republic was not an authenticated official record', let alone 'an objective critical reconstruction' (10) — certainly not, we have known that for centuries. Rather, what Romans knew as 'history' was a 'social construct' that 'may tell us a great deal about Roman society', as this particular sort of 'historical commemoration also actively comments on people, events, and situations, but for their own ends' (xxii) — again, true enough, but who are 'they' and what are 'their ends'? H.'s answer is programmatic for the following concrete analyses: not only 'history writing' in the 'literal' sense of the term, but also 'history' as such was controlled by 'members of the ruling élite', that is the senatorial aristocracy and its core group, the so-called *nobilitas*. It was above all history that 'provided the Roman élite with a vehicle to define themselves in relation to their fellow aristocrats, lower Roman orders, and non-Romans, and to inculcate their own conduct'. This élite and their conduct were conditioned by, as well as geared to, a 'highly competitive political milieu' which forced individual members of the élite continuously and permanently to offer 'evidence of their virtue through high birth, wealth and ostentatious

---

8   This is especially true for H.'s general remarks on magistracies and the *cursus honorum* (4f. with the notes 222f.). More modern surveys include J. Bleicken, *Die Verfassung der römischen Republik*, 7th ed., Paderborn, 1995; A. Lintott, *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*, Oxford, 1999, both with further references. Cf. now the detailed treatment by H. Beck, *Karriere und Hierarchie. Die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des* cursus honorum *in der mittleren Republik*, Berlin, 2005 (forthcoming).

9   Cf. for a survey of recent work M. Jehne (ed.), *Demokratie in Rom? Die Rolle des Volkes in der Politik der Römischen Republik*, Stuttgart, 1995 (esp. the editor's introduction); K.-J. Hölkeskamp, 'The Roman Republic: Government of the People, by the People, for the People?', *SCI* 19, 2000, 203-23 (reprinted with Addenda in: id., *SENATUS POPULUSQUE ROMANUS. Die politische Kultur der Republik — Dimensionen und Deutungen*, Stuttgart, 2004, [= *SPQR*], 257-80), and now E. Flaig, *Ritualisierte Politik. Zeichen, Gesten und Herrschaft im Alten Rom*, Göttingen, 2003; R. Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 2004, 1ff.; A.M. Ward, 'How Democratic was the Roman Republic?', *New England Classical Journal* 31.2, 2004, 101-19, and K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Rekonstruktionen einer Republik. Die politische Kultur des antiken Rom und die Forschung der letzten Jahrzehnte*, Munich, 2004, with further references.

display, rhetorical skills and cultural refinement, victory in successive popular elections, and, above all, military leadership' (xix, cf. 4f.). This 'culture of competition', based on an inseparable interconnection of office-holding, rank and status, hierarchy and competition[10], was the specific social context in which the particular 'variety of forms', which Roman Republican commemoration(s) actually took, could unfold — and that is exactly what H. proposes to explain systematically and in more detail in the introductory chapter with the (once again) programmatic title 'The Roman Elite and the Rhetoric of History' (1-21).

In other words, what needs to be explored is precisely the nexus between forms and media of Roman Republican 'memory' on the one hand, and their cultural contexts and contents, which address Roman needs for meaning, order, and orientation, on the other. The evolving relationship between 'history' and its transformation into 'memory' finds material articulation in monuments of all types, such as temples and other public buildings (cf. H. on 14ff.), equestrian and other honorary statues (15), the decoration of aristocratic *domus*, including the waxen ancestor masks (*imagines*) and painted family trees (16ff.)[11] — and it is in this context that the media which H. is particularly interested in also play the most important part: 'relief sculptures (small altars and statue bases, pedimental groups, and friezes decorating monumental pillars and temples)' and, above all, paintings, from 'frescoes on tombs and temple walls to large paintings on cloth and portable panels carried in the triumphs of victorious generals' (xxiii).[12]

Indeed, H. even suggests that painting should be seen at centre-stage of the tableau of media of (self-)representation. Buildings, statues, coinage and even domestic decoration, though 'their diversity and ubiquity bolstered the ruling class's claims to authority', lacked a particular kind of 'specificity and intelligibility'. For H. this is the main reason why 'Roman nobles, concerned about controlling how they were publicly perceived', increasingly appreciated the 'narrative potential' inherent in painting as a 'representational strategy': 'meaningful events' and above all individual achievements 'could be

---

[10] This is certainly not new — cf. the survey of published research since the mid-sixties in Hölkeskamp, *Rekonstruktionen* (n. 9).

[11] K.-J. Hölkeskamp, '*Exempla* und *mos maiorum*: Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität', in H.-J. Gehrke, A. Möller (es.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein*, Tübingen, 1996, 301-38, esp. 305-08 (= *SPQR*, 169-98, with Addenda, esp. 173ff.); M. Sehlmeyer, *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit. Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewußtseins*, Stuttgart, 1999 (the most comprehensive treatment of statues); id., 'Die kommunikative Leistung römischer Ehrenstatuen', in M. Braun, A. Haltenhoff, F.-H. Mutschler (eds.), Moribus antiquis res stat Romana. *Römische Werte und römische Literatur im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.* Munich, 2000, 271-84. The best survey of the 'intense monumentalization of the republican city' is now A. Kuttner, 'Roman Art during the Republic', in H. Flower (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*, Cambridge, 2004, 294-321; cf. also U. Walter, Memoria *und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*, Frankfurt, 2004, 137ff.

[12] Cf. also H.'s earlier exploration of the theme in: '*Ad triumphum excolendum*: The political significance of Roman historical painting', *Oxford Art Journal* 3, 1980, 3-10; R. Renaud, 'Quelques usages romains du portrait paint à l'époque médio-républicaine', in C. Auvray-Assayas (ed.), *Images romaines*, Paris, 1998, 73-89.

rendered with greater clarity' (17; 18; 20). However, as H. admits in the same context, this form of commemoration did not replace the other media — but only much later and rather in passing does he mention the medium that more than any other could and did serve the purpose of 'individuating' a particular *togatus* or equestrian statue, a *columna rostrata*, a dedication of spoils or a temple: *tituli* of all kinds, on statues of different types and ancestral portraits, honorific, dedicatory and other inscriptions commemorate the occasion of the erection of the monument and evoke specific events and their concomitant stories — and they were as ubiquitous in the 'urban text' of the city as the monuments on which they were fixed and which they were meant to 'explain': they were the main medium used to elucidate 'the meaning of otherwise imprecise images' (208; 210, cf. 217).[13] Hence, to put it in trendy phrasing, the complex interplay between inscription (as 'text' and 'monument' in its own right, with a 'rhetoric' of its own) and the monument (as such and as the carrier of the inscribed 'text' or message) not only provides the ultimate concretization and individuation for both, but also generates a particular narrativity of (con-)text.

H. displays an admirable command of modern theoretical and empirical studies of iconography, iconology and the 'semantic system' (T. Hölscher) that underlay the Roman world of images[14] — and once again, the theory of 'cultural memory' could have added an important dimension to H.'s reconstruction of Roman commemorative practices, namely the dimension of 'spatiality' or rather, of 'space' as context and frame of reference for 'images' and other forms of visual representation. In concrete terms, this means that we may view the city of Rome in the middle and late Republic as a 'stage of history' in a double sense of the term, that is as an urban space where important events took place and where, at the same time, remembrance of these (and other) events, 'historical' as well as 'mythical', was visibly staged in a permanent 'scenery' or 'landscape' of memory. A fundamental feature of the Roman Republican 'cultural memory', then, is the 'monumental memory' developed in the third and second centuries BCE, the arrangement and evolution of this core area of 'cultural memory', i.e. the 'public spaces' in the centre of the city, the topographical context of temples and altars, statues and other images of all kinds, as well as the semantics of their symbolism and the messages and 'stories' contained therein. In the 'cityscape' of *memoria* in stone and marble that was Rome, the heroes of the glorious past from Romulus to Camillus and beyond, who had 'made' her history, were permanently on display and thus, in the full sense of the word, omnipresent. In other words: if it is true that 'Roman memory' was deeply 'rooted in the

---

13   Cf. P. Witzmann, 'Kommunikative Leistungen von Weih-, Ehren- und Grabinschriften: Wertbegriffe und Wertvorstellungen in Inschriften vorsullanischer Zeit', in *Moribus antiquis* (n. 11), 55-87.

14   I add a few important titles that H. does not mention: T. Hölscher, 'Bilderwelt, Formensystem, Lebenskultur. Zur Methode archäologischer Kulturanalyse', *StItFilClass* 3a ser., 10, 1992, 1, 460-84; id., 'Bildwerke: Darstellungen, Funktionen, Botschaften', in id., A.H. Borbein, P. Zanker (eds.), *Klassische Archäologie. Eine Einführung*, Berlin, 2000, 147-65; M. Bergmann, 'Repräsentation', ibid., 166-88. I should also mention T. Hölscher, *The Language of Images in Roman Art*, Cambridge, 2004 (enlarged English ed. of *Römische Bildsprache als semantisches System*, 1987) and id., 'Images of War in Greece and Rome: Between Military Practice, Public Memory, and Cultural Symbolism', *JRS* 93, 2003, 1-17.

sacred ground of the city', it must have been this 'landscape', functioning as a vast 'lieu d'exposition', that determined the message of any single monument put up in its midst.[15]

At the same time, these heroes and their *res gestae* were the subject matter of senatorial historiography,[16] they were turned into *exempla* of *virtus* and of a spate of moral values like *fortitudo, sapientia, gravitas, fides, pietas* and other 'aristocratic assumptions and preconceptions' (10ff.), which in turn formed the conceptual framework of the collective ethos of the senatorial élite as a 'political class' in a special sense[17] — H. has now put it in very clear terms: 'Roman history may have sought to serve collective needs through the presentation of *exempla*, but those *exempla* also served the immediate needs of the governing élite by commemorating their own achievements' (13). At the same time, these 'exemplary' heroes and their deeds mentioned above were the core and kernel of Rome's 'monumental memory'; they 'colonized' the public spaces of the city

---

15   F. Dupont, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, Oxford, 1992, 74, cf. 73ff. passim; P. Zanker, 'Nouvelles orientations de la recherche en iconographie', *Revue Archéol.* 1994/2, 281-93, at 285. See also K.-J. Hölkeskamp, 'Capitol, Comitium und Forum. Öffentliche Räume, sakrale Topographie und Erinnerungslandschaften der römischen Republik', in St. Faller (ed.), *Studien zu antiken Identitäten*, Würzburg, 2001, 97-132 (= *SPQR*, 137-68, with Addenda) and now id., 'History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic', in R. Morstein Marx, N. Rosenstein (eds.), *Blackwell Companion to the Roman Republic*, Oxford, 2005 (forthcoming); N. de Chaisemartin, *Rome. Paysage urbain et idéologie. Des Scipions à Hadrien (IIe s. av. J.-C. — IIe s. ap. J.-C.)*, Paris, 2003. Cf. also, though in another context, P. Zanker, *Die Apotheose der römischen Kaiser* (Carl Friedrich von Siemens Stiftung — Themen, vol. 80), Munich, 2004, 1f., cf. 40f.

16   Cf. now H. Beck, '"Den Ruhm nicht teilen wollen". Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge des römischen Nobilitätsdiskurses', in U. Eigler, U. Gotter, N. Luraghi, U. Walter (eds.), *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius. Gattungen — Autoren — Kontexte*, Darmstadt, 2003, 73-92; id., U. Walter (eds.), *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker* I-II, Darmstadt, 2001, 2004, esp. the brilliant general introductions on the emergence and development of Roman 'historiography' (I, 17-50; II, 17-31) and the commentaries on individual authors. Walter, Memoria (n. 11) is the best comprehensive analysis of 'history'/'historiography' vis-à-vis other media to date.

17   Cf. already K.-J. Hölkeskamp, *Die Entstehung der Nobilität. Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jhdt. v. Chr.*, Stuttgart, 1987, 204ff.; id., 'Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the *Nobilitas*', *Historia* 42, 1993, 12-39 (= *SPQR*, 11-48, with Addenda); id., *Exempla* und *mos maiorum* (n. 11), 312ff. (= *SPQR*, 180ff.); id., '*Fides* — *deditio in fidem* — *dextra data et accepta*: Recht, Religion und Ritual in Rom', in Chr. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c. 400-133 B.C.* (*AIRF* 23), Rome, 2000, 223-50 (= *SPQR*, 105-35); U. Walter, 'AHN MACHT SINN. Familientradition und Familienprofil im republikanischen Rom', in K.-J. Hölkeskamp, J. Rüsen, E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, H.Th. Grütter (eds.), *Sinn (in) der Antike. Orientierungssysteme, Leitbilder und Wertkonzepte im Altertum*, Mainz, 2003, 235-78; M. Spannagel, 'Zur Vergegenwärtigung abstrakter Wertvorstellungen in Kult und Kunst der römischen Republik', in *Moribus antiquis* (n. 11), 237-69, and the relevant contributions in M. Citroni (ed.), *Memoria e identità. La cultura romana costruisce la sua immagine*, Florence, 2003.

through all kinds of memorials, such as buildings and victory monuments, dedications of spoils and statues, in particular on the Capitol, in the Comitium and the Forum.[18]

There is a complex interplay, then, between the locations and the stories attached to them, between their public functions in any period of Roman history and their recall of past events. Roman society, of course, is not exclusively a community of memory, but also a religious, and, not least, a political community. Precisely because these different dimensions are inseparably intertwined, they are never totally identical: their interrelation and their complex web of references among each other presuppose that the individual aspects retain their distinctiveness and contrasts. As a result of this nexus, temples, statues and other monuments, their respective (hi)stories and messages, their location and spaces form a physical as well as 'mental' landscape fraught with political, historical, sacral and mythical meanings and messages. Not only can such a landscape be 'read' like a 'text', since it stores the full spectrum of myths, historical, aitiological and other stories — it could also be experienced directly, by *nobiles* and the rather elusive 'man in the Roman street', by Romans as well as non-Romans, in the concrete sense of walking through it, looking around and 'viewing' the monuments in their complex spatial context.[19]

Above all, the space between Curia and *rostra* was one of the two locations where the assembly of the people met. In the Comitium and the *campus Martius* the *populus Romanus* took on its institutional form in the *comitia*. Most of the laws were passed here, and it was here that the voting for the numerous minor magistracies and the tribuneship took place. It was the place, or space, for the permanent communication between magistrates, senators, and citizens, between the political élite and the people. The area of the Comitium and, later on, the somewhat larger Forum, was the most important civic and symbolic space within Rome's dense political topography. For despite imperial expansion, the *res publica* retained a political set-up in which the passing of laws, elections, the lawcourts of the people and the most important religious ceremonies maintained their particular city-state character and remained, as it were, entrenched in the urban landscape within the city and exclusively focused on the Capitol, Comitium, and Curia, Forum and *campus Martius*.

---

18   Cf. now T. Hölscher, 'Die Alten vor Augen. Politische Denkmäler und öffentliches Gedächtnis im republikanischen Rom', in G. Melville (ed.), *Institutionalität und Symbolisierung. Verstetigungen kultureller Ordnungsmuster in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, Köln, 2001, 183-211; U. Walter, 'Die Botschaft des Mediums. Überlegungen zum Sinnpotential von Historiographie im Kontext der römischen Geschichtskultur zur Zeit der Republik', ibid., 241-79; D. Favro, 'The Roman Forum and Roman Memory', *Places* 5,1, 1996, 17-24; Hölkeskamp, *Exempla* und *mos maiorum* (n. 11) and id., 'Capitol, Comitium und Forum' (n. 15), with further references.

19   D. Favro takes us on a 'walk through Republican Rome' in 52 BCE — and later on, for the sake of comparison, on a tour through Augustan Rome in CE 14 (*The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge, 1996, 24ff.; 252ff.). Cf. on the problem of the 'Roman viewer' P. Zanker, 'Nouvelles orientations' (n. 15), 288ff.; id., 'In Search of the Roman Viewer', in D. Buitron-Oliver (ed.), *The Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome*, Hanover etc., 1997, 179-91; id., 'Bild-Räume und Betrachter im kaiserzeitlichen Rom', in *Klassische Archäologie* (n. 14), 205-26, esp. 216ff.; Gregory, 'Powerful Images' (n. 1), 99 and passim, and H. himself, 210ff.

Rome's landscape of memory was thus in fact identical with the arena in which a member of the political élite had to appear in various functions, as orator in debates and party in political controversies, as defence counsel or prosecutor in lawsuits or, for that matter, as a young man and next of kin required to deliver the *laudatio funebris* on a senior member of his *gens* who had just passed away. To perform well in these public settings was as important for a political career as fulfilling one's duties as senator and patron, magistrate or general — for without the kind of recognition that one achieved through strenuous efforts in the urban arena of political and/or ceremonial oratory, it was impossible to attain these offices and functions (and the concomitant reputation and rank in one's 'peer group') in the first place.[20] All members of the political class were keen on advancing their political career and inevitably had to make their mark in the public spaces of the city, in order 'to hold or improve one's place in the competitive hierarchy' (H. 17, cf. 4f.) of the senatorial élite — from the young senator who belonged to an old, established family to the ambitious *homo novus* who had to do without well-known, that is (literally) 'noble' ancestors, from the middling magistrate eager to reach higher office to the former consul bent on further enhancing his authority, reputation and prestige.

The Forum and the Comitium were spaces of aristocratic competition. It was down there that they vied for offices, rank and influence — that is, in their own revealing language, for *honos* and *honores*, *auctoritas* and *dignitas* (cf. H. 4f. and the detailed discussion below). The Forum and the Comitium, or rather the *rostra*, which were right in between the two, were the places where the ruling élite met the people, which, at another point of Rome's political topography, the *campus Martius*, constituted itself in the *comitia centuriata* as the *populus Romanus*, to award those *honores*. It is precisely this social and cultural context that renders the peculiar prominence of a theme in Roman art understandable: as A. Kuttner has admirably put it, 'it is often, and strikingly, an art about talking — parley, tribunal meetings, priestly prayers. Togate orators and mounted horsemen throw their arms out in direct rhetorical address; the moment is one in which we go silent before the charismatic speaker — but it is also a moment in which the speaker remains ignorant of whether we will freely agree, vote yes or no'.[21]

Membership and rank within Rome's meritocracy depended entirely on these public decisions in the shape of elections, and only the *maximus honos*, the consulship, offered its incumbent as holder of the *imperium* a realistic chance to scale the last and highest level of Roman *gloria*: the triumph, an achievement that allowed the *triumphator* to inscribe himself permanently in Rome's memorial topography and public memory — this ceremony and its 'meanings' play a major role in H.'s chapter on 'images of Triumph' (22ff.), to be discussed later. In the code of norms and values of the Republican aristocracy these honours were regarded as the rightful recognition of services rendered to the *res publica*, in politics and, above all, in war. Civic and military duties were the only source of such rewards and formed the sole basis of prominence and prestige, of the

20   K.-J. Hölkeskamp, '*Oratoris maxima scaena*: Reden vor dem Volk in der politischen Kultur der Republik', in *Demokratie in Rom?* (n. 9), 11-49 (= *SPQR*, 219-56, with Addenda); Morstein-Marx, *Mass Oratory* (n. 9), passim, with further references.

21   Kuttner, Roman Art (n. 11), 312; cf. also Hölkeskamp, '*Oratoris maxima scaena*' (n. 20), 223f.; 254.

dignitas and *auctoritas* of the successful *nobilis* and, in general, of aristocratic status.[22] Without *honores*, a Roman could not enter into the glorious history of the *res publica* and her monumental memory. Only *honores* and deeds in the service of the Republic became 'history' in the form of exemplary stories and imposing monuments. These stories in turn added to the 'symbolic capital' of the respective *gens* and the political élite as a whole[23] — both accrued triumphs and consulships in a cumulative fashion. Just like the monumental memory of the Republic, this capital needed preservation, transmission, and permanent increase and amplification — both by individual aristocrats who adduced the collective achievements of their *gens* as an argument in inner-aristocratic rivalries for magistracies and status, and by the aristocracy as a whole, which defined itself collectively through service for the *res publica* and the glorious history of this service.

The ultimate frame of reference for this nexus of identity, memory, and politics was the myth of Rome's divine mission to rule the world, which in turn came to provide the main theme and inspiration of historiography. By the mid-second century, this myth was already fully developed: from the foundation of the city, war and conquest had always been what Rome or 'Roman-ness' was all about — indeed, it was this 'history' that 'became the mythology of Rome' (H. 209, cf. 5ff.) and that efficiently fulfilled its fundamental function as an 'ideological construct designed to control, to justify, and to inspire' (10). The myth was simply taken for granted, just like the concomitant system of moral values, norms and rewards — as well as the role of the élite. Unsurprisingly, in Rome's mythic imagination, it was Romulus himself who had celebrated the first triumph and thereby inaugurated this institution and the long series of victory celebrations that stretched from the legendary past to the present and thus firmly connected them. Romulus also initiated — and this is not as paradoxical as it sounds — the impressive roll-call of Republican heroes.[24]

In this society, history did not just boil down to the series of wars and victories as things of a glorious past. 'History' Roman-style was indeed 'static' (H. 210), but in a specific sense: the past was never remote, never turned into a period removed from present concerns, which would only be of interest to historians or antiquarians. In other words, in Rome's 'memorial space' the distinction that modern scholars like to draw between the 'communicative memory', which is in the full sense of the concept 'present in the present' as it covers only two or three generations, and the 'cultural memory' with its selective and stylized preservation of past events, does not apply: in Rome, memories that a given generation shares by having lived through the same events merge imperceptibly with a kind of transgenerational memory that is made up of venerable myths, histories and the *exempla maiorum*. To put it even more pointedly: in the 'cultural memory' of the Republic around 150 BCE, Romulus and Brutus, the first triumph and the initial struggles of the young Republic are as vivid and immediate as Scipio Africanus and the

---

[22] Cf. Hölkeskamp, *Nobilität* (n. 17), 204ff.; 245ff. and id., Conquest (n. 17), 25ff. (= *SPQR*, 27ff.).

[23] On the concept of 'symbolic' or 'cultural capital', introduced by Pierre Bourdieu, cf. now Hölkeskamp, *Rekonstruktionen* (n. 9), 92ff., with further references.

[24] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2, 34, 1-3; *Inscr. Ital.* 13, 1, 534 with further references.

Second Punic War or L. Aemilius Paullus and his spectacular triumph of 167.[25] All these 'historical' figures and past events, remote as well as recent, are 'present', in all sorts of respects, in the form of signs, symbols and telling monuments: the entire 'memorable' past, from Romulus to Aemilius Paullus, permanently towers over the present. In Rome, the present never obliterates the past since none of the memorable events is ever marginalized or fully forgotten. The past is continuously transformed into 'history' (and the symbolic capital it carries), and in this guise retains its presence in the memory of each new generation.

This specific 'presence of the past in the present'[26] was inseparably connected with the basic conviction that each generation was part of a process and a mission that unite Romulus and Brutus, Maenius and Duilius, the Cunctator and the Elder Africanus as well as more recent heroes such as Aemilius Paullus or the Younger Africanus. The past is therefore always a 'contemporary past'. The permanent presence of Rome's monumental memory, with its constant reminders and its literally omnipresent allusions to specific stories on the one hand, and the importance of this memory for the orientations, values and goals, the code of behaviour, the institutions and the political decisions of the present on the other, render the distinction between past and present virtually meaningless. To put this conclusion in concepts once again borrowed from Pierre Nora, the *populus Romanus* and its political élite formed a great, collective '*milieu* de mémoire', a vibrant, evolving community of memory. In the midst of this community, there was a complex pattern or landscape of '*lieux* de mémoire':[27] these concrete traces and marked spaces of remembrance retained, reproduced and indeed re-enforced their meanings and messages over time.

3. Images, themes and *topoi* — messages and meanings

The proof of the pudding is in the eating — and now the reviewer means what he says and turns to H.'s systematic analyses of themes, or rather 'thematic categories' (xxiii), and to his 'readings' of individual monuments. What H. is interested in, is, however, not the study of different classes of monuments as such — rather, his empirical enquiries are centred on what he calls *topoi*: he follows D. Freedberg and, again, A. Stewart and defines them as 'conventionalized', therefore 'instantly recognizable, widely accepted visual (metaphors)', in other words, 'the equivalents of *topoi* in literary discourse' (204).[28] They have to be 'intelligible to all, with simplicity and immediacy' so that 'viewers readily accept them as explanations for things that resonate within their cultural fabric' (96, xviii) — and this is the very reason why we are entitled to take them as 'a telling index of belief and behavior' (18), that is of values, views and valid convictions, accepted social conventions and collective attitudes which are the gist of the 'cultural fabric' of any society.

---

25   The triumph was still remembered as particularly splendid in Cicero's day: Cic. *Muren.* 31; *Cat.* 4,21; *Fin.* 5, 70; cf. *Inscr. Ital.* 13, 1, 556 for the other evidence.

26   This phrase was coined by M. Bloch, 'The Past and the Present in the Present', *Man*, n.s. 12, 1977, 278-92.

27   Nora, 'Entre histoire et mémoire' (n. 6), XVII.

28   Stewart, *Faces of Power* (n. 3), 69, cf. 84.

In the following chapters, H. proposes to unravel those 'webs of significance', as Clifford Geertz has called the complex 'fabric' of meanings and messages (quoted by H., xxii) that underlay Roman Republican (political) culture by analysing their reflection in specific types and *topoi* of visualization. H. rightly starts from his general statement that 'Roman discourses about *gloria* were profoundly implicated in the structures of power' (4); more precisely, they were 'woven' into the conceptualization of hierarchy and aristocratic status in addition to pervading collective convictions of Roman imperial greatness through war and victory. Therefore, H. first looks at individual images and the imagery as a whole of 'Roman society's most spectacular and esteemed celebration', the triumph (22-62). The short introductory survey of this ritual to celebrate a military victory, its original purificatory and other religious functions and its gradual transformation into a 'purely honorific ceremony' in the wake of imperial expansion and Hellenization and the route, choreography and participants of the ideal-type Republican triumph constitute a dense summary of received orthodoxy (22ff., cf. 61)[29] — and, once again, the dimension of 'spatiality' mentioned above, the close interrelation between 'ritual *circumambulatio*' (24) and its symbolic meanings, sacral topography and 'memorial landscape' seems to be somewhat underemphasised.[30] H. then offers dense 'readings' of the painted 'processional frieze' from the Tomb of the Cornelii Scipiones (33ff.) and of the (just as poorly preserved) fragments of the decoration of the Tomb of the Magistrates, commonly referred to as the 'Arieti Tomb' (36ff.), which, as he suggests with some healthy caution, could be representations of Roman triumphal celebrations. Given the state of preservation, much of his argument must necessarily remain hypothetical, but it certainly deserves serious consideration. His interpretation gains plausibility as the historical and cultural context seems to provide parallels or models for this kind of visual representation: H. adduces the whole range of literary evidence on the emergence of the practice of permanently commemorating a triumph or certain central 'aspects of triumphal celebrations' — as it were, in addition and on top of the ephemeral event of the procession itself. From the early 3rd century BCE onwards, *nobiles* and victorious generals like L. Papirius Cursor,[31] M. Fulvius Flaccus and M'. Valerius Messala began to

---

[29] Cf. also H.'s earlier article 'Roman Triumphal Painting: Its Function, Development, and Reception', *The Art Bulletin* 79, 1997, 130-47, esp. 132ff.; see further R. Brilliant, '"Let the Trumpets Roar!" The Roman Triumph', in B. Bergmann, Ch. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, New Haven etc., 1999, 221-29 (not mentioned by H.) and now Flaig, *Ritualisierte Politik* (n. 9), 32ff.; T. Itgenshorst, *Tota illa pompa. Der Triumph in der römischen Republik*, Göttingen, 2005 (forthcoming).

[30] Cf. D. Favro, 'The Street Triumphant: The Urban Impact of Roman Triumphal Parades', in Z. Çelik, D. Favro, R. Ingersoll (eds.), *Streets. Critical Perspectives on Public Space*, Berkeley, 1994, 151-64; Hölscher, 'Die Alten' (n. 18), 194ff.; Hölkeskamp, 'Capitol, Comitium und Forum' (n. 15), 108ff. (= *SPQR*, 147ff.).

[31] The *praenomen* of the consul I 293, II 272 is certainly 'Lucius' (not 'Titus', a name that was actually never used in the gens Papiria) — pace H. (30f.; 46; 62; 91, but cf. 203). By the way, the consul of 263 was a M'., for Manius (not M., for Marcus) Valerius Messala (80f.; 91; Index, 281 s.v. Messala), and it should be Ti., for Tiberius (not T., for Titus) Sempronius Gracchus (62; 212; 214; Index, 280). The moneyer of 71 was a M'. (not Marius) Aquillius (116 sqq.; 167). T. Quinctius Flamininus (not Flaminius), consul 198 and proconsul until 194, victor over King Philip V at Cynoscephalae, celebrated a triumph *ex Macedonia et rege*

commission paintings which were not only carried in the actual procession, but later permanently displayed mostly in temples or even, in Messala's case, at the Curia Hostilia (cf. 80ff.): they apparently showed the *triumphatores* themselves, (parts of) triumphal celebrations and/or memorable events connected with the triumph, sometimes perhaps — as H. suggests — in friezelike compositions (30ff.).[32]

There is another level of H.'s argumentative strategy of contextualizing his interpretation of monuments and images: here, as well as in the following chapters, he systematically adduces parallels or models, 'reflections' or even instances of direct, clear-cut 'reception' of Roman practices, schemes and conventions of visual representation in Etruria, and Middle and Southern Italy. H. may be right, it is true, to emphasize repeatedly a general 'Italic predilection for images of solemn procession' of magistrates, priests and other dignitaries, 'replete with their attendant emblems of rank and status', which constitute 'a significant component of their habitus' (48; 61, cf. 63; 155 etc.), and he shows us, in many ways plausibly or at least suggestively, the different facets of this 'predilection'.[33] It is certainly also true that Roman (republican) political culture as such can be described as a 'culture of spectacle'[34] — and to be more precise, that these 'spectacles' focused on symbolically complex and formally elaborate solemn processions such as the triumph or the *pompa funebris* to be discussed later; these processions are rituals to express order, hierarchy and collective identity and may thus be 'interpreted as a representation of political ideology, a program of power'.[35] Processions did play such a peculiarly prominent role in the whole spectrum of (Roman) visual representations, ranging from reliefs to paintings. But it is much less plausible to construe more or less close affinities and even a 'direct correspondence between Roman commemorative monuments' on the one hand and the 'iconographic traditions of Campanian and especially Lucanian painting' on the other (59). How, for example, does 'the iconographic type known as the "Return of the Warrior"', as it begins to appear in tombs near Paestum and in Campania in the late 4th century (50ff., cf. 78ff.), relate to the Roman imagery of triumphal celebrations?

First, the affinity between these scenes and the typically Roman imagery of triumph is far from self-evident. H. himself, discussing a frieze from Praeneste which shows five figures in procession, two of them apparently lictors, and a horseman, has to admit that

---

Philippo (!) in 194 (pace H. 91: 'over the city of Eretria on Euboea', cf. 152). P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus, the 'Younger Africanus', was certainly not the adoptive son of (the elder) Scipio Africanus (214).

[32]   Fest. 228 L. s.v. picta; Plin. *nat. hist.* 35, 22 etc. Cf. also Walter, Memoria (n. 11), 148ff., and on the painting showing the celebrations at Beneventum, commissioned by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus after his rather transient success against the Carthaginians in 214 BCE (H. 31f.) now M. Koortbojian, 'A Painted *Exemplum* at Rome's Temple of Liberty', *JRS* 92, 2002, 33-48.

[33]   Cf. already H.'s article 'Processional Imagery in late Etruscan Funerary Art', *AJA* 94, 1990, 73-93.

[34]   H. Flower, 'Spectacle and Political Culture in the Roman Republic', in *Companion* (n. 11), 322-43; cf. also F. Dupont, *L'acteur-roi ou le théâtre dans la Rome antique*, Paris, 1985, 19ff.; B. Bergmann, Introduction, in *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (n. 29), 9-35, with further references.

[35]   H., 'Processional Imagery' (n. 33), 73.

even this 'scene does not specifically represent a triumph' (48) — although it dates late, to the end of the 2nd century or even after 100 BCE, and could therefore certainly represent a Roman ritual. After all, the Latin city of Praeneste, less than 30 miles from Rome, had been her subject ever since the end of the Latin War in 338 BCE. Secondly, H. may again be right to assume processes of 'adaptation of foreign compositional types and artistic styles' and the 'active appropriation' of one or another 'figurative language', in particular during 'successive waves of Hellenism', by the 'victorious Romans', who — 'in the context of the last two Samnite Wars', i.e. during the last quarter of the 4th and in the early years of the 3rd centuries — 'began to appropriate the commemorative strategies of their newly conquered subjects' (61 and 59). But again, the concrete ways in one or the other direction, the means and manifestations of mutual influence are less easy to discern in detail — perhaps, given the state of the material on the one hand and the inherent ambiguities and ambivalences of visual representations on the other, this is hardly possible. In the ultimate analysis, H. presupposes, rather than proves, a full-blown 'Italic koiné' (xvii) — not just 'created' by the Romans in the process of 'adapting Greek precedent in areas as diverse as literature, philosophy, and art' as a kind of by-product of hegemony. At least implicitly, he seems to assume a considerable continuity, constancy and frequency of contacts and interactions between Rome, Etruria and the rest of Middle and South Italy as well as between the Italic peoples, and, as it were, by extension, he takes an extraordinary degree of socio-cultural homogeneity for granted — even if H. regularly emphasizes the fundamental changes brought about by military success and expansion on an ever larger scale, by the profits (and other fruits) of imperial power and 'Hellenization' (cf. 195ff.).

H.'s way of organising different classes of material and putting it into a unifying perspective which he chooses in his sweeping survey of 'scenes of battle, emblems of conquest' (63-121) follows this basic assumption: 'Since the triumph itself had its origins in Etruscan rites, precedents for its artistic celebration and commemoration should also be sought in Etruria' (63). Against this backdrop, many scenes and themes of well-known wall paintings in Etruscan tombs receive their place and function in H.'s closely-knit web of contacts and correspondences: the painted friezes of weapons in the 'Giglioli Tomb' and the 'Tomb of the Shields' at Tarquinia (64f.; 73) fit into the picture as nicely as the elaborate mythical and historical scenes on the walls of the 'François Tomb' at Vulci (65ff., cf. 129f.). H.'s tour through this 'multichambered hypogeum' and his interpretation of the rich imagery (again implicitly and explicitly)[36] serves to discover Etrusco-Roman parallels: first, the 'grandiose layout' of the 'François Tomb' as a whole 'imitated the interior disposition of an aristocratic house' — and 'the triumphal paintings decorating the atrium are similar to those tokens of honor that would be displayed in an aristocratic Roman *domus*, along with the funerary *imagines* of the family's ancestors. Their noble actions continued to bring esteem to their descendants and added to the family's power, or, in Roman terms, its *auctoritas*' (65; 74, cf. 112). Secondly, the carefully arranged 'decorative ensemble' of the paintings 'emphasized the achievements of Vel Saties', the aristocrat who had commissioned the tomb and its decoration and whose portrait 'in triumphal regalia' figures prominently in the layout. According to H., Vel

---

[36] Cf. also H., 'Narrative Structures in the François Tomb', in *Narrative and Event* (n. 2), 175-97.

Saties had obviously 'just brought new distinction to his family, while reflecting back on the *gloria* of previous generations', that is, on his 'illustrious ancestors' and their deeds and achievements in war. The whole 'ordered cycle' of mythical scenes and illustrations of 'city and family history' thus revolves around one 'primary theme', that is 'military triumph' as 'the ultimate source of *gloria*', and it 'culminates in the figure of Vel Saties in the *toga picta*', 'who, by commemorating the role his family had played in the history of Vulci, fashioned a genealogy steeped in *virtus*' (66; 72f.).

It is by no means accidental that H. persistently uses the Latin terminology of moral values — above all, the key concepts of the Roman Republican aristocratic ethos. On the contrary, this strategy is part of his message, and he makes that unambiguously clear: 'the presence of triumphal imagery' in Lucanian, Campanian or, for that matter, Etruscan 'funerary contexts underscores the dominant elements of contemporary ideology, which is exactly why it can be understood in reference to Livy and even Cicero' as well as, one might add, Horace and Vergil — after all, art objects, images and Latin 'historical and political texts operate in a mutually constitutive ideological project' (56, cf. 57f.; 63; 74). For H., this method of amalgamation and of construing 'a unified discourse' (56) seems to be not only completely unproblematic, but even self-evident; and the results are rather predictable, indeed foregone conclusions. But this approach is precisely the problem, in particular from the historical point of view.

It may be true that 'scenes of battle, emblems of conquest' and the imagery of triumph (now to be understood in a non-technical sense) did play the same role in Lucania and Magna Graecia,[37] in Etruria and in, say, late 4th- and early 3rd-century Rome, namely to underscore success in war, to represent the military ethos of the ruling class and also to affirm social hierarchies, differences and distinctions. But this statement is as fundamental as it is general — after all, many aristocracies in pre-modern epochs, not only in Europe, based their legitimacy on value systems centred on concepts of valour and gallantry, developed concomitant codes of behaviour and also strategies, media and repertoires of immediately intelligible images. It is hardly necessary to remind us of the simple fact that all these facets of a culture could and did occur in completely different shapes and configurations — in forms as manifold as the social and political institutions, prevailing ideologies and orientations of the societies in question (and the character of power and the organization of power relations in them). At least to a certain extent, the continuous existence of a cultural 'koiné' notwithstanding, this is certainly also true for the political systems and basic structures in Italy and the momentous consequences and changes necessitated by Roman expansion, the consolidation of a differentiated system of permanent hegemony over all Italian peoples and cities and the complex processes of acculturation (which we used to call 'Romanization'). In this process, the relations between, and indeed the character of, the Roman ruling class on the one hand and the regional and local élites on the other changed — and not just because the asymmetry must have become ever more noticeable. H. is well aware that what he calls 'active appropriation' of forms and styles of representation is one facet of this development.

---

[37]   Cf. H.'s perceptive interpretation of the 'Celtomachia' motif and other 'Greek models and traditions of battle imagery', 74ff. and 76ff. See his earlier article on *Celtomachia* 'The Representation of Battles with Gauls on Etruscan Funerary Urns', *Etruscan Studies* 1, 1994, 23-45.

However, even before this epoch, there were important differences between the very structures of, say, 'the Lucanian land-owning and farming aristocracy' (51), the upper classes of Greek Taras and of Etruscan cities such as Tarquinia and Vulci and the Roman politico-military élite: after all, the latter had gradually emerged from a struggle between a homogeneous caste of the patriciate and a very heterogeneous *plebs*, which had lasted for more than a century. It was only in the later 4th century, during the wars of Italian expansion, that the patricio-plebeian ruling class of the classical Republic and its uppermost echelon, the *nobilitas*, finally took shape and developed a collective identity of their own — and this was exactly the epoch which, according to H. and others, was decisive for the formation of a developed Republican political culture.

It must be emphasized once again that this totally new kind of élite construed itself as a 'meritocracy' with a particular kind of legitimacy: it was based on a sophisticated ideology of *virtus* and unswerving service to the *populus Romanus* and the *res publica*, and *gloria*, fame and reputation were taken to be the *umbra virtutis*. As opposed to other aristocracies (including Greek and apparently also Etruscan), a refined life-style with feasting, hunting sports and games, physical beauty, education and even wealth did not count — at least as ends in themselves. The ideological system as a whole as well as its concomitant conceptual framework of virtues and values, mentioned already above, which served the needs and purposes of the self-fashioning and self-construction of this special sort of ruling class, was unequivocally and unambiguously centred on one single overarching claim: high rank, *dignitas* and *auctoritas*, indeed the status as *nobilis* as such, had to be the well-deserved rewards for a lifelong exclusive concentration on, and uncompromising commitment to, politics and war.[38] In the famous words of the late 3rd-century BCE *laudatio funebris* on L. Caecilius Metellus, consul I 251, II 247, proconsul 250, who celebrated a noteworthy triumph and later also became dictator as well as pontifex maximus (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 7, 139-140): the deceased was praised for having achieved all major objectives that a true Roman *nobilis* was expected to strive for in his public and private life: to be a *primarius bellator*, to show personal bravery on the battlefield on the one hand, to be *optimus orator*, to perform well on the *rostra*, on the other, to prove *summa sapientia* in counsel and (as a consequence) to be deemed *summus senator* and generally *clarissimus in civitate*.

The most important achievements, however, that earned him distinction and *dignitas* in the first place, and indeed were the tangible prerequisite of his rank and reputation, were to have reached the *maximus honos* of the consulship and, as a *fortissimus imperator*, to have commanded campaigns of the utmost importance 'under his own auspices' (*auspicio suo maximas res geri*). In this context, *honos* — as elsewhere, above all in a famous inscription from the 'Tomb of the Scipiones' — has two meanings: it is by no means accidental that Roman notions of 'senior office' and personal 'honour', public recognition and individual reputation (as the premium for successfully discharging the duties involved in a 'formal' *honos*) tended to coalesce in one single concept.[39]

---

[38]   Hölkeskamp, *Entstehung der Nobilität* (n. 17), 206ff.; 209ff.; 219f.; 226ff.; id., 'Conquest' (n. 17), 26ff. (= *SPQR*, 27ff.), with further references.

[39]   *CIL* I² 11= *ILLRP* 312. Hölkeskamp, *Entstehung der Nobilität* (n. 17), 206f.; 209ff.; 225f.; id., 'Conquest' (n. 17), 26f.; 31f. (= *SPQR*, 27f.; 34f.), with further references.

Moreover, the *honores* had a hierarchy of their own — only the holders of the highest magistracies were vested with *imperium auspiciaque*, which consisted in a unique combination of time-honoured sacral and legal, civic and above all military powers. Only magistracies with *imperium* carried the chance to command an army, win a war and return in triumph, and therefore the consulship was the crown of the *cursus honorum*, the most eagerly coveted 'honour' of ambitious aristocrats and the ultimate goal of junior senators at the beginning of their career or personal *cursus*. The consulship, nothing else, was the ultimate prize in the fierce competition for *laus, gloria, dignitas* and *auctoritas*. This institutionalized and formalized pattern of rank and precedence defined the structure and conceptualisation of all relations of power and hierarchy: there is not only a hierarchy within the strictly and steeply stratified society of the *populus Romanus* at large, with an aristocracy of virtue at the top, but also a hierarchy of rank and authority within this élite, which is in turn directly reflected in the central institution of the Republic, the Senate.

It is this rather unusual character of the Republican ruling class which generated a political culture of competition and produced a corresponding 'culture of spectacles', which after all comprised not only *pompae triumphales, funebres* and *circenses*, but also the specific repertoire of highly elaborate civic rituals, including the census, the military levy and, last but not least, the annual elections — the public procedures of promotion to, and within, the *cursus honorum*: apart from, and in addition to, their structural function of formally assigning *honores*, which was vital for the continuous reproduction of the 'meritocracy', they are (as much as any 'procession') ceremonies designed to signify solemnity, to affirm the collective identity of the *populus Romanus* as an entity and to re-enforce the hierarchical order within the citizen-body.[40] And it was the ideology of this ruling class, centred on accumulation of *gloria* through 'exemplary' *res gestae*, past and present, which moulded their concept of history, historiography and historical commemoration through monuments and other media of the 'cultural memory', already discussed above. That is why 'Roman historical art' is not just about solemn processions, but specifically 'about crowd scenes and participatory rituals', obviously 'intended to energize participatory looking by the living crowd', that is, by the people moving through the urban landscape of the Forum Romanum. In other words, to take H.'s most important topic as an example, 'triumphal paintings often mirrored the citizen soldiery back to itself'.[41]

This (by now) almost universally accepted general view of the *arcana imperii* of the Republican aristocratic régime has to be borne in mind — as H. himself frequently asserts (e.g. 4ff.; 22; 155; 193f.). But founding his comparative conspectus of Roman, Etruscan and other Italic practices and traditions on the assumption of an overall cultural

---

40   M. Jehne, 'Integrationsrituale in der römischen Republik. Zur einbindenden Wirkung der Volksversammlungen', in *Sinn (in) der Antike* (n. 17), 279-97, with further references; cf. also Dupont, *L'acteur-roi* (n. 34), 24ff.; K. Hopkins, 'From Violence to Blessing: Symbols and Rituals in Ancient Rome', in A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, J. Emlen (eds.), *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy*, Stuttgart, 1991, 479-98 esp. 489ff.; Flaig, *Ritual-isierte Politik* (n. 9), 155ff.; Hölkeskamp, *Rekonstruktionen* (n. 9), 58ff. Cf. also Zanker, *Apotheose* (n. 15), 23ff. and passim, for a later ritual.

41   Kuttner, 'Roman Art' (n. 11), 312.

homogeneity, H. fails to take the problems and consequences of this one-sided approach into consideration. For example, he asserts not only that for the Romans, 'insofar as they were inheritors of the Etruscan tradition', 'the acquisition of *auctoritas* was cumulative' — that may or may not be true. At any rate, it is a rather unspecific topos of aristocratic ideologies in general, as is the desire 'to fashion galleries of illustrious ancestors'; but H. also claims in the same context that 'the *cursus honorum*' was yet 'another concept the Romans derived from the Etruscans' (74; 131). But, one has to ask, was the Etruscan or south Italian concept of hierarchy and social power really linked as directly and closely to a highly formalized construct as was the Roman system of *imperium, honores* and their gradually formalized *cursus*?

Indirectly, H. himself gives an at least partly negative answer in his detailed, well-informed and interesting discussion of the 'Tomb of Q. Fabius' on the Esquiline, which at the same time complements and in a way counterbalances H.'s reading of the decorations of the 'François Tomb' (83-91). H. — rightly, I believe — dates this 'earliest and best-preserved example of Roman historical painting' (83) to the early 3rd century, when Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, consul no fewer than five times between 322 and 295, was the most prominent 'Fabius': *auspicio suo*, the Romans defeated the coalition of Samnites, Etruscans and Gauls in the battle of Sentinum, which was the decisive victory in the struggle for hegemony in Italy; perhaps, he speculates, the decoration replicates paintings displayed at his triumph (125). Anyway, for H., this painting is 'crucial evidence' — and not only 'for the Roman appropriation of Greek stylistic innovations' (121, cf. 88 etc.), but above all for the prominent presence of elements of style and imagery that he identifies as distinctly and typically Roman. There is the 'prevalence' of 'continuous narrative' and the visual presentation of a 'distinct version of history' and perhaps even of 'individual achievements' of one member of the *gens Fabia* (89; 90, cf. 125). Moreover, and more importantly, there is a particularly 'Roman emphasis on details' — and these details in turn serve to emphasize 'Roman-ness': first, some figures wear distinctively Roman dress, armour and weapons — and by his apparel, their counterpart is immediately identifiable as a Samnite (84ff., cf. 121; 205f.); secondly, the *hasta* in the hand of the Roman protagonist is more than just another weapon — it is the symbol of his *imperium* and, (thus) at the same time, indicates the particular Roman 'obsession with outward signs of rank and status' (90, cf. 88); and thirdly, the extended right hand is more than a simple gesture: the *dextrarum iunctio*, 'the main symbol of *concordia, fides, pax*, and *pietas*', at once 'evokes multiple Roman virtues' (88; 90, cf. 206) and indicates the procedure of 'negotations for a peace or truce' — but certainly for a settlement *a' la Romana*, that is for a surrender to the Roman protagonist by the ritual of *deditio in fidem*.[42] This visualization of the asymmetry of power relations, in which the Roman 'party' is necessarily and naturally superior, is an early representation of the Roman mission to rule, mentioned above — and it is this message which sets it apart from its Etruscan parallels.

There was a specifically Roman world of images, revolving around what H. calls 'triumphal painting', its imagery, style and compositional conventions. Once again, H. marshals an impressive range of images, data and details: he not only discusses the scattered references in the literary tradition that give us a (rough) idea about *tabulae* showing

---

[42]   Cf. Hölkeskamp, '*Fides*' (n. 17), 241ff., cf. 228 (= *SPQR*, 122ff., cf. 110).

scenes of battle, victory and conquest, which were displayed during triumphal celebra-
tions and later put up permanently in private houses, temples or other public buildings
(80ff.).[43] He also painstakingly collects the information available on the 'limited num-
ber' of other *topoi* — apart from the rather straightforward theme of battle, the most
effective, that is immediately intelligible, imagery was the genre of 'fully panoramic
landscapes' and 'topographical paintings', including 'representations of typical or char-
acteristic sites or settings', and of allegorical representations and 'iconic personifica-
tions' of the foreign peoples and places, lands and cities that the triumphant commander
had just brought under Roman sway (104ff.; 120).

According to H., the *topos* remains prominent in the visual world of the Romans from
the late Republic through the Empire — he takes the reader on a tour de force of monu-
ments and images of different genres. In some detail, H. discusses the relief from the
Piazza della Consolazione with its depictions of shields and other trophies; the famous
'Nilotic mosaic' from Praeneste; a wall-painting in a villa at Boscoreale, showing a per-
sonification of vanquished Macedonia; and, last but not least, the panels on the Arch of
Septimius Severus (104ff.). In this context, he even goes out of his way to look at the
monument of L. Aemilius Paullus at Delphi (91-6): this very special example of 'active
appropriation', more than any other monument, 'drove home the ideological message
that Rome was now the dominant power in the eastern Mediterranean and that the arts of
the Greeks now belonged to Rome' (96). Well put, if not entirely new.

H. follows the same strategy in the following chapter on 'funerary commemorations'
(122-54). He offers a dense description of the *pompa funebris*, based on the well-known
passage in Polybius 6, 53-4, and does not contain anything novel and even ignores
important recent contributions to the 'reading' of this ritual.[44] The following survey of
procession scenes and their particular iconography on tomb paintings from Vulci and
Tarquinia, dating mainly from the 3rd and 2nd centuries, and on a group of urns from
Volterra, dating from the 1st century BCE, again contain detailed, often interesting
insights into the Etruscan world of images (128-42).[45] Once again, H. deliberately
chooses Roman terminology to characterize the personnel of these processions: *togati*,
apparitores, lictors, *cornicines* and *tubicines*, and once again he strongly emphasizes
what he considers to be exact parallels between Etruscan and Roman practices (130; 139,
cf. 129). However, he is well aware of the fact that, for example, the iconography of a

---

43   Cf. already H., 'Roman Triumphal Painting' (n. 29), 134ff. and now also I. Östenberg,
      Staging the World. Rome and the Other in the Triumphal Procession, Lund, 2003.

44   Cf. E. Flaig, 'Die *pompa funebris*. Adlige Konkurrenz und annalistische Erinnerung in der
      römischen Republik', in O.G. Oexle (ed.), *Memoria als Kultur*, Göttingen, 1995, 115-48;
      id., *Ritualisierte Politik* (n. 9), 49ff.; Hölkeskamp, '*Exempla* und *mos maiorum*' (n. 11),
      320ff. (= *SPQR*, 188ff.); J. Bodel, 'Death on Display: Looking at Roman Funerals', in *The
      Art of Ancient Spectacle* (n. 29), 259-81, not mentioned by H. Cf. recently Walter, 'AHN
      MACHT SINN' (n. 17), 260ff.; id., *Memoria* (n. 11), 84ff.; W. Blösel, 'Die *memoria* der
      gentes als Rückgrat der kollektiven Erinnerung im republikanischen Rom', in *Formen
      römischer Geschichtsschreibung* (n. 16), 52-72.

45   Cf. already H., 'Processional Imagery' (n. 33), 80ff., and for a different approach, H.
      Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford, 1996, 339ff. Cf.
      the detailed discussion of this important book by M. McDonnell, 'Un ballo in maschera:
      processions, portraits, and emotions', *JRA* 12, 1999, 541-52.

procession of 'magistrates' from the 'Tomb of the Typhon' seems to feature 'local forms of dress and specifically Etruscan attributes' and therefore obviously 'draws on indigeneous Tarquinian traditions' (135) — although this monument dates from the mid-2nd century, when Roman superiority and influence must already have been overwhelming, and H. himself admits Rome's growing 'political and artistic importance' (142).

Generally, H. systematically plays down the 'cultural differences' (46ff., cf. 123; 153ff.) and what he sees as 'minor differences of ceremonial' (130). This is certainly true for the relatively short chapter (142-4) on the well-known relief from Amiternum of the late 1st century BCE which H. takes to be a 'depiction of the elaborate *pompa funebris* of a local magistrate', which 'corresponds with Polybius's account in almost every detail' (142, cf. 153). Apart from the fact that it is not clear whether or not it really shows the funeral of a man or a woman, a magistrate or a freedman,[46] there is one (by no means 'minor') difference that H. does not mention: the display of the ancestor masks, carried by persons wearing the dress and insignia of the highest magistracy which the ancestor represented had reached, at the Roman *pompa funebris*, which Polybius in this very context (6, 54, 4ff.) describes in great detail and which (not only) for him was the most important feature of the ceremony because of its strong commemorative and educational efficacy, is conspicuously absent, here as well as in the Etruscan imagery. The consequence should be clear: *imagines*, their central functions for the self-representation and in particular 'the original idea of acting out the character of an office-holding ancestor' make it evident 'how far certain new practices of the Roman nobility of office differed from earlier, more homogenous aristocratic culture which is increasingly in evidence in many Italian towns'.[47] In other words: by now, the 'cultural capital' of great clans like the Cornelii Scipiones, the Fabii Maximi or the plebeian Caecilii Metelli was really no longer comparable to that of, say, the Pumpu of Tarquinia. As a consequence, H. is right to assume that 'Romans formulated their funeral rites to communicate social realities and render authoritative concepts meaningfully to a large and heterogeneous audience' (153) — indeed: but these 'social realities' consisted above all in the régime of a particular ruling class, which was characterized by the holding of elective office, internal hierarchy and competition in front of the 'audience' of the *populus Romanus* as electorate; and the 'authoritative concepts' were part of the ideology of a basically open patricio-plebeian 'meritocracy', which had superseded the sacral charisma of the closed circle of 'great patrician families'.[48]

The central theme of the following chapter is yet another facet of the Roman 'culture of spectacles': the official 'religious and civic duties of magistrates' (155-94), among which public rites of sacrifice and the broad spectrum of scenes and images showing or alluding to such rites are assigned pride of place (156ff.) — after all, 'various civic ceremonies' such as triumphs 'opened or concluded with sacrificial rites' (193). The

---

46   Cf. Zanker, *Apotheose* (n. 15), 14f.; Flower, *Ancestor Masks* (n. 45), 98f.

47   Flower, *Ancestor Masks* (n. 45), 351.

48   H. 130 erroneously implies that the *pompa funebris*, 'recounted with admiration by Polybius', was an exclusively patrician practice — on the contrary, the ritual in its elaborate form is part of a common patricio-plebeian code, which emerged in the late 4th and early 3rd centuries, cf. Hölkeskamp, *Entstehung der Nobilität* (n. 17), 222f. and 236 (on the analogy of the triumph).

most interesting piece is H.'s detailed analysis of the so-called Altar of Domitius Aheno-
barbus, which — following A. Kuttner[49] — he attributes to M. Antonius, the famous
orator, praetor 102 and proconsul in Cilicia until 100, when he celebrated a triumph *de
piratis ex Cilicia*, consul 99 and censor 97. His suggestions concerning the 'rhetorical
structure linking two facets of distinguished professional career of service to the state',
that is the census and the sea triumph, deserve attention (161ff., cf. 213). H.'s observa-
tions on visual representations of the 'administration of *ludi*' (181-88) and especially on
the magistrate's 'civic role' (188-94), which are largely based on fairly well-known
numismatic evidence and on a somewhat less than coherent array of images from reliefs,
only add details to his general argument.

At this point, H. at last comes full circle and restates the starting-point of his argu-
ment: it was the 'the cultural practice of history' — purposely developed by, and in the
interests of, the Republican ruling class — that 'constituted Roman social reality' (194,
cf. xxiii). In his concluding chapter on 'the effectiveness of historical commemorations
in the Republican milieu' (195-219), H. once again returns to this basic assumption and
its concrete ramifications, which he now tries to accommodate in a holistic systematic
pattern.

This view of a society and its 'reality/realities' is acceptable if and only if one sub-
scribes to a wide definition of the concept of 'social reality', to include additional, and
different, aspects from conquest, 'imperialism' and the influx of sheer wealth in the
shape of gold, slaves and other spoils of war — and the physical removal of Greek artists
and artefacts. And it was not this influx alone that caused the 'discontents' with Helleni-
zation (195ff.), tension and dissent within the ruling class, it was also and above all
concern about values, norms and orientations and about what should count as relevant
and valuable in the everyday competition for influence and advancement — that is why
the function of education, erudition and Greek art, the status of such knowledge in the
'cultural capital' of an individual *nobilis* and its value as a 'very effective mark of dis-
tinction' (197, cf. 201; 213) were controversial.[50] After all, expert knowledge of styles,
media and messages may turn into a kind of 'power' — the ability to decode the complex
'discourse' of power in the visual language can become a valuable or 'powerful' asset in
a cultural milieu.

Moreover, for H., this 'discourse' and its manifestation in the visual language, the
construction and shaping of 'historical commemoration(s)' as 'icons of power' and the
permanent process of 'invention of traditions' were part and parcel of the continuous
'creation of Rome's national identity' centred on the historical myth of her mission to

---

49   'Some New Grounds for Narrative: Marcus Antonius's Base (The *Ara Domitii Ahenobarbi*)
and Republican Biographies', in *Narrative and Event* (n. 2), 198-229.

50   Cf. H.-J. Gehrke, 'Römische Nobilität und Hellenismus', in B. Funck (ed.), *Hellenismus.
Beiträge zur Erforschung von Akkulturation und politischer Ordnung in den Staaten des
hellenistischen Zeitalters*, Tübingen, 1996, 525-41; M. Jehne, 'Cato und die Bewahrung der
traditionellen Res publica. Zum Spannungsverhältnis zwischen *mos maiorum* und
griechischer Kultur im zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr.', in G. Vogt-Spira, B. Rommel (eds.),
*Rezeption und Identität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als
europäisches Paradigma*, Stuttgart, 1999, 115-34. Cf. for a particular aspect also K.-J.
Hölkeskamp, 'Römische *gentes* und griechische Genealogien', ibid., 3-21 (= *SPQR*, 199-
217).

rule, which was indistinguishable from the ideology of its ruling élite (219). Again, it was 'competition among the members of the ruling class' itself which gave this development a particular momentum — and it was not just because it was simply in the nature of things that *nobiles* strove 'to surpass one another with the richness and pomp of their processions' and 'to outdo their peers in the scale, placement, material, and even quality of the commemorative monuments' (212).

Competition was inscribed in the very socio-political and institutional infrastructure of the Republican régime — in other words: it was a fundamental 'social reality' of its own. In the shape of fierce fights for rank and resources, positions and privileges, competition necessarily entails equally fundamental problems of internal stability and integration. However, the oligarchic Republic was a remarkably stable and, by its own ideological standards, highly successful system — as H. himself, if only implicitly, affirms more than once. He seems to be unaware that this historical and sociological phenomenon requires analysis and explanation. Here, he could again have profited from recent research in ancient history on the complementary roles of competition and consensus:[51] a political culture based on ubiquitous competition needs a stable and broad social consensus, which must include a common code of behaviour as well as norms, rules and regulations concerning the fields, limits and rewards of competition — and about the repertoire of acceptable means and media by means of which competitors try to win, What H. calls *topoi*, the language of images, signs and symbols that are universally recognizable, evoke associations in all sectors and classes of viewers and re-enforce ideological messages by implicitly (or even explicitly) referring the spectator to other 'carriers' of the same messages, must be part of that common code. After all, it is this language — together with a culture-specific, complex set of other media or 'carriers', such as oratorical skills — that in the process of self-advertising and self-presentation of competitors enables the third party, in this case the people in the *comitia*, to compare their relative achievements and merits, virtues and qualities and at last to award the premium to the most deserving candidate for the *honor* in question. Thus, as in the (middle) Republic, competition is at once institutionally channelled and even ideologically desirable — and in the final analysis, the potentially disintegrative force of competition turns out to be a stabilizing factor of a régime based on a (if only precariously) balanced combination of competition and consensus.

The weaknesses of H.'s book show *a fortiori* that the interdisciplinary or (in the now fashionable term) transdisciplinary dialogue between ancient history and archaeology is not only fruitful, but obviously necessary — and as we have still a long way to go, let's do it together.

Universität zu Köln

---

[51]   Hölkeskamp, 'Conquest' (n. 17), 22f.; 25f.; 31f. (= *SPQR*, 23; 27; 34); *Rekonstruktionen* (n. 9), 80ff. Cf. also McDonnell, 'Un ballo in maschera' (n. 45), 549ff.