Chapter 4
The Images: Catalogue and Discussion

Introduction
This (extensive) chapter constitutes the core of this study, the main purpose of which is to present the visual evidence pertaining to the basic image types [sol] (to which I will often refer simply as “images of Sol”). It consists of a catalogue of images and a discussion of those images, either individually or as a group.

The catalogue is fairly straightforward. The objects are organized according to type (statue, statuette, relief, lamp, engraved gemstone, etc.), and each group is subdivided according the iconographic themes or motifs (but with no attention to style or execution). The objects are listed per sub-group in chronological order per century. Within each chronological group, objects are listed in roughly geographical order according to provenance, starting with Italy, moving then to the Western provinces (Gaul, Hispania, Britannia), followed by the Rhine and Danube provinces, the rest of the Balkans, Greece, Asia Minor and the Near East, Egypt, and the rest of North Africa. Each entry begins with the current location of the object, followed by the provenance, material, date, a brief description, and references. On occasion, some brief comments follow the references. Information about the date, provenance, material, and other specifics is usually based on what is reported in the secondary literature. If the relevant information is not immediately available I have listed it as “unknown”, although no doubt in some cases a more extensive search of secondary literature, or consultation of museum archives and the like can reveal more accurate information. Whenever we lack the relevant information the object is listed at the end of the relevant category.

The dating of the objects in particular should be treated with caution, because especially in older literature there was a tendency to give a late date to depictions of Sol on the assumption that his cult belonged to the late imperial period. In the case of intaglios I have often provided my own dates after consultation with Professor Marianne Maaskant-Kleibrink on the basis of seal impressions, photographs, or, in the case of intaglios in Athens and Berlin, direct inspection. Whenever scholars differ on the date of an object, I tend to view the earlier date as the lectio difficilior in a scholarly environment that has long persisted in treating Sol as a late Roman phenomenon, and hence as the date more likely to be correct.

Descriptions and references are generally limited and intended only to offer a starting point for scholars seeking further information about the object in question. I have not attempted to give measurements. These are often not readily available, and when they are naturally pertain to the object as a whole rather than to the depiction of Sol in particular.

If the object is listed in the LIMC s.v. Helios or Helios/Sol and/or in Matern’s (2002) catalogue, this is invariably indicated in the references provided.

The catalogue is limited to depictions of Sol according to one of the three basic iconographic types, as well as Sol in mythological scenes. Depictions of Apollo as the sun, of regional solar deities, and other sun-related images are not included, except occasionally as

---

1 Less precisely dated objects are listed as a separate group. Thus objects dated to the “2nd - 3rd c. AD” are listed after those of the 2nd c., and prior to those of the 3rd.
comparanda. Only “Roman” images are included, being defined as images produced in a region under Roman rule at the time of production. In the case of unknown provenance, the Late Hellenistic period is generally taken as a terminus post quem for inclusion. The fifth century AD is the lower chronological limit, although a few early medieval images of the sixth and seventh centuries AD have been included to illustrate the continued use of the image types [sol].

Less straightforward than the catalogue are the discussions, that take the form of a running commentary of the image-groups. Given that the catalogue is not organized thematically according to image and content, but typologically according to object and bearer of the image, this may come as a surprise. The discussion, after all, concerns the images, not the objects (except insofar as they have bearing on our understanding of the images) and thematically related images occur in different object categories. To a certain degree this is mitigated by the fact that within each category the objects are grouped in thematic subdivisions. Nonetheless, the approach chosen here is not ideal for those seeking a comprehensive discussion of the meanings of the images of Sol in the Roman world. This is a conscious choice, for it is not my aim to offer a comprehensive discussion of that type.

As discussed in chapter 2, one can consider the three basic image types [sol] to be, in a semiotic sense, signs (much like the word Sol is in Latin). The images in the catalogue are then “texts”, many centred on only one sign, [sol], many others consisting of more elaborate groups of signs of which [sol] is but one. In a sense one could therefore view this chapter as a series of “text-editions” with a “commentary” insofar as the discussions, like classical commentaries, are meant primarily to shed light on passages in the “text”, i.e. the images themselves, their peculiarities and difficulties, and perhaps errors in earlier interpretation. The various discussions are not meant to offer a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter of the images/texts as a whole, and one should not approach the discussions expecting a logically structured overview of the nature and role of Sol in Roman religion. The purpose of this catalogue is to present the visual evidence for the Roman Sol in a comprehensive and annotated fashion, so that scholars of Roman religion can access and further analyse the information encoded and encapsulated in these images at the level of image type (in the broadest sense of the word) and visual practice in the Roman world, rather than at the level of an isolated image.

Described in these terms this is a classic catalogue raisonné of monuments, and fundamentally there is no difference, except perhaps in the scope of this chapter. The approach I take here is based on the premiss that viewing and seeing these images is not straightforward, and that Roman modes of viewing and apprehending them are still poorly understood by Classicists, myself included. If we take my aim with this chapter to be an analysis of what these images meant, then it logically follows from this premiss that I don’t really know what I’m doing. That does not trouble me (is not the whole point of research that we do not know but want to

---

2 Mithraic images or images of Sol found in mithraea, for example, occur in almost every category of the catalogue.

3 One can think of statuettes of Sol or lamps decorated with the bust of Sol. The actual “text” is, of course, more elaborate, as the object itself (statuette, lamp) on or through which Sol is depicted and its context (e.g. lararium, souvenir) are also essential components of the basic “text” centered on Sol.
contribute our two bits to finding out?) but it should, and hopefully does, affect the approach I take here. My purpose with this chapter (and this study as a whole) is threefold: 1. To provide the building blocks for a basic, dictionary-like definition of the visual sign [sol]. 2. To explore, in preliminary fashion, different modes of viewing and apprehending the various types of images in which [Sol] occurs. 3. To contribute, through 1 and 2, empirical data (my two bits) towards the broader study of Roman modes of viewing.

I would like to emphasize the importance of the third purpose. There has been a tendency, in certain circles, to contrast the “hard” but limited and fragmentary archaeological evidence for the Roman world with the “soft” rhetoric of traditional historical discourse. One can certainly agree with the reservations expressed about positivist historical rhetoric, but the optimism in these circles about the factuality of archaeological data is misplaced. Archaeological evidence does not speak for itself at any level of meaning. Every type of narrative entails the “translation” of ancient material culture to modern academic verbal culture, a major interpretative undertaking. The problems in the interpretation of Roman visual communication are, if anything, even greater, as we have seen in chapter two.

We must bear this in mind as we take a closer look at the analogy of text and commentary which I used to describe the goals of this chapter. It is, of course, an imperfect analogy because the images discussed here do not form self-contained texts but instances of the use of an image type. The visual “text” is composed by a combination of factors: the visual code to which the image adheres and the concepts thus encoded and transmitted; the interaction with the context (visual, physical, social, etc.); specific details or aspects added by the author/artist; etc. Thus a significant part of the meanings of an image is determined by the system of visual codes from which the artist draws. In that sense the image is like a word, with meaning pre-established by the language to which the word belongs, and the discussions in this catalogue take on the role of lemmata in a dictionary. At the same time an image is more complex and open-ended than a word or even a written text because it can derive meanings from its context and imbue that context with meanings to a greater degree and with greater flexibility. As we have seen, many shades of those meanings are fundamentally visual. They cannot be captured by words, only circumscribed. Connected with this is the most fundamental difference between visual and verbal “texts”, namely the role of time. An image is instantaneous, not sequential, a verbal text sequential, not instantaneous.

Coming to grips with the various and diverse strands of the visual construction of meanings through the image types [sol] is a complex dialectical process in which patterns can emerge at various levels: meaningful variations and innovations in the manner of composing the image type (raised right hand of Sol for instance); impact of (and on) context (Sol with Luna, as attributes of Aeternitas for instance); repetition and variation of visual patterns (Sol and Luna riding in opposing directions on the Prometheus sarcophagus in Naples, for instance); etc. Each recognized pattern generates its own research trajectory to be pursued, and its own feedback to

---


5 Cat. C3a4.3
the broader topic of the role of images of Sol in Roman visual communication. I believe that in terms of understanding of the meanings encoded in images of Sol and their roles in Rome’s visual system of communication there is a great deal more that we can learn. This study is only a first step.

As far as the Roman practice of viewing and engaging with its visual culture is concerned, each exploration of an hypothesized “strand of meaning” can also be deemed a preliminary test of an hypothesized mode of viewing. That does not make this a theoretical study; I have no intention of dealing comprehensively with the thorny issue of Roman viewing, nor is it my aim to provide even a working template or framework for dealing with that topic. But I approach the analyses of these images with certain pre-understandings, some of which concern the Roman modes of viewing. In that sense the issue of Roman viewing is very much “at play”. It is hence important to make these pre-understandings as visible as possible, and this has been a consideration in determining the organization of the catalogue and this chapter.

The decision to organize the catalogue by object rather than by image or theme makes it possible to subdivide the material into relatively objective, relevant categories. The type of object one is dealing with has bearing on the meaning of the image, but can be determined without taking account of the image. One cannot assign the same meaning to an image on a lamp as one does to a cult statue, even if the two are iconographically identical; the type of object is an important factor in defining the image. But one doesn’t need to define the image in order to determine that the two objects are a lamp and a statue.

In the subdivision of the main categories, definition of images was sometimes unavoidable, but here too I have attempted to keep the sub-categories as free of interpretation as possible. Once the images were organized, the logical next step was (and is) to look at them more closely in the order in which they appear in the catalogue, and attempt to identify meaningful patterns. That is the aim of the discussions following each section of the catalogue, but I make no claim to comprehensiveness. Once such patterns have been identified or postulated, they can be explored in greater depth within a broader framework of Roman visual culture. That I leave for others.

As a consequence of all this, the discussions in this chapter are unabashedly haphazard, by no means comprehensive, but sometimes wide-ranging nonetheless. Readers interested in certain aspects of Sol rather than specific image types thus may well find material here that is of interest, but will have to use the table of contents to find it.

Catalogue and Discussion
The catalogue is divided into main sections, indicated with a capital letter, subdivided into subsections (arabic numeral) which in turn can be subdivided as well (lower case letter). Entries are numbered consecutively.

A. Free-standing sculpture, life size or larger.
This section lists life-size and colossal sculpture - statues as well as busts. Besides certain or near certain representations of Sol it includes a selection of sculptural works often incorrectly identified as Sol or as assimilations with Sol. Certain famous and less famous statues of Sol known only from written accounts have also been included.
A1. Full statue.
A1a. Identification as Sol certain or probable.

-1. Rome, Palazzo Barberini.
  Rome?
  Marble.
  Mid 2nd c. AD (Antonine).
  Statue of Sol, standing, nude but for a chlamys covering his l. shoulder, fastened with a fibula over the r. shoulder. With his restored l. hand, extended forward from the waste, he grasps a fold of his cloak, but it may be that he held a globe in this hand originally. In his lowered r. hand he holds the upright staff of his whip up to shoulder, letting it lean back lightly in the crook of his arm. The cord of the whip, fastened at the top, hangs down, circling the staff twice. The head does not belong to the statue. It is a portrait of an unknown man, bearded, and dates to the reign of Hadrian. Papini 2002.
  Although the head is lost, the identity of the statue as Sol appears to me to be certain.

  Rome (?)
  Marble.
  Mid 2nd c. AD (Antonine).
  Statue of Sol, standing, nude but for a chlamys covering his l. shoulder, fastened with a fibula over the r. shoulder. He stretches his restored (?) l. hand forward from the waste, but it may be that he held a globe in this hand originally. In his lowered r. hand he holds the upright staff of his whip up to shoulder, letting it lean back lightly in the crook of his arm. The cord of the whip, fastened at the top, hangs down, circling the staff twice. The head does not belong to the statue. It is a portrait of an unknown man, bearded, and dates to the reign of Hadrian. Papini 2002. Although the head is lost, the identity of the statue as Sol appears to me to be certain.

-3. Utica, Mus. Henchir Tounga (Cincari).
  Marble.
  2nd c. AD.
  Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, long wavy hair, right arm and right leg missing, left arm missing below elbow and left leg missing below the knee. Picard 1961, 85-6, fig. 4.

-4. Pl. 3.4
  Stuttgart, Landesmuseum RL 295.
  Otterdingen, near Rottenburg.
  Sandstone.
  2nd-3rd c. AD.
  Male figure, nude but for a chlamys, right arm missing, whip in left hand; front part of head, and legs below the knees missing. LIMC Helios/Sol 113; Espérandieu, Germanie, 624. Insufficient attributes to make the identification as Sol certain. Note: probably part of a relief rather than a freestanding statue with unfinished rear.

-5. Pl. 3.2
  Copenhagen, Glypt. 623.
  Rome, Esquiline, near Sette Sale.
  Carrara marble.
  Third or fourth quarter 4th c. AD (Kiiilerich & Torp 1994, 312 n. 30); early 4th c. (?) (Stirling 2005, 123-4).
  Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, long curly hair, radiate nimbus with triangular rays sculpted in relief, right arm raised (broken above the elbow), left arm held an attribute but is broken below the elbow; one horse as a support. The reconstruction of this statue is dubious. LIMC Helios/Sol 460, 461 (the head listed as a separate monument in the LIMC under 461 is in fact the head of this statue); Matern 2002, 114, 177, 238 142 (with incorrect inv. number).

-6. Pl. 3.3
  Istanbul, Arch. Mus. 5059.
  Silahtarağa.
  Marble.
  Late 4th c. AD (Kiiilerich & Torp 1994, 314-6; Stirling 2005, 214, with good arguments for rejecting the date of AD 150-190 given by Chaisemartín & Örgen 1984).

The statue was found at the Septizodium of Cincari (Henchir Tounga). For another Septizodium that may have contained statues of planetary deities, cf: Janon 1973, 229-237 (Lambaesis). Lusnia (2004, 526, 533) assumes that the Severan Septizodium in Rome was also adorned, inter alia, with statues of the planetary deities.
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys over his shoulder, long, curly hair, both arms missing from the shoulder, legs missing below the knees. Behind the forehead, the cranium has been cut away horizontally, with a hole in the center to fasten in place whatever addition was made separately for this part of the head.

Chaisemartin & Örgen 1984, 13-15 pl. 4-6; Matern 2002, 115, 238 fig. 141, fig. 53. Not Apollo, as Chaisemartin & Örgen propose, but probably Helios/Sol (Kiilerich & Torp 1994, 314-316).

Alexandria.
Thasian marble.
Roman.
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, long wavy hair, right arm lowered, broken below the elbow, chlamys draped over lower left arm (outstretched, hand and patera modern restorations). No trace of rays. Fragmentary inscription on plinth: ΔÎ ΗΛÎ[ ] ΤΟΥΜΑ... / ΑΥΤ... 

A1b. Identification as Sol possible, but uncertain.
Cività Castellana.
Terracotta.
Late 4th-early 3rd c. BC.
Torso, nude, of a young, male figure with long wavy hair; right arm missing completely, left arm missing from the elbow. A groove in the head implies the statue once had a (metal?) crown of some sort, quite possibly radiate. Part of a group of statues which adorned the roof of a temple, the torso, which ends at the waste (finished, not broken) presumably stood in a chariot. Ensoli 1995, 400 (with references). According to Ensoli not Apollo but Helios, inspired by the Lysippan chariot of Helios on Rhodes and with portrait features of Alexander.

-2. Pl. 4.1-3, 75.1
Raleigh, N. Carolina Mus. of Art 84.1.
Unknown.

Marble.
Late 2nd - early 3rd c. AD.
Statue of a youth, nude but for a chlamys, r. arm stretched forward (lower arm broken off), l. arm partially broken off, but traces remain of some object held in the hand and leant against the shoulder. On his head the youth wears/bears a strange, polos-like gear, the top of which is rough and unfinished. Along the edge of this gear are 12 holes. By his l. leg is the protome of one horse as support.
Lack of attributes make secure identification impossible; equally possible that this is one of the Dioscuri, cf. Chpt. 6.

A2. Full statues, lost (selection).

A2a. Sol alone, on chariot.
-1. Rome, Palatine, Temple of Apollo.
No indication.
Augustan.
Propertius describes the temple, and clearly states that there was a chariot with Sol on the roof: "In quo Solis erat supra fastigia currus;" (Prop. II,31,11; 2). Cf. the Carmen Saeculare of Horace (see chapter 7). On the temple of Apollo in general, see Zink 2008.

-2. Pl. 4.4-5
Rome, Circus Maximus, Temple of Sol.
Unknown.
Terminus ante quem: ca. 200. Tacitus refers to the temple as a vetus aedes, making a Republican date for the statue a reasonable possibility.
The presence of a statue on the roof seems certain, but whether it was Sol in a quadriga, as Guarducci believes, is less clear. Cf. Tert Spect. 8,1: circus Soli principaliter consecratur: cuius aedis medio spatio et effigies de fastigio aedis emicat, quod non putaverint sub tecto consecrandum quem in aperto habent.
On the temple cf. Humphrey 1986, 62-3, 91-95. It is depicted on various coins. Cf. a sestertius of Trajan, illustrating the Circus Maximus, with the temple of Sol and a minute radiate head on the roof (Guarducci
1983 (1959), 144 fig. 5; cf. BMCRE III, 180 nrs. 853-855, pl. 32, 2-4), and coins of Caracalla (BMCRE V, 477-8 nrs. 251-2, 259†; Gnechi II, pl. 109,5).

- 3. Greece, Corinth, Lechaion-Gate.

- \textit{Terminus ante quem}: ca. AD 150.

- \textit{Ek δ τς γορς ζιωντς τ ν π λεγαίου προπολαία στι κα π α τ ν ρματα πίρμας, τ μ ν Φαεθοντα Ήλιου πα δα, τ δ Ήλιον α τον φέρον.}

- \textit{Paus. II.3,2; LIMC Helios 123.}


- For coins showing the Lechaion gate and (possibly) its quadriga of Sol cf. Papachatzis 1976, fig. 72 nrs. 1-2.

- A2b. Sol alone, standing.

- 1. Pl. 5.1-6

- Rome, Golden House, then near the Colosseum.

- Bronze.

- AD 64-68 or 69-79.

- Colossal bronze statue, originally of Nero, but transformed into Sol by Vespasian.


- Unknown.

- 2\textdegree c. AD?

- Cult statue of Helios in the temple of Helios at Isthmia, restored or replaced by P. Licinius Priscus Iuventianus when he also restored the temple.

- LIMC Helios 338; Ritti 1981, nr. 6; \textit{IG IV}, 203.


- Unknown.

- Before AD 274.

- Verum illic [sc. in templo Heliogabali] eam formam numinis reperit, quam in bello sibi faventem vidiit. Quare et illic templum fundavit donariis ingentibus positis et Romae Soli templum posuit maiore honorificentia consecratum (...).

- \textit{HA Aurel. 25, 4-6.}

- A2c. Sol and Luna.


- \textit{Terminus ante quem}: ca. AD 150.

- Sol radiate, Luna with crescent moon.

- \textit{Etér ano δ Ήλιοι πεισούται κα Σελήν λίθου τ γάλματα, κα τ κ σ μ v kέρατα v}

- Rome, Temple of Sol Invictus.

- Unknown.

- Ca. AD 274/5.

- Cult statue of Sol, standing?, in the temple of Sol built by Aurelian in Rome.

- \textit{Zos. 1,61,2.}


- Stone.

- Term. ante quem: ca. AD 150.

- Sol radiate, Luna with crescent moon.

- \textit{ VT } Ηλιος ραδιειας κα Σελήν ρεποινα ...
Greece, Thalamai (Laconia), Sanctuary of Ino-Pasiphae.
Bronze.
Terminus ante quem: ca. AD 150.

No indication.

-2. Termessus (Pamphylia).
Bronze?
Ca. AD 324.
Equestrian statue of Constantine/Sol? Only dedicatory inscription preserved:
Kωνσταντέιν Σεβ(αστος) / Ηλίος / Παντεπότης / δ μοι.
TAM 3(1),45; Fowden 1991, 129 n. 95; Tantillo 2003a.

-2. Venice, Arch. Mus. 245.
Egypt.
White Thasian marble.
1st c. BC-1st c. AD.
Long, wavy hair blown back against a nimbus with holes along its edge for metal rays.
Krug 1969 with lit.; EA 2444/5; Beschi 1983; cf. Smith 1988, 182 C8; Bergmann...

I concur with Smith (1988, 182 C8) that this is simply Sol, not Mithridates VI assimilated to Alexander-Sol (*pace* Krug 1969).

-3.

Pl. 7.1

Jena, Schott collection.

Unknown.

White marble.

Late Hellenistic?

Fairly short, wavy hair; seven holes for rays.

*Ea* 1465/6; Matern 2002, 171, 245 B9 fig. 66.

-4.

Arles, Mus..

Arles.

Limestone.

1st c. AD (Espérandieu).

Head of Sol with wavy curls and seven holes for rays.

Espérandieu III, 370 nr. 2532.

-5.


Rome, Circus of Maxentius.

Marble.

Late 1st or early 2nd c. AD.

Badly weathered male bust with short hair, unspecified number of holes for rays.

Identification as Sol doubtful.


-6.

Pl. 6.4

Rome, Museo Capitolino 732.

From the Vatican, probably entering the Capitoline collection as a gift of Pius V in 1566.

Greek marble.

1st or 2nd c. AD.

Head turned, "heavenly" gaze, long wavy hair, 7 holes for rays.


-7.

Vatican, Mus. Gregoriano Prof. 10747.

Ostia, Mitreo degli Animali.

Marble.

Around AD 160.

Long, wavy hair; seven holes for rays.

*LIMC* Helios/Sol 12, *Ea* 2257; Ostia II, 91 pl. 32,4.

-8.

Vatican, Lateran Coll.

Ostia, Mitreo del Palazzo Imperiale.

Italian marble.

2nd half 2nd c. AD.

Long wavy hair; back of head damaged.

*LIMC* Helios/Sol 13; Ostia II, 56, 92 pl. 32.1.2.

According to Becatti (Ostia II) this head originally wore a Phrygian cap, in which case it is Mithras, not Sol.

-9.


Anzio.

Yellowish white, fine-grained marble.

2nd c. AD.

Long wavy hair, 5 holes for metal rays


-10.

Rome, Art Market.

Unknown.

White marble.

2nd c. AD.

Long wavy hair, 7 holes for rays, chlamys; 3 corn ears on chlamys.

*Ea* 811 (cf. remark concerning this bust at *Ea* 1172); Matern 2002, 170, 180, 246 B13.

-11.

Madrid, Prado 367.

Unknown, probably Italy.

White marble.

2nd c. AD.

Long wavy hair, roughly rendered; nimbus with holes along the edge for metal rays.


-12.

Athens, Agora Museum S 2356.

Athens, Agora House C, room 7, well P.

Marble.

Mid 2nd c. AD, buried deliberately ca. AD 530 together with a bust of Nike and a portrait of a bearded man.

Long wavy hair, 15 holes for metal rays.

*LIMC* Helios 175; Shear 1971, 273-4; Frantz 1988, 37, 41, pl. 40b; Matern 2002, 13 n. 96, 179, 245 B6.


-17. Sevilla, Casa de Pilatos, patio principal (?). Rome, probably. Marble. Undated. Long wavy hair, upward turning head, heavenly gaze, triangular stone rays (some restored). Gomez-Moreno & Pijoán 1912, 67-8 Fig. 29; Matern 2002, 171, 246-7 B15


A3a. Sol and Luna.


A3b. Lost busts.

A1a Identification as Sol probable

Only seven statues have survived that can be tentatively identified as Sol, and not one statue of which the identification as Sol is completely certain.

Papini (2002) makes a persuasive case that the Antonine statue in the Palazzo Barberini (A1a.1) and a closely related one of similar date in a private collection in France (A1a.2) both represent Sol. Both depict him in the standard image type of a youth, nude but for a chlamys, holding a whip in his right hand. Both statues, however, have heads that were added later, and therefore an alternative identity cannot be excluded, the more so as their original context is not known. In effect, the identification hinges on the whip. Papini points out that there are no nude figures other than Sol for whom a whip is a standard attribute in Roman art. By the same argument a limestone statue in Stuttgart (A1a.4) is probably Sol, although it too is quite damaged (lower legs, right arm, face and part of its head are missing), so that again we can only rely on the whip he carries in his left hand to identify him as Sol.

That the statue in Copenhagen (A1a.5) represents Sol is widely accepted, and more than likely correct. This statue was either made or set up by Flavius Chryseros of Aphrodisias. It was found in 1885 in a highly fragmented state on the Esquiline hill in Rome, where its pieces had been reused as building material in a wall together with numerous fragments of other statues. A total of ten heads, many body fragments, and a number of signed bases were found at the time. Out of these fragments four statues - a satyr with the infant Dionysus, Poseidon, Zeus and Helios/Sol - were reconstructed. They were acquired by Carl Jacobsen for the Glyptothek in Copenhagen together with a head of Herakles from the same group. The other fragments were dispersed and their whereabouts is unknown.

The Copenhagen statue has all the hallmarks of the image type [sol]: a young man, nude but for a chlamys, raised right hand, his beardless face framed with rich curly hair. The stone, radiate nimbus has no direct parallels, but other attempts to portray Sol three-dimensionally with

---

6 Cf. Papini 2002, 96. Both statues come from old collections, and both were found no later than the 17th century, probably in Rome. Papini (2002, 99) writes that he could imagine them as part of the decoration of a Mithraeum, given their slightly reduced size and fairly superficial execution, but emphasizes that he has not found any concrete evidence for their actual provenance.

7 C.L. Visconti reports on the discovery in various installments in BullComm 14 (1886) under the sections headed "Trovamento di oggetti d'arte e di antichità figurata": pp. 234-6, 297-8 (mentioning the ten heads and listing 9), 314-323 (inscriptions), 339-341, 359-60 (on the restoration of the statue of Neptune).

8 LIMC Helios/Sol 461, referring to EA 170, suggests that the group included a second head of Sol, closely similar to the Copenhagen head. This is incorrect, as the photo in EA shows the Copenhagen head itself, before the statue was restored. Based on Visconti's report in BullComm (cf. above n. 7) the missing heads are: head of Juno, idealized bust of a youth (Paris?), portrait bust of a woman (heavily damaged), and the head of a beardless male (so much damaged as to be hardly recognizable). The head of Cupid mentioned by Visconti is probably the head of the infant Dionysus. Cf. Floriani Squarciapino 1943, 42-3.

9 This radiate nimbus has generally been described incorrectly as a radiate mural crown, following Visconti (1886, 298), who actually described the head as a Cybele with mural crown and rays. The damaged nimbus was sequently restored as a mural crown with turrets when the statue was reassembled. Now that these turrets have been removed, together with the other restorations, the fact that this is a radiate nimbus, rather than a radiate mural crown,
nimbus and rays exist. There is a problem, however, insofar as the image type [sol] is never accompanied by only one horse as is apparently the case here. Even so, if the missing attribute in his left hand was a globe or a whip, this would have clinched the identification as Sol. As it is, we cannot be certain, the more so because Squarciapino (1943, 38) emphasizes that the fragments of the statues were put together "senza molta scrupolosità tanto che è dubbia la pertinenza delle teste ai tronchi e delle statue stesse ai plinti cui furono ravvicinate". This could mean, of course, that the protome of a horse which currently acts as a support for this statue was originally part of a different one. Perhaps the head of a youth, tentatively identified by Visconti as Paris (supra n.8) was actually one of the Dioscuri, and the horse was a support for his statue. As it is, we cannot take for granted that the current combination of iconographic elements in this statue is accurate, and hence cannot be certain that it does, indeed, depict Sol.

The context within which the statue was found also does not help us. Although it seems likely that all the fragments found together on the Esquiline hill near the Sette Sale cistern belonged to a group of statues which were produced together as part of one project, this need not mean that they stood together as part of one iconographic program or group. Thus we cannot hazard any serious guess as to the original iconographic or programmatic context of the statue, which could have helped in confirming its identity, although it may be noted that the group as a

---

appears obvious. It is interesting to note that while the nose is not yet restored on the photograph E.A 170 (cf. n. 8), the turrets are present. This presumably shows that the restoration was in progress when the photograph was taken.

10 Cf. a marble bust in Venice (A3.2) and one in the Prado (A3.11) for stone nimbi with metal rays; for triangular stone rays cf. a bust in Sevilla (A3.17).

11 Matern (2002, 113) disagrees with me on this point, but the only other example she gives of Sol with a single horse is on a small relief in Rome (cat. C2w.5). What Matern identifies as the protome of one horse by the right leg of Sol is in fact a portion of the relief that is so badly damaged that virtually nothing remains of the horse except for a fringe of manes. I have looked closely at this relief on various occasions and the damage is simply too extensive to admit any certainty about the number of horses originally depicted; there may well have been two or even four staggered horses' heads rather than the single head postulated by Matern. The relatively high position of the surviving fringe of manes relative to Sol's leg suggests to me that more than one protome was depicted, the other(s) staggered below the surviving manes, as otherwise the single protome would be a bit large. Matern also refers to a statue in Paris (Louvre MA 74; Matern 2002, cat. G32, fig. 28) with two horses by his right leg, which she identifies as Sol but I do not. Her identification of this figure is based solely on seven small holes in the head which may have held rays. Unfortunately, the original attributes he held are lost and his clothing (short chiton) is most uncommon for Sol, so that this statue cannot be securely identified. In any case, one must also account for the fact that there are two horses here, suggesting that - for whatever reason - just one would not do. In general the presence of a single horse suggests the person accompanied by the horse was its rider, while more than one horse is needed to imply a chariot.

12 Cf. Arndt, Glyptotheque, 224. Matern (2002, 113) points out that in the case of this particular statue the head and torso do appear to belong together.

13 Visconti, 1886, 298, clearly considers the female portrait bust - now lost - to be different (and later) in style. Even so, it seems too much to suggest - as Kiderich & Torp (1994, 310) do - that it is pure chance that brought these statues together, and that they need not even have come from the same building. It is much more likely, as they themselves suggest further on (p. 314), that the statues adorned a rich, late antique villa on the Esquiline.
whole conforms quite well to what we know of the sculptural decoration of fourth century villa's.\textsuperscript{14}

There is one potential parallel for the statue in Copenhagen, but it is equally problematic. The North Carolina Museum of Art houses a statue of a youth, rather dubiously identified as Caracalla, supported by a single horse, nude but for a chlamys, and wearing the remnants of a crown that may have been quite similar to the one of the Copenhagen statue (A1b.2). Here the rays were not sculpted in relief on the side, however, but are presumed to have consisted of twelve metal spikes set on top along the edge.\textsuperscript{15} Although Vermeule (1990) identifies this as a statue of Caracalla in the guise of Sol, I have argued elsewhere that it is more likely a statue of Castor (Hijmans 1994; cf. chapt. 6). The single horse, the youthfulness, the chlamys, the right arm stretched out to hold a spear, and the traces on the left arm of a \textit{parazonium} all point in this direction (pl. 75.1-6). Taken in isolation, this identification cannot be confirmed, but if the statue was originally set up as one of a pair the identification would be beyond doubt.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus although on balance the identification as Sol is clearly preferable in the case of the Copenhagen statue, we must accept that the attributes he held in his left and right hand - in combination with the single horse - could have been enough to establish a different identity for this figure.

Lack of sufficient data makes it equally impossible to securely identify the other potential statues of Sol. The colossal marble statue in Berlin (A1a.3) lacks attributes (the present ones are modern restorations), but an inscription on the base reads Διὸς Ηλίου... , which has suggested the identification as Helios/Sol. The statue of Apollo from Silahtarağa (A1a.6) is probably Sol, as Kiilerich and Torp (1994, 314-316) believe, but his identity hinges not only on the attributes in his missing hands, but also on the separately made, and now also missing, headdress. This may well have been a radiate crown or nimbus of some sort, but something completely different, such as a Parthian cap of Attis, cannot be excluded. If the statue represents Helios/Sol, it can be linked to the Selene found in the same cache, and together with the Artemis and Heracles is an interesting example of the manner in which the elite of late Roman times remained interested in pagan themes, decorating their homes with such statues.\textsuperscript{17}

Finally, excavations in 1955 at Henchir Tounga (ancient Cincari) in Tunisia revealed a statue (now in the museum at Utica) which may be Sol. This statue was found near a building which was originally the frigidarium of a bath-complex, but was subsequently transformed into a

\textsuperscript{14} Kiilerich & Torp 1994, 113-4.

\textsuperscript{15} Only the 12 holes remain, and we cannot be certain that they contained rays.

\textsuperscript{16} Naturally, given the right setting and attributes, this statue could be of Sol. My argument is simply that the attributes of a Dioscure best fit the lost elements of the statue.

\textsuperscript{17} I prefer the late date proposed by Kiilerich and Torp (loc. cit.) to the earlier ones proposed by Chaisemartin & Örgen (1984).
Septizonium (Picard 1961), i.e. a monument dedicated to the planetary gods.\textsuperscript{18} It was found together with fragments of two other statues, one of Mars and one of Saturn. The statue is of a youth, nude but for a chlamys, with fairly long, wavy hair. His right arm and right leg are missing, as are his left arm below the elbow and his left leg below the knee. Thus attributes such as a whip or globe, which could have clinched the identification, are lacking. As it is, the statue taken in isolation cannot be firmly identified. The context, however, makes its identity as Sol likely. The nature of the monument in its second phase, dominated by seven niches quite probably meant to contain seven statues, is virtually confirmed by the discovery nearby of a fragmentary inscription on which by chance only the word \textit{septidonivm (sic)} was preserved.\textsuperscript{19} This, together with the discovery of three of the seven planetary gods (Saturn, Sol and Mars) suggest that the statue under discussion is indeed Sol. However, the excavation has been insufficiently published, and it is impossible to verify Picard's claim that the inscription, the statues, and the second phase of the frigidarium can indeed be considered contemporaneous.\textsuperscript{20}

A1b. Identification as Sol possible, but uncertain

Various other statues have more or less tentatively been identified as Sol in the past, but in all cases the identification remains possible at best, though not necessarily probable. Two torsi of nude youths with a \textit{balteus} decorated with signs of the zodiac can serve as an example. Both are sometimes deemed remains of statues of Sol, but there are no parallels for Sol with such a \textit{balteus}, and all the attributes one would expect with Sol are either lacking (e.g. the chlamys) or lost.\textsuperscript{21} Hence there is no reason to identify the two as Sol, the more so because there is a good case to be made for identifying these torsi as \textit{Annus} or \textit{Eniautos}, a young man, nude, with a zodiac as his main attribute.\textsuperscript{22} This too, however, is obviously no more than a hypothesis.

Radiate statues of Apollo, with quiver, are sometimes equated with Sol. They certainly represent the Olympian god in his solar guise, but strictly speaking fall outside the scope of this study, and have hence mostly been excluded from the catalogue. An example of such a statue is the Apollo in Civitavecchia thought by Langlotz (1975/6) to be a copy of the colossal statue of Helios on Rhodes. It is in every respect closer to Apollo than Helios, as he has none of the iconographic elements typical of latter. Langlotz' suggestion that this is a copy of the colossus of Rhodes can be no more than hypothetical, as we lack sufficient data on the appearance of the original.

This brings us lastly to the terracotta statue (torso and head; A1b.1), about two-thirds of

\textsuperscript{18} Septizia are often conceived of as fountains but Picard (1961, 93) points out that there is no firm evidence for hydraulic works in any of the surviving septizonia

\textsuperscript{19} Picard 1961, 90 fig. 8.

\textsuperscript{20} The only publication of these excavations, apparently, is that of Picard (1961). An article with further details was promised (N. Duval & J. Cintas, "Le martyrium de Cincari et les martyria triconques et tétraconques en Afrique", \textit{MEFRA} 88 (1976), 853-927, p. 856 note 1), but as far as I know never published.

\textsuperscript{21} LIMC Helios/Sol 301; LIMC Helios 335.

\textsuperscript{22} On Annus/Eniautos cf. Zuntz 1991, 37-45 (with references); LIMC Annus, commentary (p. 800).
life-size, which formed part of the decoration of the temple "dello Scasato" at Falerii Veteres (Civita Castellana). According to Ensoli (1995, 400) this is not Apollo - as has generally been thought - but probably Helios. She claims that the figure "...è fortemente influenzata dai ritratti di Alessandro (...)", and especially of Alexander-Helios (comparing it specifically with the Capitoline bust A3.4). In view of the early date of this statue (late 4th-early 3rd c. B.C.) this is surprising. On the problem of Alexander-Helios, see chapter three.

There are other examples of statues that at one point or another were deemed to represent Sol, usually because they were radiate. But because Sol is not the only deity to emit divine light, rays alone can never be considered adequate grounds to identify a figure as Sol.

A2 Full statues, lost
We have literary references to a number of statues of Sol, ranging from Vespasian's transformation of Nero's Colossus to the various quadrigae solis on temples in Rome and elsewhere - not to mention the famous Hellenistic statue of Helios on Rhodes. The iconography of these statues is unknown and the selection of lost statues discussed below is not comprehensive.

The most famous sculptural depiction of Helios in a quadriga was the statue group by Lysippos set up by Rhodes either on Rhodes itself or in Delphi. As for Roman statues, there were quadrigae of Sol on the roof of the temple of Apollo Palatinus (A2a.1) and possibly on the roof of the temple of Sol in the Circus Maximus (A2a.2) as well as on the Lechaion gate at Corinth (A2a.3), to name a few. The tradition of placing statues on the roofs of temples is an Italic one, and if Ensoli (1995, 400) is right in her interpretation of the terracotta statue from Falerii Veteres (A1b.1), there is an early precedent for placing Sol on the roof of a temple in Civitì Castellana.23

Cult statues of Sol are attested for the temple of Elagabal at Emesa (A2b.3), in the temple of Helios at Isthmia (A2b2) and in the temple of Sol in Rome built by Aurelian (A2b.4), to name a few of the most important examples. Liciniius stipulated an annual burning of incense on November 18th for a cult statue of Sol according an inscription from Mahmudia in Romania, dating to ca. AD 320 (A2b.5).24 In other cases statues of Sol together with Luna are recorded in sanctuaries of other deities (A2c.1-3), as are statues of Sol in larger groups (A2e). At various locations statues of Sol as one of the planetary deities may be assumed (A2d).

As to the iconography of these quadrigae and statues, we have no clue. They serve to confirm, however, that statues of Sol were not overly rare, could be found throughout the Roman Empire, and could date to almost any period.

The Colossus of Nero
For a discussion of the Colossus of Nero, see chapter 6.

23 For an even earlier antefix with the Etruscan Usil, cf. LIMC Helios/Usil 14.

24 Cf. an inscription from Como recording the building of a templum solis - with cult statue? - by T. Flavius Postumius Titianus during the reign of Diocletian; AE 1914, 249; Degrassi 1944.
A2f Assimilations of the emperor with Sol

The religious status of the living emperor has been a longstanding subject of debate and controversy in Classical scholarship.²⁵ Often perceived as a symbol of divinity, the imperial radiate crown has played a significant role in this debate,²⁶ with those who see it as a divine symbol likely to see it as a solar symbol as well and hence as an iconographic characteristic which forges a connection between the emperor and Sol. From there it is a small step to postulating depictions of the emperor in the guise of Sol, i.e. not just radiate but with the full range of iconographic elements of Sol.

I see far less direct solar symbolism and assimilation with Sol in imperial iconography, in the first place because I believe the imperial crown was a real object with a set of primary meanings unconnected with Sol and (imperial) divinity (see chapter 6). That does not mean that I reject the notion that the emperor was a living divinity. That is a separate issue. Likewise I do not assume a priori that the emperor could not be depicted in the guise of Sol. The imperial radiate crown, with its prominent ribbons and carefully depicted reality, did not do so directly; but if Commodus could be portrayed as Hercules I see no intrinsic reason why some other emperor could not have had himself portrayed as Sol. There is, however, no firm evidence that this actually happened.

Nonetheless, we have evidence for a small number of statues, now lost, which many believe depicted the emperor in the guise of Sol. The most famous is no doubt the Colossal statue commissioned by Nero. Vespasian transformed this into a statue of Sol, and hence many conclude that it was originally intended to depict Nero in the guise of Sol. As I argue in chapter 6, this view misinterprets Nero’s radiate crown, and ignores everything else we know about the Colossus.

We can also leave aside the so-called statue of Caracalla-Sol in North Carolina, which appears to be neither Caracalla nor Sol.²⁷ There were, however, two statues of Constantine, one in Constantinople (A2f.1) and one in Termessus (A2f.2) which many believe assimilated the emperor to Sol.²⁸ As both statues are lost, it is obviously impossible to establish with absolute certainty whether, and if so how, this was done in iconographical terms, but as I will contend below, what evidence we have argues against it.

---
²⁶ Cf. in particular Bergmann 1998.
²⁸ On the statue in Termessus, see Tantillo 2003a. On the statue in Constantinople, cf. Tantillo 2003b, 1039-1045, Wallraff 2001, 133-4; Bergmann 1998, 284-7; Fowden 1991. On a second statue of Constantine in Constantinople, connected with the hippodrome and thought by some also to have depicted him in the guise of Sol, cf. Ch. 6. Various other statues have also been thought to have depicted Constantine as Sol, including a golden signum dei dedicated by the Senate to Constantine after his victory at the Milvian Bridge (Tantillo 2003b, 1004-9) of which no description survives, and a statua marmorea suo numine radians erected for Constantine in Leptis Magna between AD 324 and 326, which Tantillo (2003b) interprets as an over life-size statue of Constantine, radiate.
Equestrian statue of Constantine in Termessus

A widely quoted example of a statue of Constantine-Sol is one from Termessus, known to us only through its surviving inscription (A2f.2). A direct link to the Roman Sol is unlikely, as the statue was an equestrian one. Sol on horseback is not a recognized image type [sol]. Hence if the aim was to depict Constantine in the guise of Sol, the equestrian format was not a logical choice. On the other hand the inscription accompanying the lost statue can be read as mentioning Constantine and Helios as one: Κωνσταντίνει Σεβ(αςτ) / Ἡλί / Παντεπόπτε / δ μος (To Constantine Augustus, to the Sun All-seeing, the demos <dedicate this statue>). Fowden (1991, 129 n. 95) states that "since there was no room on the base for a statue of Helios as well, Constantine and Helios are unambiguously identified", but Tantillo (2003a) has shown that the inscription is not quite so straightforward. He has established that the first line (Κωνσταντίνει β[) was a later addition and that initially the inscription dedicated the statue simply to Helios Pantepoptês. A cult of Helios is attested in Termessus from at least the 2nd c. AD, and Tantillo believes that the statue was erected at that much earlier date. In his view the addition of the dative Κωνσταντίνει Σεβ(αςτ) marks a transformation of the statue Helios into one of Constantine-Helios after the defeat of Licinius, but how this was achieved iconographically remains unclear. Tantillo argues that the statue had always been an equestrian one, indicating that Helios Pantoptês was not the Graeco-Roman Helios/Sol but a Hellenized local sun god depicted on horseback. This is a reasonable supposition, although a closer examination of the base is needed to ascertain that the three connections of the horse’s hooves to the base are contemporary with the original inscription, rather than with the later reworking. But assuming that Helios Pantoptês was an equestrian sun god, what evidence do we have that the statue was reworked at all? The cryptic, asyndetic datives of the inscription imply, if anything, a double dedication, to Constantine and Helios Pantepoptês, a reading Tantillo rejects on the same grounds as Fowden (supra), namely that there is no room for statues of both Helios and Constantine. But this lack of room is puzzling only if the statue and full inscription were erected at the same time, under Constantine, as Fowden believed. Thanks to Tantillo we now know that the apparent contradiction between the (single) statue and the (double?) asyndetic dedication is the result of the later insertion of the first line “To Constantine Augustus”. Given these

29 An exception may be a small number of intaglios (cat. H12) and local coins depicting a radiate rider on horseback, but these appear to represent local deities, such as the Egyptian Souchos, the Anatolian Sozon, or Hosios kai Dikaios, rather than the Roman Sol. Cf Tantillo 2003a, 171-4, who sees more local “Helioi” in these scattered radiate horsemen than I do. The emperor can also be depicted radiate on horseback on local coinage, albeit rarely; Bergmann (1998, 280, cited by Tantillo) gives two examples, one from Aphrodisias (SNG von Aulock 6553, Bergmann 1998, pl. 54.3) and one from Tarsus (SNG von Aulock 6040-1, Bergmann 1998 pl. 54.4). On a mosaic in the museum of Sens, depicting the fall of Phaethon (cat. D4.1), the damaged figure on horseback in the foreground, mastering the stampeding chariot of the sun, is generally deemed to be Sol although this cannot be certain as the upper part of the mosaic is destroyed; cf. the same scene on the mould of an Aretine bowl in Boston (cat. F1b.1). Two inscriptions from Asia Minor mention statues of Helios “ ” (Inscr. von Pergamon II, nr 336 and IGR III, 296). We know nothing of their iconography.

30 Tantillo 2003a, 165-6, citing Taeger 1960, 471 and n. 603.
circumstances I see no reason to postulate that the statue itself was at this time changed into one that represented Constantine in the guise of Helios. I believe it to be much more likely that it continued to represent Helios Pantepoptes only, as it had since its erection many generations earlier, in the 2nd c. AD.

If we consider the crisis the Termessians faced in AD 324, we can imagine - speculatively of course - how the first line came to be added and what it was intended to mean. Licinius, whom Termessus had presumably dutifully supported against Constantine, had been defeated and like all supporters of the vanquished party Termessus must have feared the wrath of the victor, Constantine. In time-honoured fashion they hastened to seek appropriate forms of tribute to demonstrate their allegiance to their new emperor and to deflect his potential revenge. One area they could focus on was the fortuitous circumstance that an important deity of their city happened to be the sun, Constantine’s personal patron deity. One can imagine the rededication of this presumably important statue of their sun god to Constantine as one small move among many to emphasize this special bond with their new ruler. Where the inscription formerly had read “The demos <dedicate this statue> to Helios Panoptês”, the new, more ambiguous inscription should then probably be read as something like “the demos <dedicate this statue> for Helios Panoptês to Constantine Augustus”. Strictly speaking, one would have liked the dative Ἡλίου Παντεπόπτης to have been changed to an accusative, making this a typical votive offering pro salute imperatoris, but particularly if the statue itself had been left unchanged the sense would be clear to all local viewers in any case. One cannot suggest that in the eyes of the Termessians their venerable statue of Helios Panoptês, if left unchanged, had now suddenly come to represent Constantine in the guise of Helios through the addition of two words to the inscription.

In fact the slight opacity and ambiguity of the new text with its asyndetic datives was perhaps even preferable. From an aesthetic perspective the erasures needed to change the dative of Helios Panoptês to the more logical accusative would have marred the remarkably elegant lettering. More importantly, retention of the dative adds a hint of polysemy to the inscription which would otherwise be lost. There was a long tradition, particularly in the East, of acclaiming a (new) emperor as a "new sun" and the like. Of course such verbal imagery does not imply actual identification of the emperor with Sol (the "real" sun, so to say), and solar metaphors of this type were used widely not just in Roman imperial religious contexts, but also in Jewish and Christian ones. A Termessian reading the revised inscription could catch echoes of this imperial use of solar metaphors in speech without assuming for a moment that the (unchanged) statue of

---

32 Emphasizing a special religious bond with the ruler had good precedents, most famously in the case of Aphrodisias, that highlighted its venerable cult of Aphrodite in connection with the Julian claim of descent from Venus.

33 The original inscription is very neat and regular, and it is noteworthy that the stonemason took considerable care to use the same type and size of lettering when he inserted the new line; cf. Tantillo 2003a.

Helios was suddenly intended to visualize such a metaphor. Of course this whole discussion is highly speculative, but the contention that this statue depicted Constantine in the guise of Helios is even more so. We cannot categorically exclude the possibility that the equestrian statue was modified at the same time as the inscription, but there is no evidence that it was and the inscription, in my opinion, is both more subtle and more comprehensible if it was not. On the available evidence, then, there are no grounds to postulate that the statue represented Constantine as Helios.

**Radiate statue of Constantine in Constantinople**
This statue (A2f.1) is discussed fully in chapter six.

**A3. Heads/busts of Sol**
The catalogue lists twenty life-size or over life-size busts of Sol, of which nineteen are made of marble and one of limestone. In addition, one pair of busts - of Sol and Luna together - and one example of a lost bust or herm are included here. The list is certainly incomplete, and more problematically, almost certainly gives a somewhat skewed impression of the nature and iconography of busts of Sol. The problem is that such busts are among the more difficult representations of Sol to recognize with certainty.

**Identification**
The issue is straightforward. Reducing the image type [sol] to a bust obviously limits the scope for identifying attributes, particularly in the case of sculpture in the round. Basically, the only available identifying characteristics are clean-shaven youth, longish hair, and rays (with or without nimbus), but none of these are sufficient to identify a bust conclusively as Sol (as we have seen in chapter three, this is even the case with rays). Common sense suggests that the one remaining characteristic attribute of Sol - rays - does gain additional significance under these circumstances, making it likely that in the eyes of a Roman viewer the default identity of a bust of a beardless youth with longish wavy hair and rays would be Sol. But rays are not indispensable. There are examples of busts without any visible trace of rays which almost certainly represented Sol in view of their find context, and there are busts with rays that are clearly portraits, not Sol.

To begin with the former: a bust from a Mithraeum depicting a beardless, bare-headed youth is likely to depict Sol, even if it lacks rays. Context, therefore, can have been a decisive factor for a Roman viewer in identifying such busts, and that leaves us empty-handed when dealing with the numerous busts of unknown provenance depicting idealized youths with long wavy hair which in the right context - a mithraeum or among the planetary deities for instance - could have been Sol but now remain anonymous.

On the other hand, the (presumed) presence of rays does not resolve the question. In most

---

35 In the case of two-dimensional representations, it is still fairly easy to include, for instance, a whip behind Sol’s shoulder (cf. e.g. cat. E3.1, E3.2).

cases only holes have survived, and we cannot be certain what was fastened onto the head with these holes.\textsuperscript{37} We cannot exclude the possibility that they served to fasten some other object such as a metal wreath, perhaps, or something more elaborate covering the head (cf. \textit{infra} on cat. A3.6). But even if it is safe to assume that in most cases the holes held rays, this still leaves us with a number of radiate portrait busts which clearly depict a human individual rather than Sol.\textsuperscript{38} The number such busts is small, but it may well be that other portrait busts were crowned in antiquity with removable bronze wreaths with rays, now lost. The five examples of radiate portrait busts quoted here (\textit{supra} n. 38) have in common that the rays do not emerge directly from the head, but are fastened into a clearly articulated thick band encircling the head just above the ears. This emphasizes the physical reality of the depicted object with its spiky “rays”, as opposed to the intangibility of light emanating directly from the head. Together with the distinct portrait features, this physical reality of their radiate “crown” clearly sets these busts apart from busts of Sol in the sense that they depict the portrayed person not “as Sol” but as radiate “in a manner different from Sol”.

Before we can leave the problem of identifying radiate busts as Sol or not there is one final issue, that of the Alexander-like traits in images of Sol. I have dealt with this at some length in chapter three. In summary, the issue is one of context, compounded by the sometimes flimsy grounds on which a bust is identified as a “portrait” of Alexander. As far as I know, there are no radiate Alexander-like busts which are beyond doubt portraits of Alexander. On the other hand, there are cases of Alexander-like busts from Mithraea which some have deemed portraits of Alexander despite their provenance. In my opinion, context in these cases weighs far more heavily than any more or less generic, Alexander-like features of fiery youth, and these busts should therefore simply be identified as Sol. With no Alexander-like busts that are undisputedly Alexander, and a number that are undisputedly just Sol, the whole notion of Alexander-Helios appears to lack sufficient supporting evidence, and I suggest that all radiate Alexander-like busts be identified simply as Sol.

That leaves us with a number of non-radiate busts with generic Alexander-like features that are of the same type as radiate busts which I would identify simply as Sol (cf. cat. A3.1 and A3.6). Parallels support this. On Hellenistic Rhodian coinage, Helios was commonly depicted without rays and with Alexander-like features.\textsuperscript{39} Mithraea have yielded non-radiate images of Sol.\textsuperscript{40} In general, rays are not a \textit{conditio sine qua non} for depictions of Sol. In short, it is less problematic to postulate that in such cases the non radiate bust is simply Sol than that the radiate one must be Alexander. This opens the possibility that various non-radiate busts with generic

\textsuperscript{37} In only two cases the actual rays - of marble rather than bronze - have survived.

\textsuperscript{38} Clear portraits - with holes for rays - include a bust (of a priest of Sol?) of the early 3rd c. AD in Paris (Louvre Ma 4710), a bust of Severus Alexander in the Museum of Costanza (Bergmann 1998, 280-1 pl. 55.2), a bust of Gordian III in Florence, Palazzo Medici-Riccardi Inv. GFN 16340 (Bergmann 1998, 279 pl. 55.1), and a bust of Gallienus in Copenhagen (Bergmann 1998, 281 pl. 55.3). Cf. also cat. A3.5.

\textsuperscript{39} LIMC Helios 182-6.

\textsuperscript{40} Cat. A3.8
Alexander-like features depicted Sol rather than Alexander, but cannot now be securely identified because their intended context has been lost and we have no radiate counterparts of the same type.\footnote{ Cf., e.g., the comments at the end of cat. C2c.22.} It is possible, perhaps even likely, therefore that non radiate busts of Sol were more common in antiquity than our catalogue implies.\footnote{ Besides being iconographically acceptable, non-radiate busts may also have had practical advantages. Sculpture was prone to vandalism in antiquity, as the many hacked off noses attest, and the relatively flimsy bronze spikes of radiate busts must have formed an especially tempting target. If the bust were set up in the open air, the bronze spikes would also soon disfigure the marble with green trails of corrosion.} 

As a rule of thumb, then, all busts of more or less idealized youths with holes for rays emanating directly from the head, or from a nimbus fastened to the head, were busts of Sol, irrespective of Alexander-like traits such as the\textit{ anastole}, tilted head, upward gaze, and/or slightly opened mouth. Non-radiate busts of this type may well have depicted Sol, with context providing the decisive factor for secure identification. Radiate portrait busts are not Sol, provided the rays emerge from a band around the head, rather than the head itself. We must bear in mind that in all cases context was an important factor and made it far easier for the ancient viewer to correctly identify these busts than it is for us.

**Discussion**

Of the busts listed in this section of the catalogue, only ten are also included in the LIMC (either sub Helios or sub Helios/Sol). Yet the list offered here is by no means exhaustive. All busts meet the criteria given above, and most can be identified as Helios/Sol with reasonable certainty. Two busts have a nimbus with holes for rays (cat. A3.2 & A3.11), two have triangular stone rays (cat. A3.17 & A3.19), two have no rays (A3.1 & A3.8) and the rest have holes for rays drilled directly into the head.

Krug (1969) argues that the Venetian Sol with elaborate radiate nimbus (cat. A3.2) actually represents Mithridates VI in an iconography assimilating him to Alexander-Helios.\footnote{ She cites the Lazzeroni-Sol in Schloss Fasanerie (A3.16) as a prime example of the latter - a bust which I consider one of the most securely identified as Sol in view of the four horses and chariot.} I agree with Smith that Krug's evidence is too weak and that this bust is simply Sol.\footnote{ Smith 1988, 182 C8.} Of the two non-radiate busts the one from Ostia (A3.8) is identified as Sol by its Mithraic context. Becatti believes that some sort of headdress such as a Phrygian cap may have broken off,\footnote{ Becatti, Ostia II, 56.} but there is no clear evidence for this and hence I agree with the LIMC that this is simply Sol.\footnote{ This is not the only example of Sol without rays in a Mithraic context. Cf., e.g., the magnificent opus sectile depiction of Sol from the Mithraeum of Santa Prisca (cat. D5.4).} The other non-radiate bust, in Boston (A3.1) is so closely similar to the Capitoline Sol (A3.6) that the two are often deemed to be copies of the same original. If we accept the Capitoline bust as Sol, it then
seems reasonable to assume the same identity for the Boston bust. It is important to note, however, that the Boston bust was originally placed on a draped statue. As it comes from Ptolemais Hermiou, a site which yielded three replicas of the Alexander Aigiochos-type, Stewart (1993, 334) tentatively suggests that the Boston-head may have stood atop a statue of this type. The Capitoline head, of which the bust below the base of the neck is modern, was also originally part of a statue, which means that we have no certainty concerning its identity either. To conclude that this statue represented the deified, radiate Alexander, is premature, if only because the extra hole in the crown of the head, and the lack of detail on the back of the head, imply that the eight holes may have served to fasten something more elaborate than rays. We can speculate endlessly (and fruitlessly) on the various possibilities, but in the final analysis can conclude only that the two statues, now lost, which were crowned by these heads, would with their attributes have clinched their identity. Lacking those statues, we cannot on our present knowledge identify these busts with certainty either as Helios, Alexander, or any other figure.

Another "Alexander-Helios" (A3.12), found in the Agora in Athens, and originally described by Shear (1971) as an Alexander, is now widely accepted to be a Helios/Sol. Frantz (1988, 37) very tentatively links this bust, which she believes was salvaged by its later owners from the Herulian rubble, with a bust of Luna discovered in the vicinity. Both, she feels, may have come from a Mithraeum destroyed by the Herulians.

Finally, there is the much weathered bust of the late first or early second c. AD found in the Villa of Maxentius at Rome (cat. A3.5), which has holes (for rays?) set directly in its head, but with its short hair and gaunt appearance is more like a portrait than a bust of Sol. Its poor preservation may be the distorting factor here, and makes it impossible to arrive at any firm conclusions about this bust.

Conclusions
Statues and busts adhering to the norms of the basic image types [sol] occurred throughout the Roman Empire in sufficient numbers to be readily recognizable, but they were not common. Known and implicit contexts range from the religious (Mithraea) to the symbolic or decorative (Septizonia, villas), but in most cases the context is no longer known. As far as we can ascertain, the iconographic rules, as set out in chapter 3, were carefully observed, although in the case of busts in particular, context could play an important added role in fixing the identity. Another problem is that none of the statues have been preserved intact, making it almost impossible to identify them with absolute certainty. With the exception of Nero’s colossus and statues of regional or local solar divinities, however, there are no statues which must be identified as Sol but which diverge from the iconographic norms for depicting the Roman sun god.

---

47 Ensoli 1995, 401. Her suggestion, quoting P. Moreno, that the Capitoline bust derives from the same original as the Civita Castellana statue in the Villa Giulia (Ensoli 1995, 400) seems to me speculative at best.

48 Ensoli (1995, 400) suggests that the extra hole held a nimbus in place behind the rays. This is possible, but the evidence is by no means conclusive. Cf. B4b.1.

49 Nielsen 1993, 140; Frantz 1988, 37, 41; LIMC Helios 175.
B. Small free-standing sculpture

In this section I have gathered free-standing statuettes of Sol that must have stood on a fairly high support such as a shelf, a ledge or low wall, a table, a niche, or the like to engage the viewer. Most statuettes are quite small (ca. 0.10-0.20 m. high), but a few are larger (ca. 0.40 - 0.60 m). The category is rather imprecise, because often the original function or usage of a “statuette” can no longer be determined. A number of objects gathered here may actually have been appliques, i.e. decorative elements of some larger object such as a vessel or container, a piece of furniture, a cart or chariot, and the like (cf. e.g. B1.5). This is particularly the case with heads or busts, although these can also have belonged to statuettes.

Most statuettes of Sol are made of bronze, but the list also includes statuettes of marble, steatite, terracotta, red sandstone, and silver-plated bronze or gilded silver.\(^\text{50}\)

### B. Small free-standing sculpture


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paris, Cab. Med. 114. Chalon-sur-Saône.</td>
<td>Bronze. 1st-2nd c. AD (Kaufmann-Heinimann). Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (7 rays), right hand raised, whip in left hand. LIMC Helios/Sol 115; Reinach RépStat 1, 238; Babelon-Blanchet (1895), 114; Kaufmann-Heinimann 1998, 250; Matern 2002, 102-3, 161 n. 901, 162, 172, 236-7 18, fig. 38. The statuette was found together with a number of others, all dated to the 1st or 2nd c. AD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boston MFA 1996.3. Asia Minor (formerly in the collection of a Greek refugee family from Smyrna, living in England).</td>
<td>Bronze. Antonine. Sol, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (only one ray survives), right hand raised, his left hand held an object, lost, possibly a whip. Unpublished. Reportedly found together with statuettes of Hygieia, Aesculapius, and Isis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Art Market. Unknown.</td>
<td>Bronze. 2nd c. AD. Upper part of a statuette (?) of Sol, wearing a chiton and chlamys, r. hand raised, globe in left hand, 7 rays. Matern 2002, 239 148, fig 55.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{50}\) Gilded silver: B1.6; marble: B1.21, B4b.1; steatite: B2.1; terracotta: B2.8; Bronze and silver: B2.12, B2.13; red sandstone: B3.1.
Statuette of Sol, radiate (five holes survive, rays lost), nude but for a chlamys, r. arm raised, globe in l. Inscription: Nvm(ini) Avg(usti) rat(iarii) / Ebvrod(enses) frat(res)?... 
Found in depot 1 in section B below a house of the 3rd c. AD, used as a potter’s workshop in the 4th c. AD. The relationship of deposits 1 and 2 (close together, but distinct) to these buildings is not clear, making it difficult to give a firm date of deposit (depot 2 contains coins, giving a terminus post quem in the latter part of the 3rd c. AD; depot 1 contained no coins).

-7. Pl. 7.5
Paris, Louvre BR 1059
Montdidier
Bronze
2nd-3rd c. AD
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (7 rays of which one lost), right hand raised, left hand with attribute lost.
LIMC Helios/Sol 115; F. Braemer, in: Altherr-Charon et al. 1979, 37 n. 64 pl. 13,15 (with references, date); Matern 2002, 103, 131 n. 702, 161, 232 I9, fig. 39.

-8. Unknown.
Saint Jean d’Acre.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD
Sol standing, nude, radiate (12 rays), right hand raised, globe in left hand.
LIMC Helios/Sol 117; Reinach RepStat III 30.7; Matern 2002, 110, 173 n. 953, 237 I35 (on p. 325 she mistakenly lists the provenance of this piece as unknown), fig. 51.

-9. Pl. 7.6
Geneva, Mus.
Sainte-Colombe-les-Vienne (Rhône).
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (7 rays), right hand raised, left hand holding a whip of which the rope hangs down by his hip.

LIMC Helios/Sol 116; F. Braemer, L’Art dans l’Occident romain (1963), 57 nr. 224 pl. 20; Matern 2002, 109, 172, 236 I31, fig. 48.

-10. Pl. 8.1
London, BM GR 1865.0712.17.
Rhodes.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (5 rays of which one lost), right hand raised (? broken just above the elbow), attribute in left hand lost.
LIMC Helios/Sol 117; Walters BM Bronzes 1015, pl. 28; Matern 2002, 102, 131 n. 702, 160, 173 n. 953, 231 I4, fig. 35.

-11. Pl. 8.2
Lost.
Bulgaria.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (7 rays), globe in right hand, whip in left hand.
LIMC Helios/Sol 117; RA 1923, 26; Matern 2002, 90, 227 G14, fig. 25.
Found together with a statuette of Luna.

-12. Pl. 8.3
Antakya, Hatay mus. 15346.
Antakya.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol, radiate (5 rays), nude but for a chlamys (unfastened, hanging over left shoulder), right hand raised.
Matern 2002, 103, 230 I1, fig. 31.

Unknown.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (7 rays), right hand raised, object in his left hand is probably a whip.
LIMC Helios/Sol 116; Reinach RépStat II, 110,4; Matern 2002, 109, 237 I34 fig. 50.

Unknown.
Bronze. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Statuette of Sol, radiate (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, r. arm raised, globe in l. hand. Matern 2002, 103, 231 I6, fig. 36.

-15. Pl. 8.4
Paris, Cab. Med. 113. Unknown. Bronze. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (7 rays), right hand raised, attribute in left hand (whip?) lost. LIMC Helios/Sol 115; Reimach RépStat I, 238.8; Babelon-Blanchet (1895), 113; Matern 2002, 109, 161 n. 899, 172, 237 I33.


-17. Unknown, formerly Forman collection. Unknown. Bronze. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Sol standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (5 rays), right hand raised, left hand outstretched, palm upwards, attribute lost. The right hand may have held some iron or metal object, the remains of which are oxidized against the palm. LIMC Helios/Sol 115; Smith 1899, 17 nr. 104; Reimach, RépStat III 30.1; Bergmann 1998, 75-6 pl. 13.3; Matern 2002, 104-5, 232 I10, fig. 41; Vasilieva 2004, 152.


Unknown. Bronze. 2nd-early 3rd c. AD. Statuette of Sol, radiate (only 1 ray remains), nude but for a chlamys, r. hand raised, left hand probably held a whip. Matern 2002, 102, 107, 148, 231 17, fig. 37.


-21. Pl. 8.5
Leiden, RMO 1884. Laodicea. Marble. Undated. Statuette of Sol, radiate nimbus, dressed in chiton and chlamys, sceptre or whip in l. hand, r. arm largely missing. Matern 2002, 87 n. 519, 98, 177 n. 772, 229 G28, fig. 27.


-23. Deva, Mus. Sarmizegetusa, Mithraeum. Marble. Late 2nd c. AD. Upper part of a statuette of Sol, radiate nimbus (7 rays), chlamys. LIMC Helios/Sol 31; CIMRM II, 2132 fig. 578.

B2. Busts, with or without chlamys

-1. Pl. 8.6


8. Vienna, Limeskommission.


10. Pl. 9.5 Paris, Cab. Med. 117 Rimat, near Saïda, Syria. Bronze. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Bust of Sol, radiate slightly turned to the left, "wreath coiffure" of carefully arranged locks and curls, upward gaze, chlamys. F. Lajard, ArchAnz, 1851, 50-51; Babelon-Blanchet p. 54 nr. 117; Matern 2002, 182, 249 B 33. Found in 1849 together with a Kriophoros (Cab. Med. 450) and an applique (cat. K1.6) in a small, vaulted room of about 1m x 1.5 m.


-14. Pl. 9.2
Székesfehérvár, Mus. 69.350.
Gorsium (Tac).
bronze.
3rd c. AD.
Small bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys.

-15. Pl. 9.3
Unknown.
bronze.
3rd c. AD.
Highly corroded head of Sol, wreath coiffure, radiate (9? rays, of which one missing and most damaged). Either a bust or a fragment of a statuette.
LIMC Helios/Sol 16 (with ref.).

-16. Lost.
Strasbourg.
Bronze?
3rd c. AD.
Bust of Sol, radiate, 5 rays.

Ehl (?)
bronze.
Undated.
Head of Sol, radiate (5 rays).
Matern 2002, 248 B30 (with ref.).

-18. Pl. 14.3
Naples, Mus. Naz. 5110.
Unknown.
bronze.
Undated.
Bust of Sol, radiate, 7 rays.
Matern 2002, 172, 182, 248-9 B31 fig. 70.

Unknown (formerly in Thiersch collection, acquired by the museum in 1860).
bronze.
Undated.
Bust of Sol, radiate, emerging from leaves.
LIMC Helios/Sol 66; Schumacher 1890, nr. 280.

Unknown.
bronze.
Undated.
No description available.
LIMC Helios/Sol 66 (without ref.).

Unknown.
bronze.
Undated.
No description available.
LIMC Helios/Sol 66 (without ref.).

-22. Vienna.
Unknown.
bronze.
Undated.
Bust of Sol (applique), radiate (9 rays), long wavy hair, chlamys.
Sacken 1871, 77 pl. 36.6.

Unknown.
bronze.
Modern?
Head of Sol, long wavy hair, 5 or 7 rays.
Froehner 1885, 196-7 nr. 946.

B3. Sol with quadriga.

-1. Pl. 9.4
Bad Homburg, Saalburg Mus.
Stockstadt, Mithraeum I.
Red sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol, nude but for a chlamys, in a quadriga. Head and arms of Sol lost.
LIMC Helios/Sol 123; CIMRM II, 1174; Matern 2002, 214 Q39.
Identification as Sol likely, given the Mithraic context.

B4. Identification uncertain.
B4a. Standing, full-figure.

Boscoreale.
bronze.
Early 1st c. AD.
Standing male figure, nude but for a chlamys draped loosely over the shoulders and the left arm, right hand lowered and holding an unclear object, and likewise some object (sword?), now lost, in lowered left hand;
wreath coiffure, radiant (?), and a smooth, peaked cap on the back of the head behind the “rays”.
LIMC Helios/Sol 114 (Sol, placing the statuette mistakenly in New York MMA); Hill 1949, 29 nr. 51, pl. 5.
Found in a lararium together with two statuettes of Jupiter, one of Mercury, and one of Isis-Fortuna.
The “rays” of the “radiate crown” are exceptionally thick. Notably the central “ray” must be interpreted as a support of something - a star perhaps, above the head - for it cannot be a ray. This suggests that the other, broad “rays” may be the leaves of a wreath. Combined with the peaked cap, the unfastened chlamys, the unidentified object in the left hand, and the general posture of this figure these elements all suggest that this is not Sol. Too many attributes are broken off to allow a secure alternative identification, but possibly he is one of the Dioscuri.

Alba Julia/Apulum (Dacia).
Bronze.
Antonine.
Sol (?), nude (no chlamys), right hand raised, left hand outstretched, palm upward to support an object (globe?) now lost, no rays nor trace of rays. Incription: M(arcus) Aurel(ius) Sila a/ctar(ius) eq(uitum) / sing(ularium) pro se et suos v(otum) s(olvit).
Identified as Sol by Matern on the basis of the raised right hand and the assumption that the lost attribute was a globe.

-3 Sion (Switzerland), Mus. Arch. 653.
Muraz/Anchettes.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Two appliques, found together, being all that remain of the seven gods of the week? Venus and Sol. Sol nude but for a chlamys, standing on a globe, right hand raised to his head, whip (reported, but not visible to me on the photographs at my disposal) in his left hand; curly hair surmounted by a radiate nimbus(?).
LIMC Helios/Sol 290 (ref.).
The context may suggest that this figure is Sol, but the strange headdress has no direct parallels.

-4 Art Market.
Unknown.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol (?), nude but for a bit of cloth hanging over his left shoulder, right hand raised with elbow at right angle, left arm lost, 5 holes (for rays?) in his head.
Matern 2002, 232 111, fig. 42.

-5. Pl. 10.1
Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 10151.
Tommerby, Jutland.
Bronze.
Ca. AD 500 (Poulsen 1993); late 4th c. (Bergmann); early 4th c. (Calza).
Large statuette of a beardless man, dressed in high-girt chiton and chlamys, radiate (12 rays) with a central jewel above the forehead, right hand raised (hand missing), left hand outstretched (missing). The statue presumably stood in a chariot. Identification as Constantine in the guise of Sol (LIMC) rejected by Bergmann; Poulsen (1993) suggests Theoderic.

B4b. Bust.
-1 Caracal, coll. Ilie Constantinescu.
Romula.
White marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Head of Sol(?), long wavy hair, 5 holes for rays(?). The back of the head, spherical, unworked, was presumably covered by some (metal?) object.
Berciu & Petolescu 1976, 43 nr. 31, pl. xix-xx.
Identification as Sol not certain, as this hinges on the missing headdress: radiate nimbus (=Sol), conical cap (=Dioscuri), Persian cap (=Mithras)?

-2. Pl. 10.2
Boston, MFA 1964.316.
Bought in Jerusalem.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Head of a statuette; long curly hair, radiate crown, uraeus.
LIMC Helios/Sol 15; Comstock & Vermeule 1971, 99 nr. 105; Matern 2002, 182, 248
B24.

B5. Lost, iconography unknown.
Brass.
Undated.
Small plaque for the base of a statuette, with inscription: Deo Invicto / typvm avrochalcinvm / solis.

Identification
The iconography of the securely identified full figure statuettes in this section invariably follows the established norms: Sol is radiate (usually 7 rays) and usually nude but for a chlamys although sometimes he wears a chiton. He is normally depicted with a raised right hand and an attribute (whip or globe, but often lost) in his left hand. In two cases (B1.11, B1.20), Sol has a globe in his (lowered) right hand. The busts adhere to the same iconography. In the case of the sandstone statuette from Stockstadt (B3.1) Sol is depicted as a charioteer, nude except for his chlamys, driving a four-horse chariot.

In the past, some statuettes have been identified as Sol on dubious grounds. These do not follow the iconographic criteria for the basic image types [sol], and in that sense do not belong here. I have nonetheless included a few to serve as examples of the problems that arise when the iconographic criteria for images of Sol are not fully taken into account.

Two statuettes (B4a.2, B4a.4), in Hannover and a private collection respectively, are problematic because they lack a chlamys. Both have a raised right hand, although the sharply bent elbow of B4a.4 is strange for Sol. Any attribute they held in their left hand has been lost. In the case of B4a.4 a number of small holes in the head may have held rays. If that was the case, and if the missing attribute was a globe or whip, this statuette could be identified as Sol even without a chlamys. There is no trace of any rays on the head of the large statuette in Hannover. As it is, the lack of Sol’s standard garment and the loss or absence of any other identifying characteristics means that the identity of these statuettes cannot be securely established.

A head found in Romula (B4b.1), which may or may not have belonged to a fairly large statuette, represents a beardless male with long hair in a wreath-coiffure and five evenly spaced holes which may have held rays. The back of the head is worked down to half a sphere, apparently so that it could be covered by something else. Tudor assumed that is was a metal nimbus, but there are various other possibilities such as the conical cap of the Dioscuri or the

---

51 Quoted by Berciu & Petolescu 1976, 43 n. 31.
Parthian cap of Mithras. Without certainty about the nature of the (metal) covering of the head, its identity must remain open.

The bust in Boston (B4b.2) most likely does not depict Sol. The many-pointed crown is not really radiate, and it has no parallels in depictions of Sol. The prominent uraeus on the front of the crown confirms that this is a very different type of head-dress. Given that this head was originally part of a statuette, we can assume that further iconographic characteristics may have helped identify this as a very different figure from Sol.

Of the other uncertain statuettes, the Copenhagen statuette (B4a.5), discovered in Denmark in the 19th century, is an enigma. How this statuette, according to some a posthumous portrait of Constantine with radiate crown and jewel, ended up in Jutland is difficult enough to explain (Viking contacts with Byzantium?). The iconography itself is also hard to understand. Stutzinger believes that the statuette is a copy or adaptation of a famous statue of Constantine, but the original can certainly not have been the statue on the porphyry column in Constantinople (cf. cat. A2f.1), as Stutzinger, quoting Mackenprang, believes. There was definitely no space for a quadriga on that column, and there can be little doubt that the Copenhagen-statuette was a quadrigatus. Poulsen's (1993) suggestion, that the statue represents Theoderic in the guise of (a famous statue of) Constantine is interesting, but as Poulsen himself points out it is no more than an hypothesis and one that requires a rather later date for the statuette than it is generally given. Bergmann argues that the statuette is simply a late 4th or early 5th c. AD representation of Sol. She sees no clear portrait features and explains the straight hair as a late antique, stylized rendition of Sol’s long hair, pointing out that it is markedly longer than the hair of the 4th c. emperors. Bergmann also points out that there are no parallels or precedents for depicting the emperor in the clothing of a charioteer. On the other hand she acknowledges that there are also no parallels for Sol with a jewel on the front of his radiate crown. In short, there is no consensus on this statue, and all we can conclude, then, as far as this study is concerned, is that we have here a late statue, possibly a portrait of a ruler, in an iconography that reminds one of Sol. But bearing in mind that both hands (with a wide range of potential attributes) are missing, it seems best not to make too much of this.

52 Spätantike 507-8 nr. 114
53 Bergmann 1998, 287-9; Wallraff (2001, 134 n. 41) feels that the statuette does not need to be the emperor or Sol, but does not explicitly address Bergmann’s reservations about an imperial identity of the statuette.

54 Some have suggested that this statuette is a copy of a statue that was paraded in the hippodrome of Constantinople at the opening of the chariot races. There is no evidence to support this, and good reason to doubt any connection. We know little with certainty about this statue, apparently made of gilded wood. Our sources provide quite confusing information, identifying it alternately as Constantine, Helios, and a female charioteer (full sources in Preger 1901, 166-9). It stood on a chariot and, depending on the source, bore a “Tyche” or a “running statuette”. Given that the Tyche of Constantinople was depicted seated on a throne, Preger suggests that the statuette was actually a Nike rather than Tyche, although the sources that identify the statuette at all are unanimous in identifying it as the latter. Preger concludes that the statue depicted Constantine in the long chiton of Sol (that long garment leading to it later being mistaken for a woman), bearing a running Nike. This is ingenious, but as Bergmann points out (supra n. 73) emperors were not depicted in the garb of charioteers. Iconographically a statue of Constantine in a long chiton as charioteer on a chariot and bearing a Tyche or Nike would be quite bizarre, and to postulate an iconographically unparalleled statue simply to make sense of clearly confused sources is not sound.
The statuette in Sion (B4a.3) is strange, and I hesitate to designate it as Sol, as the gesture towards the head by the right hand has no parallel, I cannot make out the whip he is reported to hold in his left hand, and the strange "radiate nimbus" to my mind most resembles the feather headdress of native Americans. Be that as it may, the suggestion that this statuette/applique and the statuette of Venus with which it was found are two of the seven planetary gods is not without merit, and in such a context it would not be difficult to recognize Sol in this strange figure. With five of the seven lost, however, this suggestion remains to be proven.

The statuette from Boscoreale (B4a.1), identified to as Sol by the LIMC and as Alexander-Helios by the Walters Art Museum, is almost certainly not Sol (nor Alexander). It is much more likely to be a Dioscure as Hill (1949, 29 nr. 51) suggests.

Discussion
Unfortunately very little is known of the find contexts of most statuettes of Sol. It seems certain that the typum Solis (B5.1) stood somewhere in Augst, but the inscribed bronze plate of its base was discovered in the 1850s on the pole of a farmers cart to which it had been nailed. Likewise very little is known of the vaulted, underground room in Rimat, Syria, where a bust of Sol, an applique of Sol and a statuette of a Criophorus were discovered in 1847 (B2.10, K1.6). The Ordona statuette (B1.5) was found in the courtyard of the villa, its stratification not fully clear, and its context suggesting that it is more of a stray find than that we should take it as an indication that some object or monument stood in the courtyard with which this statuette was connected. The bust from Carnuntum (B2.8) is, unfortunately, an illegal, stray find. Thus only the rather anomalous chariot from Mithraeum 7 in Stockstadt comes from a clearly registered, but hardly revealing, context. Thus all that really emerges from the known provenances is that statuettes and small busts of Sol occur in most parts of the empire, ranging from Syria, Rhodes and Bulgaria to Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Germany and France.

Matern devotes a significant section of her study to the bronze statuettes of Sol with a raised right hand, a schema which she terms the “invictus” type. Among these she recognizes a main type and a subordinate type, and she contends that the similarities among the statuettes of the main type are so striking that they must depend on a single original. That original, she

methodology. Alternatively one could, with equal lack of evidence but perhaps greater probability, suggest the following: 1. Under Constantine, a statue of Sol - patron deity of the circus - was a prominent part of the opening parade at circus games, as it was in Rome. 2. At some point - sooner rather than later - the statue of Sol was dropped from the parade. 3. At the time of Malalas (Preger 1901, 466), a gilded wooden statue of Constantine bearing a Tyche was driven around the hippodrome in a ceremony that Malalas believed dated back to the time of Constantine. 4. At the time of our later sources (Preger 1901, 467-8) this statue was also no longer paraded and, in a somewhat garbled and conflated form, the two Constantinian traditions (the parading of a statue of Sol and of a gilded wooden statue of Constantine) had become attached to at least one, but probably more than one ancient statue in Constantinople (the female charioteer reportedly stood in the Neolaia, the statue of Helios on the Milion). As a hypothesis this is no more amenable to proof than Preger’s unparallelled statue of Constantine in Sol’s chitom and our sources are too confused and unreliable to allow any firm conclusions. Under these circumstances, any attempt to link the statue in Copenhagen to this (which?) lost statue in Constantinople inevitably leads to circular arguments.

55 Roth 1860, 85-6.
believes, may have been none other than the Colossus of Rhodes. Intriguing though this hypothesis is, the evidence for it is too meagre. Matern bases her argument primarily on what she considers to be the “erstaunlich wenige Abweichungen beim Standmotiv, der Armhaltung oder der Blickrichtung”, but to my mind these are not nearly as striking as Matern would have it. In the 12 statuettes of her “main type” the direction of the gaze varies between left (e.g. B1.2, B1.19), straight ahead (e.g. B1.17, B1.18), and right (e.g. B4a.4), and can be down (e.g. B1.14, B1.19), level (e.g. B1.15, B1.17), or up (B1.7); the hand can be raised to shoulder height with the palm horizontal, facing down (e.g. B1.18, B1.19), or with the fingers as high as the crown of the head and the palm vertical, facing outwards (e.g. B1.7), and with a nearly straight arm (e.g. B1.2) or with an elbow bent to a right angle (e.g. B1.7). All these statuettes have a certain contrapost with the same standbein and spielbein (reversed in Matern’s subordinate type), but that is hardly remarkable. In short, I would argue that what Matern regards as an astonishing lack of variation is nothing more than the result of artists’ adherence to the clear iconographic norms for the depiction of Sol. The wide variation of depictions of Sol within the established iconographic limits makes it unlikely that the artists producing these images were dependent on an actual statue or image as the dominant prototype. Nonetheless, Matern assumes such a prototype, which she dates to the late 4th or early 3rd c. BC by postulating a terminus post quem based on the coiffure and contrapost of the Roman statuettes, and a terminus ante quem deduced from their lack of torsion. Her conclusion that the prototype must be the colossus of Rhodes follows almost inevitably from the fact that we do not have any Greek images of Sol as a standing figure except, probably, that colossus. But Matern’s method of “dating” the postulated prototype is far too speculative, and disregards the general Roman artistic practice in the depiction of idealized nude youths, drawing on precisely those elements that Matern refers to (long unruly hair, powerful gaze, dynamic contrapost) as generic elements of Rome’s visual repertoire, to be deployed as appropriate. It is true that such elements had been inherited from Greek art, where they had first been developed, but in the Roman era they were widely used independently from specific Greek examples.

It is unfortunate that we know so little about the provenance of most statuettes. Some were definitely religious in function, but we cannot postulate that for all statuettes. Some may have been used for decorative or symbolic purposes.

---

57 Matern 2002, 147.
58 Matern assigns B1.1, B1.6-7, B1.10, B1.12, B1.14, B1.17-19, B4a.2, and B4a.4 to her “main type”, to which we can add B1.2.
59 The contrapost, according to Matern (2002, 148), is Polykleitan, i.e. in line with the principles of the second half of the fourth c. AD.
C. Reliefs
This extensive section is divided into five main parts: architectural reliefs (C1), votive reliefs and other religious reliefs (C2), funerary reliefs (C3), reliefs with another or an unknown function (C4) and reliefs on which the identity of Sol is doubtful (C5).

“Reliefs” do not form a clearly defined or definable category. Statues, such as the Augustus of Primaporta, can be decorated with scenes in relief on their breastplate for instance, and there are numerous small objects with relief decoration. These are not discussed here, but separately. The distinctions between the types of reliefs gathered here and those grouped in other sections are primarily pragmatic. In some cases a different aspect of the object formed the basis for the category. Lamps, for example, are collected under the rubric “lamps” rather than here under reliefs, notwithstanding their relief decorations. In other cases the reliefs decorate an element or aspect of an object that would normally not be considered a “relief”. The Augustus of Primaporta is a statue, but the image that interests us is a decorative element of his breastplate. Hence the object is catalogued as decorated breastplate in section K2a. Section C is devoted to a wide range of objects that are solely or predominantly decorated in relief.

C1. Architectural reliefs
Under architectural reliefs I have gathered reliefs that formed decorative elements of buildings or arches. The section is subdivided into: Pediments (C1a), Metopes (C1b), Architraves (C1c), Captals (C1d), Triumphal Arches (C1e), and Other/unknown (C1f).

C. Reliefs.
C1. Architectural reliefs.
C1a. Pediments.

-1. Pl. 10.3
Delos, Iseum (Temple I of the Serapeum).
In situ.
Marble.
130 BC.
In the centre of the tympanum: frontal bust of Sol, heavily damaged, identification uncertain.
LIMC Helios 297 (with ref.).

-2. Pl. 11.1
Rome, Museo Capitolino 2977.
Rome (?); acquired in the 18th c. from a marble-dealer near the Capitoline.
Marble.
Mid 1st c. AD.
Tympanum of a small shrine (original width slightly more than 1 m.). In the centre Dea Caelestis riding side-saddle on the back of a lion; she is flanked in the corners by Luna (right, lost) and Sol (left), emerging, waste upwards, with his quadriga, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, possibly a whip in his right hand.
LIMC Helios/Sol 353 (with ref.); Hommel 1954, 50-1 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 71, 221 Q95, fig. 14 (with refs.).

Lost.
Various.
After AD 86.
Two reliefs preserve somewhat vague indications of the sculptural decoration of the pediment of the temple after its restoration under Domitian:

Rome, Trajan’s Forum.
Marble.
Early 2nd c. AD.
Relief (fragm) depicting a scene in front of the Capitolium, showing the façade of the temple. In the temple front (now lost, but preserved in three drawings), Sol (left) and Luna (right) in quadriga and biga (or both in biga?) respectively flank the Capitoline triad, each riding towards it. On the roof: planetary deities, with Sol (missing) and Luna at the corners, and Jupiter at the apex. The drawings do not provide enough detail to ensure secure identification of any of these
figures.
LIMC Helios/Sol 354; LIMC Ares/Mars 280 (with bibl.); Matern 2002, 69, 221 Q93.

Rome, Forum, arch of M. Aurelius, later used as decoration in the church of S. Martina, and moved to the Palazzo dei Conservatori in 1515.
Marble.
AD 176.
M. Aurelius brings sacrifice in front of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, depicted tetrastyle though it was in fact hexastyle. On the gable, a frontal 4-horse chariot, flanked to each side on the lower end of the roof by two poorly preserved acroteria. The detailed relief in the pediment depicts Jupiter in the centre above an eagle with outstretched wings. To the left of Jupiter (i.e. by his right side) Juno, to the right Minerva (helmet). To the right of Minerva are seven figures, of whom the central and most prominent one is Sol in his chariot (only one horse depicted) ascending to the left towards the centre. Between Sol and Minerva are Mercurius (above) and below him Asclepius. To the left of Asclepius, next to the eagle, a woman, possibly Salus (Cafiero), but also identified as Juventas, the wife of Hercules (Simon). The three figures in the far right corner are probably Cyclopes forging thunderbolts for Zeus (Cafiero), as are the three corresponding figures in the far left corner, towards whom Luna, left of Juno, is driving her chariot (only one horse depicted). The small nude male figure behind her chariot is usually identified as Hercules.
Matern 2002, 221 Q94 (with refs.); Cafiero 1986; Simon 1990, 114-118

-6. Pl. 12.1
Berkeley, Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology 8-4282.
Environ of Rome.
Marble.
Ca. AD 225 (LIMC); 150-200 (Moormann/Hijmans).
Small pediment, only left-hand corner preserved, depicting Sol emerging upwards in the corner in his quadriga towards a reclining Oceanus with rudder; Sol (no rays) is dressed in Chlamys and chiton; his right hand, now lost, was raised.
LIMC Helios/Sol 355 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 71, 221 Q92, fig. 13 (with refs.).

-7. Pl. 12.2
Milette, Serapeum, West-facade.
In situ.
Marble.
2nd half 3rd c. AD.
In the centre of the tympanum: bust of Sol, radiate (117 rays), chlamys..
LIMC Helios 136 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 177 n. 972, 182 n. 991, 261 B117.

In situ.
Limestone.
Undated.
Fragment of the eastern tympanum, with bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (9 rays), chlamys.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 26 (with ref.); Jucker 1961, 147 sketch 12.

In situ.
Limestone.
Mid 3rd c. AD.
In the tympanum of the eastern facade, busts of Sol and Luna to either side of a window. Quite worn, but still recognizable.
LIMC in per. or. 28; Klinkott 1989, 121. The nature of this building is uncertain; cf. Klinkott 1989, 109-10; Lenoir 1999.
C1b. Metope.
-1. Corinth, Mus. 572.
  Corinth, Theatre.
  Marble.
  1st quarter 2nd c. AD.
  Eighteen fragmentary panels with reliefs depicting the battle of Gods and Giants; on one: Helios and Giant. Identification uncertain.
  LIMC Helios 379 (with ref.); LIMC Gigantes 481 panel XVIII; Matern 2002, 189, 284 K44.

C1c. Architrave.
-1. Pl. 14.2
  Oinoanda.
  Oinoanda, agora.
  marble.
  193-211 (dedicatory inscription to Septimius Severus).
  Soffit relief of the architrave of the boukonisterion at Oinoanda. Bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys. In the space below Sol a whip and below the whip a bird (eagle?). The companion relief depicts Luna with 8 stars.
  Matern 2002, 262 B119; Coulton 1986, 76-7 & pl VIII b.
  The so-called boukonisterion is interpreted as a building connected with athletics.
-2. Pl. 12.3
  Sens, Musée Munic.
  Sens, City Wall (spolium).
  Limestone.
  Early 2nd c. AD (Moormann/Hijmans). 
  Fragment of an architrave with bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, whip over left shoulder.
  LIMC Helios/Sol 29 (with ref.); Espérandieu IV, 67-8 nr. 2858; Matern 2002, 262 B125.

C1d. Capital.
-1. Qasr Rabbah, Jordan; reused in a house Qasr Rabbah, temple.
  Limestone.
  Early 2nd c. AD.
  Capital of a pillar: bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys.
  LIMC Helios in per. or. 21; Glueck 1966, 58, 303 fig. 137a, 454-455.
-2. Cussy-la-Colonne.

-3. Reims.
  Reims.
  Sandstone.
  Early 3rd c. AD.
  Capital, fragm., with head of Sol, radiate, head of Luna (crescent uncertain) and two heads of bearded gods without defining attributes.
  LIMC Helios/Sol 264 (with ref.); von Mercklin 1962, 110 nr. 301, figs. 541-3, 546 (Sol: fig. 541).
  Rome, Palatine, Domus Severiana.
  Marble.
  1st half 3rd c. AD.
  Capital of a pilaster (fragm): frontal bust of Sol, long wavy hair, radiate (9 rays, some missing), chlamys, in a tondo above a garland carried by two amorini.
  LIMC Helios/Sol 200 (with ref.); von Mercklin 1962, 128-9 nr. 342, fig. 649; Matern 2002, 262 B124.
-5. Formerly Rome, Albergo Costanzi.
  Rome.
  Unknown.
  Roman Imperial.
  Capital of a pilaster with busts of Dionysus, Attis, and Sol (chlamys, r. hand raised).
  Von Mercklin 1962, 167-8 nr. 403 (not illustrated).

C1e. Triumphant arches.
-1. Orange, arch.
  In situ.
  Limestone.
  AD 26-7.
Under an arch in the tympanum of the lateral sides, between cornucopiae, Sol (East), radiate (10 rays) and Luna (west). The face of Sol is much damaged.

LIMC Helios/Sol 361; Amy e.a. 1962, 140, pls. 21, 70; Paar 1979, 233-4; Matern 2002, 262 B121.

   Leptis Magna.
   Marble.
   Early 3rd c. AD.
   Relief-fragment from the arch of Septimius Severus: head of Sol, radiate nimbus (7? rays).
   LIMC Helios/Sol 2; Bartoccini 1931, 92 fig. 65; Bacchielli 1992.

- 3. Pl. 14.1
   Rome, Arch of Constantine.
   In Situ.
   Marble.
   AD 312-315.
   Sol is represented five times on the arch of Constantine.
   1. Pl. 13.1. Eastern arch, west side, bust of Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, left hand (now lost) holding globe. Across from Sol bust of Constantine with chlamys and cuirass, right hand (now lost) raised, left hand (now lost) holding globe. The other two busts presumably depicted Licinius and Jupiter.
   2. Pl. 13.4. West side, frieze, profectio, two signifers carrying statues of the dii militares Victoria and Sol, standing, radiate, chlamys, right hand raised (lost).
   3. Pl. 13.3. East and West side, tondi with Luna in biga (West) and Sol in quadriga (East), radiate, dressed in chiton and chlamys, right hand raised (hand lost), globe in left hand, preceded by Lucifer with torch, Oceanus lying below the horses.
   5. Pl. 13.2. Postament-relief. Soldiers carrying standards surmounted by Victoria and Sol (damaged) respectively.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 201, 362, 408 (with ref.); L’Orange - v. Gerkan 55, fig. 10, pl. 7b; 57-8, 126- pls. 32 c-d; 138-9, pl. 33 c,d; 162-
   fig. 1, pl. 38a; Matern 106, 110, 126-7, 224 Q106, 233 118-9, 237 137a-b.

C1f. Other/unknown.
   Corinth, Agora.
   Marble.
   Late 1st c. BC-early 1st c. AD or 2nd-3rd c. AD (v. Hesberg).
   Two panels, one with bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, and the other with Luna.
   LIMC Helios 296; v. Hesberg 1983, 228 pl. 46,1; Corinth I.2, 83 fig. 57; Matern 2002, 12 n. 81, 115 n. 264, 261 B116.

- 2. Bolsena, Duomo.
   Unknown .
   Terracotta.
   Late 1st c. BC - early 1st c. AD.
   Fragment of a frieze. At the left: Sol, only partially preserved, nimbate (no rays?), possibly seated, presumably towards Phaethon (lost). To the right, two women (Horae) preparing the chariot of Sol.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 180; LIMC Phaethon I, 4; Gabrieli (1911); Matern 2002, 186, 278 K2

- 3. Pl. 15.1
   Vienne, Mus. Lapid.
   Vienne.
   Marble.
   1st c. AD.
   Corner fragment of a large relief showing Sol emerging from waves, radiate nimbus (originally 9 rays), chlamys, torch in raised right hand.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 27 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 97, 229 G30.

- 4. Aphrodisias, Mus.
   Aphrodisias, stoa of the agora.
   Marble.
   AD 14-29.
   Frontal bust of Sol between garlands, radiate nimbus (eight rays).

- 5. Aphrodisias, Mus.
   Aphrodisias, Sebasteion.
   Marble.
   Early 1st c. AD.


-7. Pl. 15.2 Paris, Louvre N4570. Rome (?). Terracotta. Ca. AD 114-117 (LIMC), ca. AD 120 (Gundel). Fragment of a terracotta plaque, which formed a complete scene with 5 others, now lost. On the preserved fragment: three signs of the zodiac, part of the radiate head of Sol and his right hand holding a torch, part of a radiate circle and part of an inscription: [...]

-9. Corinth, Mus. Corinth, Odeion. Marble. Ca. AD 175; Late 1st c. AD (LIMC). Numerous fragments of marble slabs, which presumably decorated some part of the scaenae frons of the odeum. Each square slab appears to have consisted of a square border connecting the ends of a superimposed + and x which fill the square, and a mask in the centre. The bars of the + & x have been interpreted as rays, implying that the masks represent Helios. The masks differ greatly, however, and some, at least, appear to have been theatre masks (e.g. Corinth X, fig. 109 nr. 101). LIMC Helios 300 (with ref.). I base the date of AD 175 on the remarks of Broneer, Corinth X, 114, who compares these fragments stylistically to pilaster capitals belonging to the second phase of the odeum which is dated to around AD 175.

-10. Pl. 16.1 Ephesus, Mus. Ephesus. Marble. Ca. AD 170. Fragment of a relief of the Parthian monument. Sol ascends a chariot to the left (only one wheel remains, horses lost), preceded by a youthful nude figure with flowing cloak. Sol is nimbate and radiate (7 metal rays, fixed in holes, lost), has a raised right arm (upper part lost) and held some object in his lowered left arm - possibly a torch; I concur with Matern that it was not a Kithara. He is dressed in a girded chiton and chlamys. There is no evidence the chariot was drawn by griffins, rather than horses, and nothing in the surviving fragment suggests that this was Apollo or Apollo-Helios, rather than simply Sol. Matern 2002, 70 n. 444, 79-8, 224 Q110.

1975b); Matern 2002, 172, 177 n. 972, 182 n. 991, 262 B122 fig 85.

-16. Antalya, Mus. 18.23.93.
Perge, Theatre.
Proconessian marble.
1st quarter 3rd c. AD.
On a relief depicting the gigantomachy, Sol moves right on a quadriga. Sol, radiate (holes) is dressed in a belted chiton and chlamys. His left arm points forward (hand broken off), and with his bent right arm he raises a now lost object behind his head in a threatening gesture. A small nude figure stands before Sol on the chariot. Below and behind Sol is the upper body of a woman, and directly below him a river deity with a jar from which water flows directly into the mouth of a defeated giant.
Matern 2002, 12 n. 81, 81, 222 Q97.

-17. Antalya, Mus.
Perge, Nymphaeum F2.
Marble.
Ca. AD 200 (Severan).
To either side of the tympanum, reliefs depicting the busts of Sol and Luna.
Mansel 1975a, 65-71; Matern 2002, 172 n. 946, 182 n. 991, 260 B108, fig. 84.

Perge, Propylon H.
Marble.
Ca. AD 200 (Severan).
Two soffits, iconographically identical but stylistically very different, depicting the rape of Ganymede in a central lozenge-shaped panel, between two tondo's depicting the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate, one with 12 rays, the other with 13. The latter bust (13 rays) has a garland around the neck and a chlamys; the former bust is unfinished below the face.
Mansel 1975a, 71-75, fig. 32a-b; Matern 2002, 180 n. 985, 182 n. 991 and n. 998, 262 B123a and b, figs. 87-8.

Vindolanda (Chesterholm).
Sandstone.
Early 3rd c. AD.
Fragment of a relief; preserved are the upper
part of the face of Sol with a radiate nimbus
(6 rays, representing about half the total) and
next to the head the top of Sol’s whip.
Coulston & Philips 1988, 52 nr. 131.

-20. Balat, Miletus Mus. 2121.
Didyma.
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Coffer of a ceiling with bust of Sol
(damaged), radiate.
Matern 2002, 177 n. 972, 182 n. 991, 260-1 B111.

In situ.
Stone.
Undated.
Doorpost, relief, decorated with a frontal
bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (8? rays).
Jucker 1961, 178, fig. 68.

-22. Jebel Druze
Reused locally in the walls of a house.
Stone.
Undated.
Fragments of a doorpost? Busts of Sol and
Luna.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 20 (with ref.);
Glueck 1966, 304 pl. 138, 472.

Khirbet et-Tine (near Homs).
Basalt.
Undated.
Fragment of an architectural frieze decorated
with busts; only the bust of Sol and traces of
the arm of an adjacent bust remain. Sol is
radiate and wears a chlamys.

C1a. Pediment reliefs
On pediment-reliefs, Sol occurs mainly together with Luna as a subsidiary figure (C1a.2, 3, 5, 9,
and probably 6). Usually they are corner figures with Sol emerging in the left corner and Luna
descending on the right. This schema was already used on the East pediment of the Parthenon. In
Rome it was apparently a feature of the pediment of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus after AD
82 (restoration of Domitian), or earlier.
The evidence for the presence of Sol and Luna on the Capitoline temple of Jupiter is scant
but unmistakable. It is provided by a Trajanic relief, now lost, and a relief from the arch of
Marcus Aurelius (C1a.3), supplemented by seven sarcophagus reliefs (C3b1.1-7), two terracotta
lamps (G1d.1-2), and certain coins. The reliefs of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius both depict the
Capitoline temple in the background of their main scene. It is hexastyle on the former and tetrastyle on the latter relief, and in both cases the minute figures of the pediment sculpture are very small and rather sketchily rendered. While both depict the three figures of the Capitoline Triad in the centre, they differ significantly in the positioning of the other figures of the pediment. On the panel relief of Marcus Aurelius (C1a.3b), Sol is in the right half of the pediment, moving left towards the centre, and Luna is to the left, also moving left, away from it. On the drawings of the Trajanic relief, the two are on the opposite sides (Sol left, Luna right) and both are moving towards the centre. These differences may be the result of artistic license, may reflect a renewal of the pediment sculpture at some point between the reigns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, or may indicate that the respectively tetrastyle and hexastyle temples on these reliefs are not actually both the same temple. Whatever the case, these reliefs document Sol and Luna as flanking figures of the Capitoline Triad on one or more temple pediments in Rome in the second century AD.

This combination is also found on the seven Antonine sarcophagi. Here we find the Capitoline triad flanked by Sol on the left in his quadriga and Luna on the right in her biga, with both Sol and Luna moving to the right. On the two lamps we also find Sol on the left, Luna right, both moving to the right on their respective chariots. These images are not uniform, as various other figures may be depicted alongside the Triad as well. Thus they do not offer direct evidence for the composition of the pediment reliefs of the temple, but do confirm that the image of the Capitoline triad flanked by Sol and Luna had wide currency in Rome by the 2nd c. AD.

On the Trajanic relief Sol and Luna may also figure as acroteria, together with the other planetary deities. However the figures are not very distinct, Sol himself is largely missing, and the reliability of the relief is in any case not clear, so we should not make too much of this. On the other hand, Sol was also a prominent figure atop the temple of Apollo on the Palatine (Cat. A2a.1), and his presence on the roof of the temple of Capitoline Jupiter is not inherently unlikely.

Two small pediments (C1a.2, C1a.6), both thought to be of shrines, and both probably from Rome, also depict Sol emerging in the left corner. In both cases the right corner, presumably with Luna, has been lost.

In other parts of the empire, notably in the East, Sol alone (C1a.1, 7, 8) or Sol and Luna (C1a.5, 9) could be depicted as the main decoration of temple pediments. In one case Sol is depicted on one pediment and Luna on the other (C1a.5), in the other both are on the same pediment. Finally, there is one pediment on which Sol occurs as one of a number of figures (C1a.4).

**C1b - C1f**

Sol is not a common figure in other architectural contexts, and in most cases very little is known about the original context of the architectural fragment on which Sol occurs. On the arch of

---

60. On the lamps, two Tritons; on the sarcophagi, the two Dioscuri with or without Fortuna (C3b1.1, 2, 4, 5, 6) or the three Parcae (C3b1.3).

61. The provenance of most sarcophagi and one of the two lamps is unknown, but when the provenance is known it is the city of Rome and its immediate environs and a similar provenance is possible, even likely, in most other cases.
Constantine (C1e.3), Sol is depicted five times, and in all cases on reliefs of Constantinian date rather than reused older ones. Three times Sol is depicted as one of the two *dei militares* of Constantine’s army, the other being Victoria. A large relief on the west wall in the eastern arch depicts Sol opposite a closely similar relief of Constantine on the east wall. A tondo on the eastern, short side of the arch depicts Sol in his quadriga, with a similar tondo depicting Luna on the west side. This prominence of Sol on the arch, connecting him with the army, with Constantine, and with the arch itself, is clear evidence that he remained important to the official imperial message after the battle at the Milvian bridge.\(^{62}\)

No clear patterns emerge from the other reliefs in these sections. They range from mythical depictions of Phaethon or the gigantomachy to generic depictions of Sol alone or Sol and Luna, come from all parts of the Empire, and vary in date between the late second century BC to the fourth century AD.

**Discussion**

Sol does not appear to have been a common figure in temple pediments, but the survival rate of pediments is not high, making it difficult to fully evaluate the evidence. We should bear in mind that he also occurs in the “pediments” of a substantial number of naïskos-shaped votive reliefs and the like.\(^{63}\) While these are not images of actual temples, they do actively invite the viewer to imagine a temple along the lines they portray - i.e. with an image of Sol, or Sol and Luna, on the roof or in the pediment. This is noteworthy because many such reliefs occur in regions from which no actual pediment figures of Sol are known, such as North Africa or the Balkans. Whether the imaginary temples evoked by the votive reliefs had real counterparts in local shrines or temples is hard to say, but they certainly show that such temple imagery was conceivable also in these parts of the empire. The conclusion, then, must be that Sol, with or (more rarely) without Luna was a potential element of decorative schemata of pediments of sanctuaries - ranging from small shrines to major temples - in most if not all parts of the Roman Empire. A glance at the dates of the surviving examples as well as the naïskos-shaped reliefs suggests that this was the case throughout the (late) Republican and imperial period.

The pediment played an important role in the decorative scheme of the exterior of shrines and temples. Generally speaking, the pediment had the most defining, even narrative function, whenever it was decorated with sculptural figures, as was often the case. The visual role of the pediment sculpture was sometimes supported by acroteria and other rooftop sculpture and narrative friezes and the like, but elsewhere on the temple exterior reliefs were primarily decorative. Geometric and vegetational designs predominate, ranging from the ubiquitous egg-and-dart and dental-frieze ornamentations and the like, to acanthus scrolls, rosettes, etc. Nonetheless, here figurative elements, though less common and more formalized in nature, also occur. One can think of the repetition of gorgoneia in the long row of antefixes along the side of the roof, but also of masks or heads in soffit blocks, bucrania, sacrificial implements, putti and other symbolic figures. A similar division in visual function and meaning of reliefs can be found

---

\(^{62}\) The arch was dedicated in AD 315.

\(^{63}\) See, for example, sections C2d or C2f of the catalogue for numerous examples.
in other public structures such as stoas and basilicas, theatres, and the like.

Though Sol is by no measure a common element of architectural reliefs, it is worth noting that he occurs both in more “narrative” contexts (such as pediments) and in more “decorative” ones (such as doorposts or soffits). If we leave aside the occasional mythical scene, a closer look reveals that conceptually as well as physically Sol often actually occupies the middle ground between the decorative and the narrative in such buildings, especially when he is depicted together with Luna. This is almost literally the case with the pediments in which Sol and Luna occupy the corners. Sol emerges as it were from the “generic” part of the temple into the corner of the pediment which rapidly expands beyond Sol to its most narrative, central section and then recedes again to Luna who dives down from the other corner “into” the more generic part of the temple again. Sol and Luna negotiate the transition from building to sculpture back to the building again.

We see something similar in the architrave above the entrance of the boukonisterion of Oinoanda with its two soffit reliefs depicting Sol and Luna respectively (C1c.1). They do not define the entrance in the manner in which the central figure(s) of a pediment can define a temple - neither the entrance nor the building to which it gives access are “of Sol and Luna” - but they do enhance the entrance in a manner that goes well beyond what can be achieved with, say, a purely decorative set of geometrically patterned soffits. Similar “intermediate” functions between decorative and narrative can be assumed or conjectured with a number of other architectural reliefs of Sol.

This “mediation” is not limited to the narrative and the decorative (pediments) or between outside and inside (doorposts, soffits, etc.). On the short sides of the arch in Orange (C1e.1) and again on the arch of Constantine in Rome (C1e.3) we find Sol and Luna in a comparable role, but mediating as it were between the real and the surreal. Triumphal arches were by nature highly surreal gateways which one transited without going from “outside” to “inside” (or vice versa). This is not the place to explore the liminality - virtual or real - of such arches. For our purposes it is enough to note that triumphal arches impose a line, a limen of some sort, across the road. That line is generally not a “real” border, such as a border between the profane and the sacred, or city and country, but a purely notional or symbolic one. Along one axis, the road, that symbolic “border” is spatially clear defined by the physical reality of the arch, and the point of negotiation of whatever transition(s) that border constructs is unmistakable. The decorative elements of the two long sides of the arch can be used to further articulate different levels of meaning of this notional border or transition. But there is an inherent tension between the physical reality of the arch and the intangibility of the transition it defines. That tension becomes quite clear when we view the arch along its other main axis, the one across the road from one short side of the arch to

---

64 C1b.1, C1f.2, C1f.16; in mythical scenes, Sol’s role is conceptually different, and that difference is visually articulated by depicting Sol with a distinct iconography that differs substantially from the norm.

65 Besides all entries under C1a, cf also C1f.17.

66 On can think of column capitals for example (C1d.1-5), depending on the original location of the capitals and the context. Were all capitals decorated with busts, or only those flanking an entrance for instance? C1f.1, 3-5, 9 (if indeed Sol, by no means certain), 13, 14 (?), 15 (?), 18, 20-23 (?).
the other. The short sides clearly mark the physical ends of the arch, but do not have any corresponding role for the notional “border” represented by the arch, precisely because it is notional. In other words, the two main axes defined by the arch are fundamentally different in nature. One, the road, is real and has an actual trajectory. The other axis is notional, not spatial, and as such lacks a beginning and end. The two short ends of the physical arch thus stand in direct contradiction to the lack of such a spatial dimension (“beginning”, “end”) in the notional “border” the arch implies. One could say that the short sides are not ends at all, but are inconclusive, and hence troubling. That inconclusiveness makes the short ends the parts of the arch which most directly confront us with the tension between the physicality of the arch and the purely conceptual nature of the transition it imposes on the road. In a sense the short sides mark a transition of their own, a transition from the physical arch to the notional limen. On these indeterminate and transitional short ends of the oldest and the youngest surviving triumphal arches of the Roman world we find Sol and Luna.

I must stress here that I am not trying to argue that Roman artists used Sol and Luna to define such spaces as transitional. Sol and Luna are too rare as architectural decorations for such a claim. My point is rather that Sol and Luna are at home in such transitional or liminal spaces, and that this potentially tells us something more about how Romans read their presence. It is too early to consider that question further, but that role of Sol and Luna in Roman art is one issue to which we will return repeatedly in this chapter. I am also not suggesting that Sol, with or without Luna, is at home in liminal spaces only. Sol occurs on various other reliefs of the arch of Constantine without Luna as counterpart, in contexts closely associated with power and the emperor.\(^{67}\) He can be the sole figure in the centre of a tympanum,\(^{68}\) have a distinctly cosmic flavour,\(^{69}\) or be part of a larger group with its own function.\(^{70}\) And there are various reliefs which no longer give any hint of their original place or purpose.\(^{71}\)

In short, as part of architectural decoration, reliefs of or including depictions of Sol were rare, but could occur throughout the empire and throughout the imperial period. They obviously do not form a homogeneous group either in nature or function. What his group of reliefs shows is the wide range of potential functions and meanings of Sol with which an ancient viewer had to be conversant. We have picked out and begun to explore one strand of Sol imagery in our discussion of the “liminal” placing of certain Sol and Luna reliefs, and as we continue our discussion of the catalogue we will return to this theme and explore it further. Needless to say, other themes will also emerge and receive attention, at which point relevant images from this section of the catalogue will be the object of further discussion.

\(^{67}\) C1c.3. In the eastern arch, Sol and Constantine are depicted opposite each other with, as far as we can tell, closely mirrored gestures and attributes. On three different places Sol is depicted as military deity.

\(^{68}\) E.g. C1a.1, 6, 7, 9.

\(^{69}\) E.g. C1f.7

\(^{70}\) E.g. C1a.4, C1f.8.

\(^{71}\) E.g. C1c.2, C1f.12.
C2 Religious and Votive reliefs

This section is comprised of reliefs with a religious or votive function, broadly defined, that were erected as more or less self-contained objects. The most frequent are votive altars and votive reliefs of all sizes. The section has been subdivided into groups according to the principal deity or deities to whom the relief was dedicated or in whose context Sol is depicted.

C2. Religious and Votive reliefs.

C2a. Sol alone.

-1. Pola, Mus. 251.
Pola. Said to come from the temple of Roma and Augustus.
Limestone.
1st c. AD.
Votive altar; in the centre, bust of a deity, probably Sol (heavily damaged); inscription: SOLI // N(umerius) PLACEN[tius] / ATTICVS.
Ianovitz 1972, 15-16 (with refs.); CIMRM I, 757 (incorrect transcription of the inscription); Degrassi 1970, 629.
Whether the altar was actually associated with the temple of Roma and Augustus cannot be certain. In 1860, the temple became a depot for antiquities, and it was subsequently no longer clear which objects were found in context with the temple and which were removed to it in the years after 1860; cf. Reichel 1893, 6-7 nr. 89. A first c. AD date for the altar is given in Inscriptiones Italiae X, 10, nr. 22 "ex forma monumenti". Ianovitz (1972, 16 n. 38) feels that this makes the date "difficilmente valutabile, affidato com'è (...) a considerazioni personali", but Degrassi (1970, 629) does accept it and I see no reason to reject it. Ianovitz was probably uncomfortable with this early date because of his tendency to link all references to Sol with Mithraism.

Berenice.
Limestone.
Mid 1st c. AD.
Votive relief. Sol on frontal quadriga, radiate nimbus (face and most rays destroyed), dressed in chiton (?) and chlamys.
Bonanno 1978, 63, G38, pl. 4,38; Matern 2002, 53, 213 Q38.

-3. Pl. 17.2

Rome, Mus. Cap. 1904/s.
Rome.
Marble.
AD 158.
Votive altar. At the top, bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), draped, with whip (r.) and globe (l.). Below: inscription: SOLI INVICTO DEO / EX VOTO SVSCEPTO / ACCEPTA MISSIONE / HONESTA EX NVME / RO EQ(uitum) SING(ularum) AVG(usti) P(ublius) / AELIVS AMANDVS / D(onum) D(edit) TERTVLLO ET / SACERDOTI CO(n)S(ulibus).
Schraudolph 1993, 236 L144, pl 40 (with refs.); Matern 2002, 39 n. 305, 172, 256 B79, fig. 81 (with refs.).
This is the oldest precisely dated use of *invictus* as epithet for Sol.

-4. Pl. 17.3
Vatican, Galleria delle Statue 550.
Rome, near the Porta Portese, at or near the shrine of the Syrian gods (according to Palmer).
Marble.
2nd c. AD.
Altar; above inscription in tondo, frontal bust of Sol (face restored), radiate, chlamys, carried by an eagle with outstretched wings. Inscription: D[eo] / SOLI VI[ctori] / Q OCTAVIVS DAPHNICV[s] / NEGOTIa(n)nS VINARIVS A SE[p/r?.. / TRICLIAM FEC(it) A SOLO INPE[n] / SVA PERMISSV KALATOR(um) PON[TIF][icum] / ET FLAMINVM CVI IMMVNITAS / DATA EST AB EIS SACRVM FACIEND[i].
LIMC Helios/Sol 37 (with ref.); Amelung 1908, 4166 pl. 61; CIL VI 712; Palmer 1981, 372-381; Chausson 1995, 666-7; Matern 2002, 42 n. 328, 170, 184, 257 B83, fig. 80 (= B107).
There is no room for lost letters prior to VI of victori, and therefore no grounds for the reading *Invicto*. 
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The end of line 4 has been variously restored as A SEP[tem Caes(aribus) (Marini) or A SER[api (Mommsen); cf. Palmer 1981, 368 n. 3). Palmer accepts Marini's restoration, but it is almost certainly too long, although it has the advantage of a parallel in CIL IX, 4680 which records another vinarius a septem Caesaribus. Perhaps Daphnicus used the abbreviation Sept(em), which occurs in some inscriptions (e.g. AE 1982, 928b, a much later inscription; CIL III, 10577; 14141; CIL IV, 10580; CIL V, 6176; CIL VIII, 1040). There may conceivably be room for A SEP[T(em) Caes(aribus), in particular if one looks at the apparent length of line 6 and accepts a slight variation in the length of the lines.

-5. Pl. 18.1
Naples, Mus. Naz. 6678.
Rome.
Marble.
Ca. AD 175 or ca. AD 215.
Votive relief; in the centre a statue of Sol on a base; Sol's head is missing, but above his right shoulder traces are visible of his long hair and a nimbus. He is nude but for a chlamys, his right hand is raised, and he holds a whip in his left hand. In front of the statue-base stands a small, portable, tripod altar, burning. Between the altar and the base a dead bull lies on the ground; to either side of the altar two men in toga, bare-headed, of whom the right-hand one is in the act of placing something on the altar. Behind him a boy is holding a pyxis. The inscription, in the field, identifies the dedicants as L. Arruntius Philippus, Quintus Codius Iason and the latter's son Mercurius. The emperor in whose honour the dedication is made can be either Marcus Aurelius or Caracalla. Inscription: PRO SAL[V]TE ET M[EM]ORIA / IMP(eratoris) CAES(aris) MARCI AVRELI(A) AVGVSTI / L(uci)us ARRVTIVS / PHILIPPVS / Q(uintus) CODIVS / IASON / E(T) / MERCVRIVS / FILLIVS / HVIVS / D(onum) D(ederunt).
LIMC Helios/Sol 189 (with ref.); von Hesberg 1981, 1054-5 nr. 5b (with ref.); CIL VI 1018; various drawings were made of the relief, with restored head: Vermeule 1966, 21 nr. 182; Vermeule 1966, 16 nr. 8282; Matern 2002, 110, 164, 237 I36.

Side.
Limestone.
2nd c. AD.
Altar with bust of Sol, face hacked away, radiate (9 rays), draped. Below, inscription: ΕΡΜΈΣ / ΗΛΙΩ / ΕΥΧΗΝ

-7. Pl. 18.2
Vatican, Mus. Greg. Prof. 9906.
Rome, Via del Mare (near theatre of Marcellus).
Marble.
2nd-3rd c.; Antonine (Liverani).
Votive altar, on the front bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays), whip; on the back crescent and star; on either side, sacrificial bowl and jug respectively. Inscr.: INVICTO / SOLI / FELICISSIMVS ET PHILOCVRIVS AED(iculam) / D(onum) D(ederunt). Schraudolph 1993, 237 L152 pl. 41; Liverani 1993; Matern 2002, 237 B84.

Fano.
Marble.
2nd half 2nd c. - early 3rd c. AD.
Altar bearing an inscription: SOLI / INVICTO / Q(uintus) VALERIVS / EVTYCHES / D(onum) D(edit).
Altar found in conjunction with a headless statue of Abundantia, the torso of a seated man, fragment of a relief depicting a winged man standing next to an altar around which a snake is curled, small base on which three statuettes (two, headless, preserved) of women in long chiton, and a head of Hercules with a lion's skin over his head. Bernardelli Calavalle 1986; Battistelli & Deli 1983, 77, 81, 91.

-9. Petronell (Austria), Schloß Traun (?)
Carnuntum.
Stone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol, bare-headed, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, in a quadriga to the right.
LIMC Helios/Sol 143 (with ref.).


-12. Pl. 18.3 Aix-en-Provence, Mus. Granet. La Torse, Aix-en-Provence. Sandstone. AD 270-280. Altar. In a niche, framed by two columns, Sol in a frontal quadriga, radiate (7 holes for rays), nude but for a chlamys billowing out behind him and filling the apse of the niche, right hand raised, left hand broken off. The heads and forelegs of four small horses are all that is visible of the quadriga. Inscription above and below the niche: P(ublius) TALLIVS ONE/SIMVS/V(otum) S(olvit) L(libens). LIMC Helios/Sol 122 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 214-5 Q46; Esperandieu I, 77 nr. 94.

-13. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Mus. Vercovicium (Housesteads), Mithraeum. Stone. 3rd c. AD (?) Altar with inscription; on the border above the inscription bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, whip over right shoulder. Inscr.: D(eo) SOLI / HERION / V(otum) L(ibens) M(erito). RIB 1601; Harris & Harris 1965, 35, pl. 5.2; CIMRM 1858/9 (inscription incorrect); Matern 2002, 255, B75 (inscription incorrect).


Marble?
Undated.
A variety of pantheistic symbols crowned by a bust of Apollo-Helios, radiate (9 rays), chlamys, quiver behind right shoulder.
Vermeule 1966, 24 nr. 8380.

-19. Pl. 18.6
Budapest, Nat. Mus. 97.1909.2.
Dunaúváros/Intercisa.
Limestone.
Undated.
Votive altar, no inscription, on the two sides small bust of Sol, radiate (8 and 10 rays respectively).
Barkóczí e.a. 1954 Nr. 366.

-20. Pl. 18.5
Budapest, Nat. Mus., North depot cellar.
Unknown.
Limestone.
Undated.
Votive altar (?), no inscription; small bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, between two horses to either side.
Ubi-erat-lupa.org ID nr. 9893 (otherwise unpublished).

C2b. Sol and Luna.
-1. Pl. 19.1
Florence, Mus. Arch. 86025 (formerly Villa Casamorata).
Rome, Trastevere.
Marble.
Neronian (Bergmann).
Bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays), chlamys (?); inscription: EVMOLPVS CAESARIS / AVR(IAE) (sic) ET CLAVDIA PALLAS F(ilia) / SOLI ET LVNAE DONVM POSVERVNT CIL VI, 3719 = 310331; Matern 2002, 254 B65; Bergmann 1998, 194-201.
Bergmann sees conscious echoes of Nero’s features in the bust of Sol.

-2. Pl. 19.2-3
Rome, Mus. Cap. 9775.
Rome, Aventine, Dolichenenum.
Marble.
Ca. AD 150.
Votive altar dedicated to Sol, and set up together with a twin altar dedicated to Luna.

Sol is standing, not radiate, nude but for a chlamys, whip in r. hand, globe in l.

-3. Pl. 19.4
Paris, Louvre Ma 2754
Janiculum, Syrian Sanctuary; entered the Louvre in 1816.
Marble
Ca. AD 100-135
Triangular block with on each side respectively a relief of Sol (radiate bust, 7 rays), Luna (bust) and a bull (walking to the right). Below Sol an inscription: DORYPHORVS PATER.
Bouillon 1821, III, Candelabres p. 3, pl. 3;
Froehner 1874, 387-8 nr. 424; Gauckler 1912, 160; LIMC Helios in per. or. 10;
Matern 2002, 171-2, 182 n. 998, 256 B77, fig. 79.
The triangular base for this votive altar was found in situ in the sanctuary.

Duweir (near Sidon).
Stone.
Ca. AD 100-135
Triangular block with on each side respectively a relief of Sol (radiate bust, 7 rays), Luna (bust) and a bull (walking to the right). Below Sol an inscription: DORYPHORVS PATER.
Bouillon 1821, III, Candelabres p. 3, pl. 3;
Froehner 1874, 387-8 nr. 424; Gauckler 1912, 160; LIMC Helios in per. or. 10;
Matern 2002, 171-2, 182 n. 998, 256 B77, fig. 79.
The triangular base for this votive altar was found in situ in the sanctuary.

-5. Székesfehérvár, Mus. 496.
Zámoly, from a tomb of the 4th c. AD.
Wood, originally plated with metal.
4th c. AD.
Side A: bust of Sol, radiate (12 rays), chlamys, whip; inscription SOLI[. Side B: Bust of Luna, inscription [LU]N[.]

-6. Destroyed in 1870.
Nehwiller-pres-Woerth.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Remnants of a depiction of Sol and Luna below an inscription: SOLI ET LUN(a)E
SAC(rum) / EDULLIUS VISURIONIS / [ex] IU[SU SO[L(vit) L(ibens)] M(erito). Espérandieu VII, 211 nr. 5622; CIL 13, 6058.

   Tyre.
   Stone.
   Undated.
   Altar. On the front an eagle above a thunderbolt, and two bulls; on the two sides busts of Luna and Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), chlamys.
   LIMC Helios in per. or. 6 (with ref.).

   Aqura.
   Stone.
   Undated.
   Altar decorated on four sides, with a thunderbolt, a bull, and busts of Luna and Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), chlamys.
   LIMC Helios in per. or. 7 (with ref.).

   Si‘ä.
   Basalt.
   Undated.
   Naiskos with an eagle in the tympanum between the busts of Luna (l.) and Sol (r.), the latter rendered as a Sonnengesicht on a radiate disc.
   LIMC Helios in per. or. 29 (with ref.).

C2a and C2b: Sol (alone or with Luna).
A relatively small number of votive altars and reliefs are dedicated to Sol himself, and a fair number of these associate him directly with Luna in some manner. A good example is the votive altar of Eumolpus and his daughter Claudia Pallas depicting a bust of Sol, but with an inscription dedicating it to Sol and Luna (C2b.1). Another example are the twin altars from the Aventine Dolichenum dedicated to Sol and Luna respectively (C2b.2). In the case of the latter we would not have known that Sol and Luna were invoked jointly if only the one altar to Sol had survived. Similar connections with Luna, now lost, cannot be excluded for some of the other reliefs listed in C2a (Sol alone). Hence I will discuss C2a and C2b together.

Votives of the type gathered here can usually be interpreted as clear acts of cult, and one relief from Rome, now in Naples (C2a.5), actually depicts an act of cult for Sol. It shows two

\footnote{Cf. CIL III, 14386d; CIL VIII, 1458-9; CIL XIII, 4472 & 4477.}
adults and a child bringing sacrifice before a statue of Sol. The altar of Eumolpus and Pallas, which dates to the third quarter of the first century AD attests that Sol was the recipient of votives in Rome no later than the 1st c. AD. This is not surprising, given that we know of at least two Republican temples of Sol in the city, at the Circus Maximus and on the Quirinal.\(^73\) There was also a shrine of some sort for Sol in Trastevere from at least the 1st c. AD onwards, and finally there was the famous temple to Sol in the Campus Martius dedicated by Aurelian in AD 274.\(^74\) Given this number of temples it is surprising that we actually have so few votive reliefs, altars, and similar evidence for cult either from Rome or, indeed, any part of the Empire dedicated specifically to Sol.

As we shall see in subsequent sections of the catalogue, Sol is much more often part of the identity of a deity or a secondary figure associated with one or more other deities. This is also the case with some of the reliefs in this section, such as C2b.2 from the Aventine Dolichenum and C2b.3 from the Syrian sanctuary on the Janiculum. Sol and Luna do not take centre-stage in either sanctuary, but if anything seem to form a “Roman” element in a “foreign” context. Their iconography stands in marked contrast to the iconography of the deities of Doliche or the Heliopolitan triad who are invariably depicted as “foreign”, for Sol and Luna are represented in their standard Roman guise in both sanctuaries.\(^75\) This must have been a conscious choice, for there was no reason not to depict deities of the sun and moon in a different iconographic tradition, more closely akin for the ones used in Syria. These iconographic variants reached Rome as early as the 1st c. AD, as the Palmyrene votive altar for Sol Sanctissimus perhaps illustrates, on which griffins draw the chariot of Sol as markers that this is not the standard Roman sun.

But however rarely, Sol alone or Sol and Luna together were also the recipients of votives in their own right. Why there should be so few votives for Sol alone is difficult to say. The cult of Sol was apparently not *chique* until the reign of Aurelian. Neither the dedicants of the reliefs connected with Sol’s shrine in Trastevere, the freedman Eumolpus (C2b.1) and the wine-merchant Daphnicus (C2a4), nor the majority of the *sacerdotes* Solis belong to the elite of the Empire.\(^76\) Romans of less than top rank have left comparatively little trace in the epigraphic and archaeological record. Hence it is not surprising that we know more *pontifices Solis*, members of

\(^{73}\) See chapter 5.

\(^{74}\) For a more detailed discussion of these temples, and in particular the shrine in Trastevere, see chapter 5.

\(^{75}\) This is certainly the case with the altars of Sol and Luna from the Dolichenum (C2b.2) and the triangular altar from the Syrian sanctuary (C2b.3). By contrast, the eagle below the bust of Sol Sanctissimus/Malakbel (C2q.1) and - less prominently - below the bust of Sol on the votive altar of Q. Octavius Daphnicus (C2a.4) may be considered an iconographic marker that indicates that here we are not dealing with the standard Roman Sol. In the case of Sol Sanctissimus this is clearly confirmed by the uncommon epithet and, explicitly, by the bilingual inscription, not to mention the other reliefs. In the case of Daphnicus’ votive, we also have a unique epithet - *Sol Victor* - but no real other indication.

\(^{76}\) On the connection of Eumolpus and Daphnicus with the shrine in Trastevere, and on the five sacerdotes Solis in Rome that we know by name, see chapter five. We have no evidence for the rank of Arruntius Philippus or Codius Iason (C2a.5).
the new college of *pontifices* instituted by Aurelian, than *sacerdotes* of Sol prior to AD 275.\(^{77}\) The *pontifices* were all powerful senators whose rank almost obliged them to leave a rich epigraphical trail.

But modest status of the cult cannot be the only explanation for the limited number of votives to Sol or Sol and Luna specifically. As we review other votive reliefs on which Sol occurs, further patterns will emerge, suggesting additional factors at play.

**C2c. Mithraic (selection).**

-1. Pl. 23.2-3
   Wiesbaden.
   Nida (Hedderheim).
   Sandstone.
   late 1st– early 2nd century A.D.
   Two–sided Mithraic relief, one side depicting a tauroctony, the other Mithras and Sol at a banquet. Sol is dressed in a long chiton and a chlamys, holds a whip in his left hand and is receiving food (?) on his outstretched right hand. He is bare-headed, having removed his radiate crown and placed over a Persian cap on a post between Mithras and him.
   The main relief revolves within a frame decorated with minor scenes. On the slab above the main scene, between two tondi depicting wind gods, Sol with quadriga and Luna on a biga. Interestingly, Mithras is depicted ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 252; Merkelbach 1984, 342-4 figs. 101, 103; CIMRM II 1083

-2. Wiesbaden.
   Nida (Hedderheim).
   White marble.
   AD 85 - 200.
   Small Danubian-style marble relief, round top, depicting a tauroctony. In the upper left corner, above the cape of Mithras, a sketchy bust of Sol. Below and separated from the main scene, three minor scenes. From left to right: man laying hand on kneeling man; Sol and Mithras at banquet; Mithras ascending chariot behind Sol.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 254; CIMRM II 1084 fig. 276.
   This relief comes from the oldest Mithraeum at Nida, Mithraeum 1, that was built in about AD 85. The Mithraeum was abandoned in AD 210.

-3. Pl. 22.2-4
   Nesce, Mithraeum.
   Marble.
   AD 172 (Clauss 1992, 49).
   Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, chlamys, whip (no rays); right-hand corner Luna.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 373; Merkelbach 1984, 322 – 3, fig. 73; von Hesberg 1981, 1086-7 nr. 10; CIMRM I, 650-1

   Rome, possibly from a Mithraeum on the Capitoline Hill.
   Marble.
   2nd c. AD.
   Tauroctony in grotto; above in the left-hand corner Sol, bare-headed (not radiate) nude but for a chlamys, whip in r. hand, in an ascending quadriga, preceded by Phosphorus; in the right hand corner, Luna in descending biga, preceded by Hesperus.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 377 (with ref.); CIMRM I, 415.

-5. Pl. 20
   Paris, Louvre Ma 3441.
   Fiano Romano.
   Marble.
   2nd half 2nd c. AD.
   Two-sided relief. Side A: Tauroctony, upper left-hand corner, frontal busts of Sol, radiate nimbus (11? Rays), upper right hand corner frontal busts of Luna. Side B: Mithras and Sol, nude but for a chlamys, radiate nimbus (11? rays), whip, dining; in upper left-hand corner Luna.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 370 (inaccurate descr.);

\(^{77}\) See chapter five.
CIMRM I, 641.

Rome.
Marble.
2nd half 2nd c. AD.
Tauroctony. Upper left-hand corner frontal bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays), chlamys; right-hand corner lost.

-7. Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 2229.
Acquired in Rome.
Greyish marble.
2nd c. AD.
Fragment of a Tauroctony-relief. Preserved are Cautes and above him bust of Sol with radiate nimbus.
LIMC Helios/Sol 373; CIMRM I, 597 fig. 169 (not fig. 171).

Dieburg, Mithraeum.
Red sandstone.
Late 2nd c. AD.
Two-sided relief, revolving on a pivot. Side A: a total of 11 panels. There is a central panel (Mithras on horseback, hunting), with one large panel above (3 scenes) and one below. The central scene of the upper panel depicts a temple-like building (dystyle in antis) in which a bull is lying. In the tympanon are two busts, possibly Sol and Luna, to either side of a goose (Vermaseren) or eagle (Spätantike) on a globe. On the large panel below (divided into two by an inscription), the right-hand scene depicts Sol, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (? not visible on the illustrations available to me), whip, on quadriga, with Mithras stepping up from behind. Four small panels are arranged vertically along each side (lower right hand corner: Mithras and Sol, with nimbus, no rays, dining). Inscription: D(eo) I(nvicto) M(ithrae) / SILVES/TRIVS / SILVI/NVS / ET SILVESTRIVS PE[petuus et a]VRELIVS NEPOS. PERPETV(u)S FRATER / ARTIS SVTORIAE / V(otum) S(olvit) L(ibens) L(aetus) ME(rite).
LIMC Helios/Sol 173; Spätantike 537-540 nr. 144; Merkelbach 1984, 358, 261 fig. 123; Matern 2002, 186, 278 K4.

-9. Poetovio (Ptuj), Pokajinski Mus. RL 144.
Poetovio (Ptuj), Mithraeum I.
Marble.
Mid 2nd c. AD.
Statue-base. On the left side, frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys, whip above his right shoulder; on the right side bust of Luna. On the front: inscription.
LIMC Helios/Sol 308; CIMRM II, 1489-90; Selem 1980, 101 nr. 34.
10. Jerusalem, Israel Museum 97.95.15.
Syria.
Limestone.
2nd - 3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. Frontal bust of Sol, radiate, left, and Luna right. Lower right: Sol (radiate) and Mithras at the banquet. The relief includes a number of other scenes, some unique.
De Jong 1997.

In situ.
Marble.
Ca. AD 200.
Altar with relief of tauroctony; upper corner left, frontal bust of Sol; upper corner right frontal bust of Luna. LIMC Helios/Sol 368; Merkelbach 1984, 299, fig. 43; CIMRM I, 338-9.

12. Pl. 22.1
Rome, Mus. Cap. 1205-
Rome
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD-
Tauroctony. Upper left-hand corner frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys; upper right-hand corner frontal bust of Luna. LIMC Helios/Sol 368 (with ref.); CIMRM I, 417.

Rome, Via di Borgo S. Agata.
Travertine.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony; on the upper left bust of Sol, radiate; upper right, bust of Luna. CIMRM I, 366.

Rome, near the church of S. Lucia in Selci.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony; upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), chlamys; right-hand corner bust of Luna. Merkelbach 1984, 304 fig. 50; CIMRM I, 368; Amelung 1903, 692-3 nr. 568, pl. 74.

Tor Cervara.

Uncertain, presumably Rome.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Mithras standing on the back of the slaughtered bull; upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (7 rays), chlamys; upper right-hand corner bust of Luna. LIMC Helios/Sol 372 (with ref.); Merkelbach 1984, 298-9 fig. 42; CIMRM I 334.

Rome, reportedly found between the Porta Portese and S. Pancrazio.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Upper part of a tauroctony; in upper left corner bust of Sol (chlamys, radiate, damaged) above Cautopates, in upper right corner bust of Luna (damaged) above Cautes. LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM I, 585 fig. 162.

Rome.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony; in the upper corners busts of Sol (left), chlamys, radiate, and Luna (right). LIMC Helios/Sol 374; Merkelbach 1984, fig. 69; CIMRM I, 598.

Rome?
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony, in the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, 7 rays. LIMC Helios/Sol 373; CIMRM I, 588 fig. 164.

-21. Vatican City, Cortile d. Belvedere. Ostia. Marble. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Tauroctony. Upper left-hand corner: bust of Sol, radiate (4 or 5 rays), upper right-hand corner bust of Luna. Other Mithraic scenes along the border, including Mithras crowning Sol. LIMC Helios/Sol 284, (incorrect description); Merkelbach 1984, 297 fig. 41; CIMRM I, 321.

-22. Clamecy. Intaranum (Entrains). Sandstone. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Upper left hand corner of a tauroctony; with the head of Sol, radiate (8 rays), the raven, and most of Mithras. LIMC Helios/Sol 368; Espérandieu III, 260 nr. 2275; CIMRM I, 945. The surviving part of the relief is in two pieces which fit together; see photograph in Espérandieu. One (or more?) of the youthful, upturned heads with long wavy hair found at Entrains may be Sol rather than Bacchus (as Espérandieu identifies them), but this would depend on the context (e.g. within the Mithraeum); cf. Espérandieu III 2286 (quite likely), 2288 (possible), 2291 (possible).

-23. Lisabon, Mus. Etnol. Caetobriga (Troia). Marble. 2nd-3rd c. AD. Part of a large Mithraic relief. Of the main scene, only a small section at the right, with the frontal bust of Luna above Cautopates with lowered torch, are preserved. To the right, in a separate panel, Sol, Chlamys and chiton, radiate nimbus (11 rays), right hand lowered and outstretched, palm outwards, drinking horn in left hand, and Mithras lie together on a couch; two servants. Bendala Galán 1986, 398 ß1, pl. XI; CIMRM I, 798.


-26. Formerly Hanau, Schloss Philipsruh (destroyed in WWII). Gross Krotzenburg. Red sandstone. Late 2nd - 1st half 3rd c. AD. Altar; head of Sol, radiate, between two bulls' heads. Dedicatory inscription: DEO SOLI / INVICT(o) MYTRAE / IVL(ius) MACRINVS / IMMVN(is) LEG(ionis) / VIII AVG(ustae) EX VOTO / SVSCEPT(o) SOLVIT / L(ibens) L(aetus) M(erito). LIMC Helios/Sol 187; Merkelbach 1984, 363 fig 127; CIMRM II, 1150-1. Found together with a Tauroctony relief (upper left part), and another altar, similar but slightly smaller, dedicated to Luna by Lucius Fabius Anthimus, who was a member of the Cohors IIII Vindelicorum (if the much damaged text of the lower part of the altar was correctly read and reconstructed).

2nd-3rd c. AD.
In the main field, Tauroctony, with busts of Sol (left), radiate, and Luna (right). The main panel is framed above and to the left and right by a series of smaller panels with various Mithraic scenes. These include: (above, third and fourth scenes from left) Sol in quadriga, jumping upwards (right), with Mithras behind him, and Luna, in biga, going downwards.
LIMC Helios/Sol 255 (ref. to Spätantike incorrect); Merkelbach 1984, 354-5, fig. 116; CIMRM II, 114-5, 1283.
Remains of a Jupiter-Giant pillar were found in close vicinity to this Mithraeum (CIMRM II, 1282, 1284, 1286), but according to Clauss (1992, 111 n. 68) were not in any way connected with it.

Lopodunum (Ladenburg).
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Sol, nude, and Mithras, nude but for a chlamys, reclining behind a three-legged table.
LIMC Helios/Sol 249; Schwertheim, 1974, 144 pl. 42; Beck 1984, pl. 3.

-29. Hanau, Schloss Philippsruh.
Rückingen.
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Two-sided Mithraic relief. Side A. Lower part: tauroctony under an arch decorated with the signs of the zodiac; in the two corners busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right). Upper part divided into four horizontal registers, of which the top one is almost completely destroyed. The registers depict various scenes; Sol is included in the following: Top register, right hand corner, Sol kneeling, being crowned by Mithras; third register, centre, Sol in quadriga; fourth register, Sol, standing, globe, among the planetary deities (? - if so, they are in arbitrary order over two registers), Sol and Mithras shaking hands, Sol and Mithras dining. Side B depicts two scenes: the upper half shows Mithras on horseback; the lower half Mithras and Sol dining.
LIMC Helios/Sol 247; Merkelbach 1984, 364-5 figs. 128-9; CIMRM II, 1137; Beck 1988, 15-6 n. 35.

London.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony within a zodiac circle. In the upper left-hand corner, Sol (head missing) in quadriga rising upwards; in upper right-hand corner Luna in biga descending.
LIMC Helios/Sol 382; Merkelbach 1984, 329 fig. 81; CIMRM I 810-1; Gundel 1992, 222 nr. 53.

-31. Pl. 23.1
Graz, Joanneum.
Pohanica (Zgornje Pohanca).
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, whip, behind the heads of four horses; in upper right-hand corner: Luna in biga of oxen (only the hindquarters of one of the oxen survive).
LIMC Helios/Sol 380; CIMRM II, 1458 fig. 372.

-32. Deva (Hungary), Mus.
Varhély-Sarmizegetusa, Mithraeum.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Bust of Sol, chlamys, radiate (6 rays); the ends of the rays are connected with a "nimbus".
LIMC Helios/Sol 30; CIMRM II, 2053, fig 544.

-33. Deva.
Varhély-Sarmizegetusa.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony, fragment. In the upper left-hand corner frontal bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays, seventh ray hidden behind the raven), chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 2062 fig. 549.

-34. Timișoara, mus.
Varhély-Sarmizegetusa.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Two fragments of a tauroctony-relief.
Above, left, bust of Sol, right, bust of Luna.
Some of the surrounding Mithraic scenes also survive, including (all below the main scene): Sol crowned by Mithras, Sol and Mithras dining, and Mithras ascending a biga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 2052 fig. 543.

35. Bucharest, Nat. Mus.
Achunar (Mircea Voda).
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Two fragments of a Tauroctony-relief, divided into three registers. Sol and Luna flanking the tauroctony are lost; in the lower register, among the preserved Mithraic scenes: Mithras ascending the chariot (one horse preserved) behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 254; CIMRM II, 2291 fig. 634b.

Apulum.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
In the centre: tauroctony, with busts of Sol (left), radiate, and Luna (right). Above and below, Mithraic scenes, including (both below): Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 252; Merkelbach 1984, 384 fig. 152; CIMRM II, 1958 (omits description of two Mithraic scenes below).

37. Alba Julia, Mus. Reg. 204/II.
Apulum.
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c.
Relief in three registers. In the upper register, at the left, Sol, nude, head lost, in biga (horses) and at the right Luna in biga (oxen) flank various Mithraic scenes. The lower register (left part lost) also contained Mithraic scenes, including Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 257; Merkelbach 1984, 385 fig. 153; CIMRM II, 1972.

Apulum.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol; in the upper right-hand corner bust of Luna. A series of Mithraic scenes surround the main scene (some lost); these include (below the tauroctony): Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; Merkelbach 1984, 383 fig. 150; CIMRM II, 1935/6.

Apulum.
Marble.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, in upper right-hand corner bust of Luna. A series of Mithraic scenes surround the main scene; these include (below the tauroctony): Mithras crowning Sol; Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; Merkelbach 1984, 386 fig. 154; CIMRM II, 2000.

40. Constanța (Rumania).
Tirgușor.
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, in upper right-hand corner bust of Luna. A series of Mithraic scenes surround the main scene; these include (below the tauroctony): Mithras crowning Sol; Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II 2306, fig. 639.
Note the inversed placement of Sol and Luna.

41. Poetovio (Ptuj), Mus. inv. 52.
Poetovio (Ptuj), Mithraeum II.
Marble.
Last quarter of the 2nd c. - 3rd c. AD.
Fragment of a tauroctony relief. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 1576 fig. 398.

42. Sarajevo, Mus.
Konjic.
Limestone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Two-sided relief. On one side the tauroctony (damaged, Sol missing). On the other side the banquet of Sol and Mithras (damages). Sol is most likely the right-hand figure on the couch, bare-headed, wearing a chiton and chlamys.
Merkelbach 1984, 381 fig 148. CIL III 14617. CIMRM 1896, figs 490-1.

-43. Split, Mus. (lost in WWII).
Pritok-Jezerine (near Bihać).
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony; in upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays); in upper right-hand corner Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 373; CIMRM II 1907 fig. 496

-44. Split.
Raetinium (Golubić, near Bihać, Bosnia).
Yellow limestone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays); in upper right-hand corner Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 1910 fig. 498

In situ.
Lead.
Ca. AD 225.
Lead plaque with 3/4 head of Sol, radiate (7 rays); the rays were cut out to allow light to shine from behind.
CIMRM I, 494; Vermaseren & van Essen 1965, 346 nr. 46, pl. 80; Merkelbach 1984, 313 fig. 62; Matern 2002, 264 B139.

Rome, Palazzo dei Musei, Mithraeum.
Marble.
2nd half 3rd c. AD (Clauss 1992, 28).
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate; in the upper right-hand corner, Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; Merkelbach 1984, 308 fig. 54; CIMRM I, 435/6.

Rome, Palazzo dei Musei, Mithraeum.
Marble.
2nd half 3rd c. AD (Clauss 1992, 28).
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, radiate; in the upper right hand corner, bust of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 373; CIMRM I, 437, figure 123.

Rome, Mithraeum of the Castra Peregrinorum (S. Stefano Rotondo).
Marble.
Late 3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, Sol in quadriga, radiate (4 or 5 rays), nude but for a chlamys, globe in left hand, reins in right; in the upper right-hand corner, Luna in biga preceded by Hesperus.
LIMC Helios/Sol 379 (with ref.).

-49. Lost.
Rome, Baths of Caracalla, Mithraeum.
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Originally head of Sol, radiate (7 rays, cut-out and meant to be illuminated from behind), raised right hand; small bust of Luna above his left shoulder. The actual head of Sol is completely lost.
LIMC Helios/Sol 307; Merkelbach 1984, 309 fig. 55; CIMRM I, 458.

Unknown, possibly Rome.
Marble.
Late 3rd c. AD (Vermeule).
Tauroctony. Busts of Sol and Luna in the upper corners. Sol’s bust (left) is in profile facing right. He has long, wavy hair, but no rays.
LIMC Helios/Sol 376; Vermeule 1981, 236 nr. 197.

Ostia, possibly from the Aldobrandini Mithraeum.
Bronze.
3rd c. AD.
Plaque with dedicatory inscription; along the
top, in relief, sacrificial knife (left), bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), and patera (right).
LIMC Helios/Sol 458; Walters BMCatBronzes 169 nr. 904; Merkelbach 1984, 291 fig. 33; CIMRM I, 234/5; Becatti, Ostia II, 42 pl. 5.1.

-52.  Pl. 21.2
Naples.
Puteoli (Puozzoli).
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony-relief; upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, chlamys, radiate (six rays, of which one extended to the mantle of Mithras).
LIMC Helios/Sol 373 (with ref).

Aquila, Monastero.
Marble.
Mid 3rd c. AD (2nd c. AD according to Vermaseren, but cf. the dates of inscriptions from the same group in the 240s; Clauss 1992, 63-4).
Tauroctony. To the left, Sol (no rays) in quadriga, to the right, bust of Luna (no biga).
CIMRM I 736 FIG. 203

Bologna? Danube region?
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. Above the main scene, busts of the planetary deities, running from Sol (left) to Luna (right) with Sarapis rather than Jupiter in the centre. Sarapis is en face, the others are en profil or three-quarter view, facing Sarapis. Below the main scene, variations on Mithraic scenes including: Mithras dining with Cautes and Cautopates; winged putto ascending quadriga.
LIMC Helios/Sol 283; Merkelbach 1984 320-1, fig. 71; CIMRM I, 693; Beck 1988, passim, esp. 101-106.
There is some discussion as to whether the four central planetary deities are original, or 19th century restorations; cf. Beck 1988, 101-106.

-55.  Trier, Rheinisches Landesmus.
Augusta Treverorum (Trier).
Sandstone.
3rd c. AD.
Altar. In the main scene, Cautes within a zodiac circle. In the upper left-hand corner, above the tympanon, bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), and in upper right-hand corner, largely destroyed, bust of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 328; Merkelbach 1984, 336 fig. 90; CIMRM I, 985.

-56.  Pl. 31.2
Bingen, Museum am Strom.
Bingen.
Limestone.
Ca. AD 235.
Votive altar to Mithras, adorned with a frontal bust of Sol (largely destroyed), radiate (7 rays), chlamys. The rays pierce the altar to allow illumination from behind.
CIMRM II, 1241-2; Merkelbach 1984, 361 fig. 124.

-57.  Speyer, Mus.
Gimmeldingen.
Sandstone.
AD 235.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (13 rays); in the upper right-hand corner bust of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 1314 fig. 348; Clauss 1992, 110

-58.  Pl. 21.1
Karlsruhe, Badisches Ladesmus. C 118.
Osterburken.
Yellowish sandstone.
Ca. 225 AD (Clauss 1992, 118, with ref.).
In the main field the tauroctony below an arch with the signs of the zodiac. Above the arch in the left hand corner Sol standing in a quadriga, preceded by Lucifer; Sol is nude but for a chlamys, has a nimbus, and holds a whip in his raised right hand. Behind Sol the head of a Wind-god; various Mithraic scenes are also depicted in his corner. In the upper right corner Luna in biga, Hesperus, a Wind-
god, and various Mithraic scenes. The central panel above the zodiac between these scenes contains the twelve gods. To the left and the right, the Tauroctony is framed by small panels with Mithraic scenes; these include: (left side, second panel from below) Sol (?) carrying disc; (right side, third panel from the top) Mithras ascending a quadriga behind Sol; (fourth panel from the top) Mithras holding an object (piece of meat?) over Sol's head; (fifth panel) Mithras and Sol shake hands above a burning altar; (seventh panel) Mithras and Sol (nimbus) dining.

LIMC Helios/Sol 378; Merkelbach 1984, 350-3, figs. 112-5; CIMRM II, 1292.

-59. Bad Homburg, Saalburg, Mus.
   Stockstadt, Mithraeum I.
   Silver.
   3rd c. AD.
   Fragmentary aedicula-shaped silver-foil relief of the tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, radiate (bust of Luna in right-hand corner lost).
   Espérandieu, Germanie 281; CIMRM II, 1206.

-60. Bad Homburg, Saalburg Mus.
   Stockstadt, Mithraeum I.
   Yellow sandstone.
   3rd c. AD.
   Altar. On the front, bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays), whip in r. hand (left hand according to LIMC, impossible to make out in the illustrations available to me).
   LIMC Helios/Sol 35; CIMRM II, 1201 fig. 315.

-61. Aschaffenburg, Stiftsmuseum 373.
   Stockstadt, Mithraeum II.
   Bronze, silver-plated, traces of gilding.
   3rd c. AD.
   Relief plaque, fragment. Tauroctony (most of the scene missing); above: heads of Sol, radiate (left) and Luna (right), each accompanied by a second youth (Lucifer and Hesperus or two of the Wind-gods).
   LIMC Helios/Sol 393; CIMRM II, 1216 fig. 319.

   Brocolitia (Carrawburgh), Mithraeum.

-63. York, Yorkshire Philosophical Society.
   Eboracum (York).
   Limestone.
   3rd c. AD (?)
   Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol; in the upper right-hand corner Luna. Below: Mithras crowning Sol, Mithras and Sol dining, and Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 254; LIMC Mithras 137; CIMRM I, 835.

-64. Enns, Mus.
   Lauriacum (Lorch).
   Limestone.
   3rd c. AD.
   Tauroctony. Left and right angle of the arched border above lost (presumably Sol and Luna were depicted there); the rest of the upper border depicts Mithraic scenes, as does the lower border. Among the latter: Mithras crowning Sol; Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 254; CIMRM II, 1422 fig. 364.

-65. Linz, Mus.
   Lentia (Linz), Tummelplatz.
   Marble.
   Last quarter of the 3rd c. AD.
   Small roundel depicting the tauroctony. The upper part (with busts of Sol and Luna) lost; in exergue, Mithraic scenes, including Mithras and Sol dining, and Mithras ascending the chariot behind Sol.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 254; CIMRM II, 1415 fig. 362.

160
66. Pl. 22.5-7
Klagenfurt, Landesmus. Lapid. 19c.
Virunum (Zollfeld).
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Pilaster, fragment, with various Mithraic scenes including Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol, radiate; Sol, radiate (10 rays), nude but for a chlamys and Mithras shaking hands; Mithras preparing to crown (or hit?) kneeling Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 244; CSIR öst. II.4 (1984), 300b pl. 6; Merkelbach 1984, 367 fig. 131; CIMRM II, 1430.

Brigetio (Komárom).
Bronze.
3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In the four corners tondi with busts of the four seasons; next to the two upper ones, busts of Sol, radiate, whip, and Luna. In a frieze below the main scene the busts of the seven planetary deities; Sol, radiate, whip, second from the left.
LIMC Helios/Sol 288, 393a; CIMRM II, 1727; Merkelbach 1984, 378, fig. 143.

68. Székesfehérvár, Arch. Mus. 8641.
Sárkeszi, mithraeum.
Limestone.
Around the beginning of the 3rd c. AD.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, radiate, and the protomes of two horses; upper right-hand corner, Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 380; CIMRM II, 1816 fig. 470; Fitz 1998, 102 nr. 186.

69. Poetovio (Puji), Mithraeum III.
In situ.
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Six fragments of a tauroctony-relief. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 376; CIMRM II, 1600 fig. 410.

70. Poetovio (Puji), Mithraeum III, RL 293.
In situ.
Marble.

71. Poetovio (Puji), Mithraeum III, RL 295.
In situ.
Marble.
AD 253-268.
Altar. Inscription on the front; on the right-hand side Sol, radiate (12 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in his raised right hand and globe in his left hand, standing on a small pedestal, the heads of four horses in low relief by his right leg; on the left-hand side a man with mural crown, cornucopia, and patera by an altar. Above the moulding on either side a reclining lion.
LIMC Helios/Sol 455; Merkelbach 1984, 375 fig. 139; Selem 1980, 128-9 nr. 89 pl. 24; CIMRM II, 1591; Matern 2002, 90, 113 n. 611, 226-7 G12.

72. Poetovio (Puji), Mithraeum III, RL 298.
In situ.
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Fragment of a tauroctony-relief. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, bare-headed, chlamys, above the heads of four horses.

73. Poetovio (Puji), Mithraeum III, RL 299.
In situ.
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Fragment of a tauroctony-relief. Among the various Mithraic scenes depicted, Sol (?) and Mithras shaking hands, and Mithras ascending the quadriga behins Sol, radiate (9 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in his right hand.
-74. Poetovio (Ptuj), Pokajinski Mus. Poetovio (Ptuj), Mithraeum IV. Marble.  1st half 3rd c. AD. Fragment of a relief depicting the upper part of Sol, frontal, radiate (9 rays), billowing chlamys and chiton, raised right hand, under an arch.

LIMC Helios/Sol 124; Matern 2002, 125, 240 I51.

-75. Zagreb, Mus. 16. Dolnoj Plemenšini (Pregrade). Marble. Late 3rd-early 4th c. AD. Tauroctony. In the upper right-hand corner Sol, radiate; upper left-hand corner Luna (crescent moon).

LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 1468 fig. 373. Note the inversion of the placement of Sol and Luna. There is a raven on the border next to the bust of Luna.

-76. Split, Mus. 413 D. Salona (Split). Marble. 3rd c. AD. Roundel. In central tondo: tauroctony. On the circular band around it: Saturn (above the head of Mithras) reclining, between the busts of Sol (left), radiate (5 rays) and Luna (right). Below Sol a snail and a crab, below Luna a crocodile and a dolphin; at the bottom a crater between two snakes.

LIMC Helios/Sol 383; Merkelbach 1984, 380 fig. 146; CIMRM II, 1861. Note that the crater between two snakes, as represented here, is common on Danube-rider plaques.

-77. Zagreb, Mus. 32 (now lost). Siscia. Marble. 3rd c. AD. Open-work relief. In the centre the tauroctony within a circular wreath of corn-ears. Above, the flanking Sol and Luna are lost, but some Mithraic scenes are preserved. Other such scenes are preserved below, including Mithras crowning Sol, Sol and Mithras dining, and Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.

LIMC Helios/Sol 254; Merkelbach 1984, 370-1 fig. 134; CIMRM II, 1475.

-78. Belgrade. Viminacium (Kostolac). Marble. 2nd half 3rd c. AD (Clauss 1992, 216). Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, bare-headed (?), right hand raised (?) Next to the heads of four horses; in the upper right-hand corner bust of Luna next to two horses.

LIMC Helios/Sol 380; CIMRM II, 2216 fig. 612.

-79. Sofia, Mus. Nat. Golema Kutlovica (Lom distr.). White marble. 3rd c. AD. Tauroctony. In the upper left hand corner Sol, radiate, chlamys, with overly large raised right hand; in the upper right hand corner Luna. Between them seven altars and seven cypresses, most missing. According to the LIMC Sol wears a tunica manicata, but I do not see this.

LIMC Helios/Sol 376; Merkelbach 1984, 391 fig. 162; CIMRM II, 2237.

-80. Sofia, Mus. Nat. Roustchouk (Sexantaprista). Marble. 3rd c. AD. Tauroctony, above which two panels, with the bust of Sol in the left hand panel, to the left of a scene with Mithras, accompanied by a second figure, shooting at a third figure in a cave. In the right hand panel a bull in a small boat, bust of Luna, and a three-legged table below Luna. Below the tauroctony a register consisting of one panel with two scenes: Mithras placing his hand on the head of Sol; Sol handing Mithras up onto his chariot with one horse jumping to the right, where Oceanus reclines.

LIMC Helios/Sol 368; CIMRM II, 2272 fig. 632.
81. Sétif (Algeria), Mus. Sitifis (Sétif).
Stone. Ca. AD 299 (Clauss 1992, 250). Tauroctony. In the upper right-hand corner head of Sol, radiate (four rays); in the upper left-hand corner head of Luna. LIMC Helios/Sol 376; CIMRM I, 148/9 fig. 43.

82. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus.
Mauls.
Limestone. 3rd-4th c. AD (Clauss 1992, 126 n. 4, with ref.). Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays, of which one extends to Mithras), chlamys; in the upper right-hand corner Luna. On the two lateral borders various Mithraic scenes, including (all on right-hand border): Sol and Mithras shaking hands, Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol, and Sol and Mithras dining. LIMC Helios/Sol 247; Merkelbach 1984, 368-9 fig. 132; CIMRM II, 1400.

Rome, Mithraeum at P.za Dante.
Marble. 4th c. AD. Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7? rays, of which one extends to Mithras), chlamys; in the upper right-hand corner busts of Luna and Hesperus. LIMC Helios-Sol 368; Merkelbach 1984, 303 fig. 47; CIMRM I, 350-1; on the reading of the inscription cf. Clauss 1992, 26.

Rome, P.za Dante, Mithraeum.
Marble. 4th c. AD. Relief; Sol, depicted from the waste upwards, frontal, radiate (7 rays), long, wavy hair, chlamys and chiton, right hand raised, globe and whip in his left hand. LIMC Helios/Sol 36 (with ref.); Merkelbach 1984, 303 fig. 49; CIMRM I, 354; Matern 2002, 106 n. 593, 131 n. 702, 146 n. 806, 263 B130; on the inscription cf. Clauss 1992, 26.

85. Jajce, Bosnia.
In situ.
Niche cut into the wall of the cult room. 4th c. AD (Vermaseren). Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol (chlamys, radiate?) above Cautopates (below and to the left, with a niche for a lamp above his head), in upper right-hand corner bust of Luna above Cautes (with niche for a lamp above his head). Merkelbach 1984, 380 fig. 147 (with ref.); CIMRM II, 267, 1902 (with ref.); for date cf. 266-7, nr. 1901 (with ref).

Sidon (Saida), Mithraeum.
Parian marble. 2nd half 4th c. AD. Tauroctony with signs of the zodiac loosely spaced in an oval around the main scene. In the four corners busts of the four seasons in high relief in tondi. Next to the upper seasons, also in tondi in high relief, the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), chlamys; Sol's tondo is radiate. LIMC Helios/Sol 375; Gundel 1992, 113-4 fig. 53, 229-32 nr. 77 (with ref.); CIMRM I, 75. Note the inversion of the placement of Sol and Luna.

According to Clauss (1992, 242-3), the only available chronological information for this Mithraeum comes from inscriptions (CIMRM I, 76, 78/9, 84/5) which should be dated in AD 389. In his opinion, the Mithraeum was founded during the "pagan Renaissance" of the late fourth c. AD by Flavius Gerontius, presumably a high-ranking aristocrat, who imported the various cult-objects from Rome. This date was first proposed by E. Will (Syria 27 1950, 261-269), and is also accepted by Vermaseren. Gundel's date for the relief (ca. AD 188) is based on the assumption that the dates provided by the aforementioned inscriptions were based on the Seleucid calendar.

Posilippo.
Marble.
2nd half 4th c. AD (Clauss 1992, 52-3); 3rd c. AD (LIMC).
Tauroctony-relief. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, chlamys, radiate (six or seven vertical rays, points connected by a horizontal band); upper right-hand corner bust of Luna. Inscription: OMNIPO\(\text{\textsc{t}}\)ENTI\(\text{\textsc{e}}\) DEO MITHRAE APPIVS / CLAVDIVS TARRONIVS DEXTER V(ir) C(larissimus) DICAT.
LIMC Helios/Sol 376; CIMRM I, 174-5, fig. 49.

Sanzeno.
Marble.
Undated.
Lateral fragment of a two-sided relief. On one side the tauroctony was depicted, of which only the left edge, including a small bust of Sol, radiate, survives. To the left of this main scene, five minor scenes survive, including (second from bottom) Sol, nude, radiate nimbus, standing next to bearded figure, capite velato (Saturn?). On the other side there was, apparently, only a main scene of which the right side survives. Preserved are part of a bull, a snake, a boar, a cypress, and Cae
tes.
CIMRM I 723, figs 198-9.

-89. Budapest, Nat. Mus.
Alc\(\text{\textsc{s}}\)ut.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. Bust of Sol in upper left-hand corner, bust of Luna in upper right-hand corner. Above and below the main panel seven Mithraic scenes, including (below): Sol crowned by Mithras; Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 254 & 368; Merkelbach 1984 378-9, fig. 144; CIMRM II, 1740.

-90. Cluj, Mus.
Micia.
Limestone.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays), in the upper right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM II, 2025; Merkelbach 1984, 387 fig. 155.

Kurtowo-Konare.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, frontal bust of Sol, and in right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM II, 2338; Merkelbach 1984, 392 fig. 164.

Sanzeno.
Marble.
Undated.
Lateral fragment of a two-sided relief. On one side the tauroctony was depicted, of which only the left edge, including a small bust of Sol, radiate, survives. To the left of this main scene, five minor scenes survive, including (second from bottom) Sol, nude, radiate nimbus, standing next to bearded figure, capite velato (Saturn?). On the other side there was, apparently, only a main scene of which the right side survives. Preserved are part of a bull, a snake, a boar, a cypress, and Cae
tes.
CIMRM I 723, figs 198-9.

-89. Budapest, Nat. Mus.
Alc\(\text{\textsc{s}}\)ut.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. Bust of Sol in upper left-hand corner, bust of Luna in upper right-hand corner. Above and below the main panel seven Mithraic scenes, including (below): Sol crowned by Mithras; Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 254 & 368; Merkelbach 1984 378-9, fig. 144; CIMRM II, 1740.

-90. Cluj, Mus.
Micia.
Limestone.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays), in the upper right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM II, 2025; Merkelbach 1984, 387 fig. 155.

Kurtowo-Konare.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, frontal bust of Sol, and in right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM II, 2338; Merkelbach 1984, 392 fig. 164.

Sanzeno.
Marble.
Undated.
Lateral fragment of a two-sided relief. On one side the tauroctony was depicted, of which only the left edge, including a small bust of Sol, radiate, survives. To the left of this main scene, five minor scenes survive, including (second from bottom) Sol, nude, radiate nimbus, standing next to bearded figure, capite velato (Saturn?). On the other side there was, apparently, only a main scene of which the right side survives. Preserved are part of a bull, a snake, a boar, a cypress, and Cae
tes.
CIMRM I 723, figs 198-9.

-89. Budapest, Nat. Mus.
Alc\(\text{\textsc{s}}\)ut.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. Bust of Sol in upper left-hand corner, bust of Luna in upper right-hand corner. Above and below the main panel seven Mithraic scenes, including (below): Sol crowned by Mithras; Sol and Mithras dining; Mithras ascending the quadriga behind Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 254 & 368; Merkelbach 1984 378-9, fig. 144; CIMRM II, 1740.

-90. Cluj, Mus.
Micia.
Limestone.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays), in the upper right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM II, 2025; Merkelbach 1984, 387 fig. 155.

Kurtowo-Konare.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, frontal bust of Sol, and in right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM II, 2338; Merkelbach 1984, 392 fig. 164.
Limestone.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, in upper right-hand corner Luna.
CIMRM I, 92.

-97. Cairo, Mus. 85747.
Memphis, Mithraeum.
Limestone.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol (?), radiate nimbus. This bust appears to be bearded, and may be Saturn, although given the position, Sol seems more likely. Vermaseren describes this bust as Sol, without remarking on the beard, but his description is confused, as he also speaks of a bust of Saturn above the head of Mithras as well as one of Luna in the upper right-hand corner, neither of which are visible to me in the photograph he provides. For an apparently radiate bust of Saturn on a Mithraic relief, cf. a relief from the Dura Europos Mithraeum, CIMRM I, 40. CIMRM I, 91.

unknown.
marble.
undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays), in upper right hand corner bust of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 376; CIMRM 357, figure 102.

unknown.
marble.
undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate (in a quadriga, radiate); in the upper right hand corner Luna in a biga.
LIMC Helios/Sol 380; CIMRM 554, figure 158.

-100. Vatican, Cortile del Belvedere.
Unknown.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (six rays);

in the upper right hand corner bust of Luna with a four-pointed star above each point of the upturned crescent.
LIMC Helios/Sol 373; CIMRM 546, figure 154.

Unknown.
Marble.
Undated.
Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate; upper right, bust of Luna.
CIMRM I 759.

Ladenburg.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Mithras relief. Next to the tauroctony, Sol, standing, nude but for a chlamys, r. hand raised and holding whip; with his l. hand Sol holds the tail of the bull. Behind Sol, a lion jumps to the left. Below his feet are seven small altars. Mithras himself is bare-headed. In the upper r.-hand corner a raven facing Mithras. Below the bull and the altars, the dedicant (?) places a jar on an altar next to a kantharos, with to ether side a snake.

-103. Stuttgart, Landesmuseum.
Mundelsheim, villa rustica.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Votive altar for Sol, found together with an altar for Luna in the cellar of the villa, which served as a Mithraeum. Bust of Sol, chlamys, radiate with seven large, cut-out rays.
C2c Mithras

Sol Invictus Mithras, protagonist of the mysteries of Mithras, has loomed large, perhaps overly so, in studies of Roman imperial religion. The relevance of this cult for the study of the Roman sun god Sol is not easy to establish because the evidence is fundamentally contradictory. In his name Sol Invictus Mithras is normally treated as one deity, but in Mithraic art Sol and Mithras are invariably depicted as two separate ones. Furthermore, while Mithras is invariably depicted in Persian rather than Roman garb, Sol is always portrayed in his normal Roman guise.

The cult of Mithras thus raises two fundamental questions for our study: what is the relationship between Sol and Mithras, and what is the relationship between the Sol within Mithraism with Sol outside it? In this section we will explore these two questions, but make no attempt to answer them comprehensively. That is not only beyond the scope of this study but probably beyond the scope of surviving evidence altogether. In fact, one may wonder whether Mithraists themselves felt it necessary or even possible to “answer” these two questions clearly.

Mithraism in the Roman World

Of all the cults with a major profile in the Roman world, Mithraism was the cult most closely associated with Sol. Mithraism flourished in the Roman Empire from around AD 100 to the end of paganism. Mithraic shrines were small, closed structures, often underground, with a simple plan. A “typical” mithraeum is a fairly narrow rectangular room with an entrance on one short side from which an aisle leads directly to the altar at the other end. Along the length of the walls to either side of the aisle are two low platforms on which initiates attending a ceremony could recline. The shrines are invariably small, rarely offering space for more than thirty initiates and often even fewer. The floor and sides of the aisle as well as the wall behind the raised platforms could be decorated with a variety of frescos, mosaics, and sculpture in niches, but the most prominent decorative element of the mithraeum was without a doubt the depiction of Mithras slaying a bull - the tauroctony - which dominated the short side opposite the entrance. Depictions of the tauroctony were usually reliefs, but were sometimes painted. Three-dimensional sculptural tauroctonies also occurred.

There is no consensus among scholars about how the association between Mithras and Sol is to be interpreted, as this obviously depends on how Mithraism itself is understood and on that opinions vary widely. The traditional view, developed primarily by Franz Cumont and, in his wake, Maarten Vermaseren, seeks the roots of Mithraism in Persia and further East and understands the dissemination of the cult in terms of a continuous historical process that was already 2 millennia old by the time Mithraism reached Rome. Proselytizing adherents of the cult were credited for its rapid expansion in the Roman empire, the first Roman Mithraists being thought to have been soldiers posted on the empire’s Eastern border where they came into contact with the cult and its Persian adherents.

---

78 The literature on Roman Mithraism is vast. Beck (1984) gives an excellent overview, which is supplemented (up to 2001) by Martens & de Boe 2004; cf. also Clauss 2000, Beck 2006.

79 Beck (2006, 64): “No blood was spilled, as far as we know, in reconciling the singularity of the sun with the distinct personae of Sol and Mithras”.
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This understanding of the origins of Roman Mithraism is still upheld by many scholars today, but has come under sustained attack since the late 1970s. An alternative school of thought, represented notably by German scholars such as Reinhold Merckelbach and Manfred Clauss, argues that there were no direct links between the Roman cult of Mithras and the Persian Mitra either in terms of continuity of cult or the nature of their respective ideas. In this view, Mithraism in its Roman form was a Roman invention and was founded in either Rome or Ostia in the first century AD and spread from there to other parts of the Empire.

A third view, proposed by Roger Beck, sees the kingdom of Commagene as the missing link between Persia and Rome, and proposes that Mithraism entered Rome when the Commagenian royal family - to which the renowned astronomer Ti. Claudius Balbillus was closely connected - was exiled to Rome in AD 72.

Views on the nature or content of the cult vary as widely as views on its origin and cannot all be reviewed here (cf. supra n. 82). Most scholars have assumed the existence of a distinct Mithraic doctrine, the text of which has not survived. Some see that doctrine as rather simplistic, others as quite sophisticated, with suggested influences ranging from Platonism to Zoroastrian dualism. There has been general agreement, however, that whatever the doctrine was, key concepts of it were expressed in Mithraic art through the representation of significant events in a postulated Mithraic mythology. More recently, however, the very existence of a detailed Mithraic doctrine has been called into doubt. In this view Mithraism was focussed on ritual experience rather than theological doctrine, with no more than a loose cluster of general ideas underpinning the rituals.

That opinions about ancient Mithraism can differ so widely is the direct result, of course, of our lack of sources. It has an obvious impact on our goal to explore the deployment of the image types [sol] in Mithraic art. This is particularly the case because the different schools of thought about the nature of Mithraism deploy, or at least assume, very different modes of reading Mithraic art. Those who see Mithraism as firmly rooted in a carefully defined and detailed Mithraic doctrine tend to study the art of Mithraea primarily as a source for the narrative or for key concepts of that doctrine. The primary function of Mithraic images, they feel, was to illustrate Mithraic beliefs, and therein lies their value for the modern scholar. The problem with

---

80 See in particular Turcan 2000.

81 For a concise statement of this position, see Clauss 2000, 7. Merkelbach sees the founder of Roman Mithraism as someone with extensive knowledge of Persian religions; cf. Beck 2006, 50-3.

82 Balbillus’ daughter was the wife of Epiphanes, the son of Commagene’s last king Antiochus IV.

83 Clauss 2000, 16-7 (role of art); Boyce & Grenet 1991 (Zoroastrianism); Turcan 1982 (Neoplatonism); Swerdlow 1991 (unsophisticated cult).


85 Beck 2006, in particular p. 52 and n. 30.

86 Beck 2006, 17-19; Clauss (2000, 62) describes this approach as “thumbing through a picture book”.
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this approach is that it is particularistic and potentially circular. It relegates to images the role of reflecting meanings constructed verbally, in a written and/or oral doctrine. As we have seen in chapter two, this is not the best approach. Narrating verbal constructs as complex as religious doctrine is neither the task nor the strength of visual communication.

Fortunately those who downplay the importance of Mithraic doctrine take a different perspective. In their opinion Mithraic art’s main task was to create a (ritual) environment. This is not a trite dismissal of the art as wall-paper or window dressing but quite the opposite. It is a key notion which Beck in particular explores in detail. In his view the mithraeum in all its material and visual facets was the “material representation of the initiate’s cognized environment”.

In practice this means that we currently are dealing not only with competing hypotheses concerning Mithraism but also with two very different approaches to reading Mithraic art: the one sees Mithraism as a cult with a specific, elaborate doctrine that was taught to the initiates and illustrated by the art; the other sees it as a cult centred on meaningful rituals that were experienced by the initiates in an environment constructed by Mithraic material culture. For our purposes the second hypothesis provides the more fruitful and dynamic context for our analysis of the image types [sol], not because it is better than the other, but because it approaches the art and material culture of Mithraism in a more sophisticated and theoretically informed manner. Notably Beck (2006) has devoted much attention to analysing the visual and experiential meanings of Mithraic material culture as a whole. In what manner initiates apprehended the Mithraeum (as opposed to “Mithraism”) is one of his central questions. He approaches this from various perspectives, some quite controversial, but from a theoretical standpoint Beck’s approach to the material culture is without a doubt the most convincing, which is why his study forms the best backdrop for our discussion.

Roman Cosmology
The principles of Roman cosmology are key to understanding Mithraism as Beck sees it, and therefore we should by briefly reviewing them here. Romans held that earth was at the centre of the universe, which consisted of eight concentric spheres revolved around earth. On the eighth and outermost sphere one found the fixed stars in their constellations. On the other seven spheres one found the seven planets. These latter spheres revolved in a different fashion, causing these seven planets to “wander” rather than retain their fixed place as all other stars did. The seven wanderers were: Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn.

Because the movement of the planets and stars was circular - around earth - rather than linear - down towards earth - the stars and planets were deemed to be of a fundamentally different matter. Furthermore, because the stars and planets had circular movement and were fixed to or associated with spheres, their movement and nature was deemed to be of a higher order - circle and sphere being “perfect” shapes. Hence the heavenly bodies were divine, and being divine, Beck 2006, passim, but see in particular chapter 7.

Beck 2006, 141.

His reliance on cognitivist approaches to locate religion physically and neurologically in the brain, for example, is bound to raise questions.
their movements must be meaningful and - potentially at least - of influence on events on earth. There was no consensus on the extent of that influence, but the basic notion that the movement of heavenly bodies was meaningful was widely shared. Research into what those meanings might be, i.e. astrology, was hence an integral part of ancient astronomy.

**Beck’s Mithraism**

This basic Roman cosmology provides the backbone for Beck’s analysis of Mithraic space, in particular the mithraeum.\(^{90}\) In his view this “cave” was a model of the cosmos,\(^{91}\) instantiating the northern hemisphere of the celestial sphere. “North” is defined by the axis around which the sphere rotates, the upper point of the axis being the northern pole of the celestial sphere, and the lower point the southern pole. The southern hemisphere is not incorporated in the mithraeum but notionally extends below the floor of the shrine. The north-south axis is a line running straight down from the midpoint of the ceiling to the midpoint of the floor of the mithraeum. The entrance into the mithraeum thus marks the transition from “outside” the cosmic sphere to inside it, with the entrant walking, so to say, at the level of the celestial equator. The further details of this model - the benches along the side as the celestial equator and ecliptic, the position of the equinoxes and solstices, the seasons and the planets, the signs of the zodiac, etc., as defined in Beck’s “blueprint” of an ideal mithraeum - need not concern us here. The specifics are germane, of course, to any attempt at an exhaustive analysis of the image types [sol] in Mithraic art, but that falls beyond the scope of the present study.

Important from our perspective is a more general point Beck makes when he explores the manner in which initiates perceived or apprehended the mithraeum. He stresses the notion that the mithraeum was real, i.e. not a model or re-presentation of the cosmos, but a real universe which the initiate apprehended as such, just as he experienced the rituals there not as enactments but as “already so”, i.e. as “actual”. Beck’s arguments in support of this are too complex and multifaceted to be presented here, and are drawn from a wide variety of sources and disciplines, ranging from work done on other ancient mystery cults to modern neurology and even avian biology!\(^{92}\) But in his conclusion of his section on the “blueprint” of the mithraeum he stresses an aspect of the Mithraic “experience” (and the difficulty describing it) that is worth quoting in full:

> The problem is not so much the inability to enter other minds as the ‘ineffability’ of the experience. It is literally indescribable. This is not because it is or pretends to be something particularly grand or ‘sacred’. It is simply that language cannot do the job. (...) Language is linear, sequential, left-brain, and so cannot narrate a quintessentially right-brain experience (visuo-spatial, simultaneous or non-temporal, holistic). (...) The experience simply cannot be captured in normal descriptive narrative. Metaphor is the

\(^{90}\) Beck 2006, 61.

\(^{91}\) Beck 2006, 102-118.

\(^{92}\) Beck 2006, 119-152. Avian biology enters the discussion on pp. 149-50, where Beck analyses the cognitive implications of the Indigo Bunting’s demonstrated ability to navigate by the stars.
best that normal language can do.\textsuperscript{93}

By focussing on space and ritual in this manner, Beck achieves results that represent a major advance. Most importantly he allows the visual, material evidence to “speak” with its own voice. It is important to realize that this does not merely allow him to redefine Mithraic doctrine but obliges him to do so.\textsuperscript{94} The evidence we have points to great care and much attention devoted to the physical and visual articulation of the mithraeum. This is valuable information for the experiential, ineffable aspects of Mithraism but offers little information on possible narratives and doctrines. In fact, we have no evidence for the existence of learned doctrines in Mithraism. On the contrary, what evidence we have best supports the notion that Mithraism was held together by a fairly loose set of general principles drawn from standard Roman cosmology.\textsuperscript{95}

Beck defines some of these main principles early in his study and returns to them in his conclusion.\textsuperscript{96} He begins with two fundamental sacred postulates or “axioms”, namely (1.) that \textit{Deus Sol Invictus Mithras} is the god of the cult and (2.) that there is “harmony of tension in opposition”, a notion which Beck derives from Porphyry \textit{de antro} 29 and traces back ultimately to Heraclitus. These axioms are expressed in a wide range of \textit{motifs}, such as ascent and descent or light and darkness, and operate in various domains, four of which Beck identifies specifically: 1. the myth or story of Mithras’ deeds; 2. the cosmos; 3. earth; 4. the destiny of human souls. “Domains” can thus be spatial (2, 3), but need not be (1, 4). The axioms and motifs were conveyed by a symbol system that had two forms, one physical and one organisational. The physical symbol system is that of the mithraeum and its art, with a particularly important role for the tauroctony, the definitive icon of Mithraism.\textsuperscript{97} The seven grades of initiation constitute the organisational symbol system. In addition to this symbol system Beck argues that Mithraism communicated with the idiom of what he terms star talk, the “language” of the stars and planets that is “spoken” through their meaningful movements. In Beck’s view initiates apprehended all this in four modes: 1. through ritual; 2. through meaningful iconography; 3. verbally; 4. by leading their life in accordance with the ethical principles of Mithraism.

This is the framework of Mithraism as Beck perceives it, and which his book explores and tests. We do not have space here to elaborate on Beck’s understanding of Mithraism in greater detail, nor do we need to, given the very preliminary nature of our own analyses. It is

\textsuperscript{93} Beck 2006, 150.

\textsuperscript{94} Beck 2006, chapter 4, “Doctrine Redefined”.

\textsuperscript{95} Beck 2006, 57-8.

\textsuperscript{96} Beck 2006, 5-8, 257-260.

\textsuperscript{97} Beck (2006, 7) presents the mithraeum and the tauroctony as two separate and distinctive structures of the physical symbol system. I believe that this assumes too great a dichotomy between architecture and art. In my opinion neither is complete without the other and in particular with three-dimensional tauroctony-statue groups it is impossible to establish clearly where the tauroctony ends and the mithraeum begins. In fact, if - as seems likely - actual rays of light admitted under carefully controlled circumstances served to link Sol with Mithras in the manner of the extended ray on tauroctony reliefs, then the Mithraeum is integral to the tauroctony.
worth stressing again, however, the superiority of Beck’s framework in terms of its theoretical and methodological basis compared to previous analyses of Mithraic material culture. Notably his attention to semiotics, and his concern to establish how Mithraic culture means rather than focussing on what it means, resonate with some of the major theoretical concerns of my own study and are much needed steps forward in Mithraic research.  In this context we should note again Beck’s emphasis on the importance of ritual, visual, material and in general experiential meanings in Mithraism that cannot be adequately conveyed with words.

The tauroctony
Sol plays a role in a range of stock themes in Mithraism’s rich iconography, including the most common and, presumably, most important “icon” of the cult, the tauroctony. In this scene, which depicts Mithras in the act of stabbing a bull, Sol and Luna are two of the indispensable figures. They occur on every tauroctony without exception. Their role is minor, however, and their position marginal. Sol occupies the upper left hand corner of the main composition, Luna the upper right hand corner. They are invariably depicted on a much smaller scale than the main figures - Mithras, the bull, a snake, a dog, a scorpion, a raven and two torchbearers known as Cautes and Cautopates - either as small busts or driving their respective chariots (a quadriga of horses for Sol, and a biga of horses or oxen for Luna). Sol is generally, but not always, radiate, and nude but for a chlamys. His attribute is usually a whip, sometimes a globe, often nothing. In short, iconographically there is nothing that sets this Sol apart from the standard Sol-types of the Roman Empire.

The tauroctony depicts Mithras in the act of killing a bull with his dagger. A dog and a snake catch the blood from the wound while a scorpion grabs the testicles of the bull. It is normally understood to be a depiction of a major event in Mithraic mythology, but as we have no Mithraic texts we do not know the narrative of the myth or grasp the precise doctrinal significance Mithraists may have attached to the tauroctony, types of information that the image itself cannot communicate in any detail. This may seem obvious, but it actually has significant implications. For it raises the question whether the tauroctony was meant to communicate

---

98 E.g. Beck 2006, 8.

99 This holds true for all two-dimensional tauroctonies (reliefs, frescos). Sculptural groups of Mithras slaying the bull were also popular, but in such cases adjacent figures such as Cautes and Cautopates, Luna, Sol and the raven, either had to be dispensed with or were produced and placed separately. There is evidence that with sculptural groups of the tauroctony the actual depiction of Sol could be replaced by lighting effects which allowed beams of light to illuminate Mithras in appropriate fashion. Cf., e.g. the Mithraeum of the Baths of Mithras in Ostia (Pavolini 2006, 126-7).

100 A late fourth c. AD relief from Sidon (C2c.86) forms one of the rare exceptions to this rule.

101 Quadriga and biga: C2c.1 (Mithras behind Sol!), 4, 30, 37 (Sol on a biga of horses, Luna oxen), 48, 53 (only Sol in his chariot, Luna not in hers), 58, 99; busts: C2c.2, 3, 5-7, 10-14, 16-22, 24-5, 27, 29, 33-4, 36, 38-41, 43-4, 46-7, 50, 52, 57, 59, 61, 63, 67, 72, 75-6, 79-83, 87-94, 96-8, 100-101. Sometimes four horses or protomes of horses accompany the bust of Sol: C2c.15, 31, 68, 78 .

102 For busts of Sol without rays cf., e.g., C2c.50, 53, 78.
Mithraic myth and/or doctrine at all, if not, to what degree knowledge of that myth or doctrine was necessary for the Mithraic viewer to understand the image. I do not doubt that there was a Mithraic narrative of some sort in verbal form - Beck’s domain 1 - but there is no hard evidence that the cult revolved around that myth or doctrine. On the contrary, in the context of Roman religion in general one would expect the ritual and experiential aspects of the cult to have been central. The function of ritual is neither to teach nor to elucidate doctrine. Ritual is not about understanding but about mediation between the participants and the divine. In Mithraism, according to Beck, that mediation took a specific form typical of initiation cults. Mithraic ritual allowed its initiates to experience that which it is impossible to describe, in Mithraism’s case the descent and ascent of the soul through the seven spheres of heaven.

Whether or not Beck is correct in the details does not really matter for the more general point, that ritual in cults such as Mithraism allows the initiates to experience the teachings of the cult in a manner that is ineffable, beyond words. The site of the ritual - in this case the mithraeum - and its trappings play an integral role in the ritual, and that must particularly have been the case with the tauroctony, prominent as it is in every mithraeum. In line with the nature of the cult we must consider the tauroctony in the first place as ritual object contributing to the experience the initiate underwent. Under such circumstances any narrative content recedes to the background. Interpretation of the primary meanings of the tauroctony should then focus its ritual roles rather than on the story behind the picture. A parallel from modern Catholicism may illustrate my meaning more clearly. Classrooms in Catholic schools normally have a crucifix on the wall. The crucifix plays an important role in creating an identity for the classroom and the school as a whole, but the doctrine behind the crucifix, i.e. its “narrative” aspect, is irrelevant as far as understanding its function and meaning is concerned. Crucifixes in classrooms are not tools to disseminate Catholic doctrine, but identity markers used to create an atmosphere that in many respects cannot be clearly communicated with words.

This does not mean that there is no doctrine behind the crucifix. Invariably, for example, the wound in Christ’s side is depicted, from which both blood and water had gushed forth. This wound and the water that came out of it have been the subject of intense theological debates, but no one would turn to such debates to help explain the role of our classroom crucifixes, any more than they would consider the crucifix a useful source for understanding the wound and its theological meanings.

I am not suggesting that the tauroctony played the same role in the mithraeum as the crucifix of our example in the classroom. Neither am I suggesting that there is an equally elaborate Mithraic doctrine behind the tauroctony frieze as there is a Christian one behind the crucifix. My point is simply that irrespective of the nature of Mithraic doctrine (elaborate and detailed or loosely grouped and general) it is important to realize that the primary function of the tauroctony was not didactic or doctrinal. Any lost Mithraic text(s) reflected in such images as the tauroctony provided non-essential narrative detail, that is, narrative that is integral to the image,
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103 Beard, North and Price 47-9; Beck 2006, 128-34.

104 Beck 2006, 41-4; cf. 284 (index) under “soul, descent and ascent of”.

105 John 19, 34.
but that does not need to be fully apprehended in order for one to understand the visual meanings of that image or to experience its full impact. Although the narrative is inscribed on the monument, the monument is not intended to convey the narrative and the (Mithraic) viewer does not expect it to.

**Narrative form and visual meanings in Roman monuments**

This lack of narrative purpose in the ostensibly narrative tauroctony is not exceptional in Roman art. There are numerous cases in the Roman world where we find an inscribed narrative that does not establish the visual meaning. In an ontological sense the narrative is apparently an essential component of the monument in these cases, but in semantic terms that monument is not, or not primarily, intended to convey the narrative.

The column of Trajan is a prime example of an ostensibly narrative monument whose primary visual meanings are non-discursive. The column consists of an exceptionally long and minutely detailed sequential narrative in visual form which was and is, in any practical sense, illegible. The higher portions of the column cannot have been visible at all to the unaided eye of a Roman, and even if they were, the sheer exertion required to crane one’s neck and walk around the column of Trajan 23 times to peruse the 190 m. long sequential frieze of increasingly minute figures is such that no artist in his right mind would have even considered communicating a narrative in this fashion if that narrative were the main message, or if apprehending that narrative in any detail were a necessary prerequisite for understanding the monument. Consequently we cannot maintain that the purpose of the column was to communicate the events depicted on its frieze. “Reading” those events in their entirety was impossible and therefore cannot have been necessary for the column to have the desired impact on the viewer.

Veyne sees no reason to be troubled by this indifference to the viewer and visibility.
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106 On Mithraism as experience rather than doctrine, see Beck 2006, 93-5, 133-40, and *passim*.

107 It has been suggested that the higher scenes were still legible because the use of paint enhanced the visibility of the images. Others have said that the two libraries flanking the column of Trajan may have had balconies from which one had a good view of the upper scenes.

108 On this difficulty of “reading” the frieze of the column of Trajan, cf. Davies 1997, 44-5, (quoting a range of earlier studies), and 58-60, and Veyne 2002. In almost all cases, it has been taken for granted that the inscribed scenes were *meant* to be viewed and an answer is sought to the question *how* that was achieved (Veyne 2002, 5-6 nn. 10 & 11, gives examples ranging from 1916 to 1996). But there is no satisfactory answer to that question. The proposed balconies, for example, would require the viewer either to constantly run up and down the stairs from one balcony to the other, or to give up on following the sequence of the narrative as it winds its way around the column. The only alternative is to postulate connected balconies on all four sides of the column area, which is highly unlikely. Rather than bend over backwards to come up with some way in which Romans could “read” the whole column, we should simply accept that this was impossible, which means that it was unimportant (unless the artist was an idiot, which does not seem likely). If that conflicts with our notions of how to view (and produce) such a monument then the Romans apparently did not share those notions - which makes it all the more interesting to answer the question why so much effort was expended on producing such a carefully detailed visual narrative that was never meant to be actually read.

109 Davies (1997, 58-60) cogently rejects suggestions that the column’s design was flawed.
“Cette indifférence s’explique bien simplement : le décor de la colonne est une expression d’apparat impérial et non une information de propagande communiquée au spectateur”. To the extent that Veyne means that the column constructs an aura of Trajanic imperial power - further on Veyne uses the term charisme for the power of Augustan imagery - this is perhaps an example of what we have termed “visual meanings” in chapter two. Throughout his article Veyne resolutely rejects the term propaganda for such art-works as Trajan’s column because it imbues images with meanings that are too precise and specific and misreads the nature of that which the imagery expressed, a line of thought that is very similar to our rejection in chapter two of verbalized meanings for images. But Veyne underestimates the semantic power of Roman images in a Roman context. Like so many scholars, he treats coins, for instance, as self-contained vehicles of imagery, rather than as part of a more concerted program of events, ceremonies and other ephemeral images, which leads him to downplay their semantic potential and impact too strongly. As for images in general, Veyne assumes (without clear evidence) that most were only comprehensible to a privileged few. This does not take into account the preponderance of image types for complex scenes which rendered individual depictions far more readily recognizable. Veyne is no doubt correct that few professors in the Sorbonne could say what sculpture adorns their university’s main entrance, but his referent is irrelevant because underlying that sculpture is a different type of force pragmatique. A closer parallel to Roman visual literacy is perhaps the museum guard in Athens who, upon learning my daughters’ names, could describe with some degree of accuracy the iconography and attributes of each of their patron saints. The difference is not in the degree of knowledge, but in the awareness that in Greek Orthodox visual culture the correct and appropriate image for a given situation or context is quite narrowly defined.

As a consequence of this, Veyne exaggerates the difference between expression and information in the case of the column of Trajan. It too did not stand in isolation, but was part of a much broader range of initiatives, expressing its visual meanings in consort with them. That the sculptural detail is not central but supportive of those meanings certainly makes them more visually expressive rather than verbally informative, but that affects the manner, not the degree, in which they communicate with the viewer.

A completely different approach to the problem is that of Davies (1997). She proposes that the column of Trajan, being a funerary monument, was decorated with its spiral frieze to impose upon the viewer the necessity to walk around the monument in a manner reminiscent of the ritual circumambulation associated with tombs. Thus in her reading the ritual experience of the monument subordinates the narrative, and the impossibility of reading the entire frieze is inconsequential; reading only a small part is enough to achieve the desired effect: the ritual of walking around the tomb a few times. At the same time, the presence of the frieze imbues the
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100 Veyne 2002, 9.
113 Veyne 2002, 14-16.
column with a narrative of which the broad outlines (war, victory) can be sensed, without being actually read, by anyone viewing the column. To those for whom it was important, the details of the narrative were available nearby, but in a different format; for it is safe to assume that a copy of Trajan’s *Dacica*, the written account of his Dacian campaigns, was deposited in the adjacent Latin library.

Whether we agree with Veyne, Davies, or neither in their understanding of Trajan’s column need not concern us here. Our main point is clear. The column of Trajan is one of the clearest examples of “illegible” narrative imagery in the ancient world. It is not the only one, nor were “illegible” narratives restricted to visual imagery. The content of many inscriptions was also essentially inaccessible because of the inscription’s length, placement and/or letter size, and of course widespread analphabetism. One example, quite closely related to Trajan’s column, is the *Res Gestae* of Augustus inscribed on two bronze stelae by the entrance of his mausoleum. We do not know the size of these columns, but the lettering must have been quite small, significantly reducing the inscriptions’ legibility in practical terms. The point is not that long inscriptions with tiny letters could not be read at all, but that they are not practical if reading them was the main purpose. These too are visual monuments of which the text is an integral part, but whose main message requires only that the viewer apprehends the presence of the text and its general nature, not its precise contents.
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114 Perhaps the most famous example is the Parthenon frieze (Boardman 1999, 306-7); cf. Veyne 2002, 10.

115 According to the inscription in Ankara (CIL III, p. 772), line 3, the *Res Gestae* were incised “in duabus pilis aheneis quae su[n]t Romae positae”, i.e. on two pilasters (*stelai* in the Greek version of the inscription) of bronze set up in Rome. Suetonius (*Aug.* 101.4) speaks of bronze *tabulae* (plaques) which were to be placed *ante mausoleum*. Buchner (1996, 167-8) has identified two rectangular foundations to either side of the entrance as the base for the bronze-plated pilasters, which he reconstructs as stelai that were 5 Roman feet (almost 1m50) wide. The *Res Gestae* has roughly 2600 words totaling over 15600 letters. To calculate how much space that would occupy on the two bronze stelae we can take the inscription on the base of the column of Trajan as an easily legible benchmark and starting point. Its letters are about 11.5 cms. high and on average it has about 10 letters per metre horizontally, and 6 lines per metre vertically, i.e. 60 letters per square metre. Let us assume that the letters covered the stele over almost the full width (1.40 m) and that both sides of each stele were used for a total of four sides. We can then make the following calculation: 15600 ÷ 4 = 3900 letters per side; 14 letters per line x 6 lines per vertical metre = 84 letters per vertical metre. 3900 ÷ 84 = 46.4. This means that if each line was 1.40 m long, and the same letter size and proportion was used as on the later Trajanic inscription, the inscribed portion of each stele would have to be 46.4 metres high - an obvious impossibility. If we reduce the letters of the *Res Gestae* to one-fifth that height (i.e. to 2.3 cms) and maintain the same proportions, we arrive at 70 letters per line and 30 lines vertically, i.e. 2100 letters per vertical metre. Each inscription would then still be almost 2 m. high on each stele, which means that if one includes a base of about 0.7 - 1.0 metres, the top lines would be a metre or more above the top of an adult viewer’s head. Of course we can fiddle more with the parameters. Buchner proposes letters of 1.5 cm high for an inscribed surface, on each of the four sides, of 1.40 m high, but however one reconstructs it, restricting the inscription to two stelai flanking the entrance was a decision that significantly limited its legibility. On the mausoleum of Augustus cf. *LTUR* s.v. “Mausoleum Augusti” (von Hesberg “das Monument”, Marciocca “le sepolture”); on the *Res Gestae* cf. Güven 1998; on inscriptions as "monumental writing" cf. Woolf 1996.

116 Other good examples of inscriptions whose primary purpose cannot have been that they were read, include the *tabulae Iliaceae* and the like with their minute lettering; cf. Habinek 2009, 124-136; on the *tabulae Iliaceae* in general cf. Sadurska 1964. Cf. also the inscriptions on the backs of the statues at Nemrud Dağ, the famous Epicurean inscription at Oinoanda, the imperial decrees and letters inscribed on the “archive wall” of the northern.
Roman visual culture was accustomed, then, to monuments that could theoretically be read as a detailed text, but for which the presence of the text was more important than its details. Returning to the tauroctony, this means that it is conceivable that the tauroctony reliefs are not about the tauroctony, in the sense that the story of Mithras killing the bull is not essential or even central to the tauroctony’s visual function(s). It is enough to know that there is a story behind the image, and one doesn’t need to actually know the story to grasp the essence of the relief, as its purpose is not to convey that story.

Tauroctony, Sol, and visual meanings
It is possible, even likely, then that much of the meanings of the tauroctony existed independently of the story of Mithras killing a bull. It is hence to be expected that the meanings that Sol brings to the tauroctony are not defined by his role, whatever it may have been, in the mythology of Mithraism. We have already seen that Sol is an indispensable component of the tauroctony, together with Luna. Clearly the two are essential to the meaning of the monument, and as the primary function of the tauroctony cannot have been to narrate Mithraic myth, we must search elsewhere than in those myths for the meanings of the Sol-Luna pair.

The manner in which Sol and Luna “frame” the main image of the tauroctony is common outside Mithraic iconography. It was already a well-established visual motif before the first tauroctonies were produced, and in the sections of the catalogue that follow, we will repeatedly meet the same motif of Sol and Luna as diminutive additions to the main scene. There can be no doubt that any visually literate person in the empire would immediately recognize it as a common visual motif with its own specific meanings. In one significant respect, however, the Sol of the tauroctonies does differ from the comparable depictions in other contexts. Mithras is invariably depicted looking back over his shoulder at Sol, and often one of Sol’s rays is extended all the way to Mithras. A raven is also depicted flying from Sol to Mithras. This link between Sol and Mithras is remarkable because it emphasizes the connection between the two, and brings out Sol’s participation in the event depicted. In other words, Sol is depicted as part of the standard visual motif or image type [sol-luna], which almost by definition had a conventionalized, non-narrative meaning, and at the same time Sol is depicted connected to Mithras in a manner which no doubt referenced specific Mithraic concepts.

Sol, then, is one pole in two dualistic units. The one is the image-type [sol-luna] which evokes dualities of light and darkness, heat and cold, ascending and descending, male and female, and the like. The other is defined by his connection with Mithras. In a shrine dedicated to the cult of Sol Invictus Mithras it is through this connection that the tauroctony as main image brings into focus the complexity as contradictory nature of the identity of the cult’s protagonist. Not only is Sol Invictus Mithras depicted as two separate figures, respectively Sol and Mithras, but the two are also portrayed as profoundly different in identity and nature from each other. Sol is essentially static, either fixed and immobile as bust, or engaged in his eternal, predictable cyclical motion as

\[ \text{parodos of the theatre at Aphrodisias, etc. (with thanks to Prof. E. Moormann for suggesting most of these examples). A modern parallel of sorts could be the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington. The 58,256 inscribed names are absolutely integral to the monument but one does not need to read all those names to experience the monument’s devastating impact.} \]
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solar charioteer. Mithras is the very opposite of this immutable, timeless image. He is in the act of killing the bull, the culminating moment of a fierce struggle and in Mithraic mythology presumably an event of major doctrinal importance. Thus in connecting the eternal Sol Invictus with Mithras in his moment of victory, the extended ray, the raven, and the gaze of Mithras are in effect uniting two opposites. This may not be how this aspect of the tauroctony was meant to be read overtly - if there was a correct way to read the tauroctony - but this tension of connected opposites was clearly an element of its visual rhetoric. One can extend this rhetoric to include the peripheral (Sol) and central (Mithras), Roman (Sol) and Persian (Mithras; note the chiastic contrast with the previous), small and large, sky and earth, light and the darkness of the Mithraic grotto, etc.

One essential characteristic of the tauroctony, then, is its rhetoric of tension/connection between opposites, not just in Sol and Mithras, but also in others, such as Cautes and Cautopates. Being visual communication, the tauroctony naturally does not define or prescribe precisely which opposites one should think of, nor does it limit its communication to the juxtaposition of opposites. At the narrative level the tauroctony depicts a significant event in Mithraic mythology, at which Mithras, in consort with the sun, kills a bull. It has also been shown, convincingly, that the tauroctony is a star chart and contributes to the definition of the Mithraeum as a whole as a model of the cosmos, thus representing the theological foundation of Mithraism. In short, the tauroctony is a complex, polysemous image that narrates an event of central importance to Mithraism with a rhetoric of tension/connection between opposites in a form that explicitly symbolizes the cosmological foundations of the cult.

Other Mithraic Representations of Sol
Sol also occurs in other roles in the rich Mithraic iconography. On elaborate tauroctony reliefs, he may appear as one of the seven planetary deities, either as bust or as full-length figure. Often the seven planets are evoked simply by seven stars, sometimes seven altars. He also appears in a number of other scenes of Mithraic myth. The most important of these is a banquet of Sol and Mithras together. Usually this is depicted as a minor scene below a tauroctony, but it is sometimes depicted on the reverse of revolving tauroctony reliefs or independently on a relief on its own. A number of other Mithraic scenes involving Sol occur with some frequency, usually on small panels to either side of a tauroctony. We find him as charioteer with Mithras stepping into the chariot behind him, or kneeling before Mithras, radiate crown removed, while Mithras holds an unidentified object over his head. Sol is also shown shaking hands with Mithras or
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117 On Cautes and Cautopates as the “principal expression” of this theme or axiom, cf. Beck 2006, 6.

118 For a concise summary of the tauroctony as star chart see Beck 2006, 194-7, with numerous references to more detailed discussions on p. 194.

119 Sol, standing, with other planetary deities: C2c.29; bust: C2c.54, 67.

120 E.g. CIMRM 1818, fig. 471.

121 Small panels with dining scene: C2c.8, 10, 23, 29(!), 34, 36, 38-9, 58, 63-5, 77, 82, 89; two-sided reliefs: C2c1, 5, 29 (!); separate relief: C2c.28, 42. Note that on C2c.29 the dining scene is depicted twice.
roasting meat together over a burning altar. In addition we have a few examples of other, less common scenes in which Sol was depicted, and numerous other depictions of Sol, found in Mithraea but not directly “mythological” or connected with a tauroctony.

Most of these images are unique to Mithraism, and strictly speaking they do not adhere to the norms of the standard image type [sol] as Sol is depicted engaging in a range of activities. Nonetheless, in most respects Sol’s depiction in these scenes is governed by the same conventions and practices as those of the image type [sol] outside the cult. In the first place it is noteworthy that while Mithras is depicted in Persian attire, the depictions of Sol in all scenes of Mithraic myth always adhere to the established Graeco-Roman iconography. This Roman attire of Sol is striking and deserves closer attention in particular in the case of the two small figures of Sol and Luna framing the tauroctony. In their Graeco-Roman iconography these two deities stand in marked contrast to the three larger, and more central figures of every tauroctony: Mithras, Cautes and Cautopates, who are invariably visually defined as Persian/Mithraic. The roots of this Graeco-Roman image type [sol-luna] amply predate the first evidence for Roman Mithraic iconography. In a very literal sense, then, Mithraic artists introduced through the Sol-Luna pair a Roman element into a scene which they were otherwise careful to define culturally as Persian. This undeniably adds another element to the rhetoric of tension of opposites in the tauroctony: the Roman Sol versus the Persian Mithras. Each juxtaposition of Sol and Mithras in one of the minor scenes reiterates that Roman-Persian contrast.

Visual Meanings in Mithraism

If we follow Beck (2006, 5-6), we can assume that this contrast between Mithras and Sol was a deliberate choice, for Beck defines one of the two main axioms of Mithraism as the “harmony of tension in opposition”, the other axiom being “Deus Sol Invictus Mithras”. In our reading the dual and contrasting depiction of the latter axiom in Mithraic art would embody the
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122 Mithras stepping onto Sol’s chariot: C2c.2, 8, 27, 29, 34, 35-9, 58, 63-6, 73, 77, 80, 82, 89; Sol kneeling before Mithras: C2c.29, 34, 39, 58, 63-4, 66, 77, 80, 89; Sol and Mithras shaking hands over an altar (or roasting meat): C2c.29, 58, 66, 73, 82.

123 Examples include Sol carrying a disc of some sort (C2c.58), Sol and bearded figure, capite velato (Saturn? C2c.88), and Sol and Phaethon (C2c.8).

124 Examples include C2c.9 (statue base), 26 (altar), 32, 45 (lead plaque, rays cut out), 49 (marble plaque, rays cut out), 51, 55 (altar with cautopates; busts of Sol and Luna), 56 (votive altar, bust of Sol, rays cut out), 60 (votive altar, bust Sol), 62 (altar, Sol, rays cut out), 70 (altar; Mithras and Sol holding meat above burning altar), 71 (altar, full-length figure of Sol with whip and globe), 74 (Sol, raised r. hand, billowing cloak), 84, 102.

125 In some cases Sol has removed his radiate crown and it is hanging on the wall behind him or lying on the ground next to him. Note that on these reliefs Luna is likewise depicted in her Graeco-Roman iconography, while Cautes and Cautopates on the other hand wear a Persian cap and clothes similar to Mithras.

126 The essential figures of the tauroctony are Mithras, Cautes, Cautopates, Sol, Luna, the bull, the dog, the snake, the scorpion, and the raven.

former one - Deus Sol Invictus Mithras being depicted as two distinct and distinctly antithetical figures. Whether or not this confirms that Beck has correctly identified Mithraism’s central axioms is not our concern. While Beck’s axioms clearly have bearing on one’s understanding of Mithraism, they are not the driving force behind our analysis of what Mithraic iconography tells us about the use and potential meanings of the canonic Sol-image of Roman art. For irrespective of whether we follow Beck or anyone else in attempting to ascertain what the tauroctony (and other canonical Mithraic images) meant to Mithraists, we cannot escape the visual, iconographic contrast that is consistently maintained in Mithraic art between Sol and Mithras. Just as the word Sol would introduce a Latin element if it were used in an otherwise Persian text - indeed it does so in the name Sol Invictus Mithras - so the images of Sol and Luna inject a Roman iconographic element into a self-styled “Persian” representation, the tauroctony. What meaning(s) this duality conveyed to Mithraists we do not know, but for our purposes the mere presence of the contrast reinforces the romanness of the Sol-image itself and thereby its connotations of Rome, i.e. empire.

Connoting Rome and the associations of empire and order that Rome evoked is not, of course, the meaning (or function) of the image type [sol-luna], either in the tauroctony or outside the Mithraic sphere. It emerges as one of the numerous elements that Sol (with or without Luna) can inject into the palette of meanings of an image or context in which he figures. And while the notion of romanness is vague, it is still too denotative to capture the fluidity and potential breadth of that aspect of the Sol-image. Inherent in visual communication is that much of the “message” is achieved through the evoking of associations, and I use romanness as an imperfect catchall for one specific group of associations Sol appears to have evoked in Mithraic art. In a verbally oriented culture such as our academic one, the fluidity of these evoked associations grates, and we are tempted to try and pin down the meaning(s) of the image and its associated concepts more precisely. But in Roman society (and other societies) the visual played (and plays) a far more central role in the communication and construction of concepts. It did not supplement the verbal definition of these concepts, or evoke the words, or stand in loco verborum (see chpt. 2); the images themselves and the experiences associated with them instantiated the concepts. The “message” was itself visual and experiential without there necessarily being a detailed verbal counterpart. Recipients of such messages visualized and experienced rather than verbalized them.

Beck (2006) emphasizes this within a broader framework in his analysis of the Mithraic experience, quoting among others Jonathan Z. Smith on the nascence of the “western world view” under the impetus of the Reformation, in which ritual is not “real” but becomes a symbol, and not necessarily a symbol of reality.128 In the world of Mithraism, according to Beck, there was no conception of such a gap between ritual and reality. “If we are to understand the mithraeum or, more to the point, to understand the initiate’s apprehension of his mithraeum, we have to ... reseal the gap” that we think exists between ritual and reality, because Romans in general and Mithraists in particular did not perceive that gap to exist. For them the ritual was real, not symbolic of some extra-ritual reality. Hence for the Mithraic initiate in imperial Rome there was no symbolic relation between the mithraeum and the universe it represented: “the mithraeum
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is the universe; the authorized microcosm is the macrocosm” (Beck’s emphasis). This brings us back to that fundamental issue which I raised in chapter 2: the Roman mode of viewing and the nature of visual meanings in the Roman world. Beck’s exploration of a Mithraist’s experience of Mithraism further illustrates how necessary it is not to take Roman viewing and visual experience for granted, as it was probably very different from ours. Indeed, the richness of the visual experience in Mithraea is further indication of the importance of that experiential aspect of the visual.

If we project the importance of the experiential onto the figures of Sol and Luna in Mithraic art again, we must first of all take to heart the problem of symbolic meanings. To paraphrase Beck, Sol and Luna do not symbolize, they are Sol and Luna - not the Sol and Luna of “raw” reality, which we cannot apprehend, but in this case the Mithraic Sol and Luna apprehended through the Mithraic mental template internalized by the initiate. It is not that they do not mean, nor that they do not mean symbolically, but that they do not symbolize verbal concepts. The visual meaning of Sol and Luna was by its very nature - that is by virtue of being visual - to a significant degree ineffable. To what degree depends on our interpretation of the specific image or image category, but for the purpose of this study it is enough to establish the importance of that ineffability. What we must bear in mind, when dealing with the inferences about Sol that we can draw from his occurrence in Mithraism, is that a powerful case can (and has) been made that Sol’s meaning, indeed the meaning of Mithraic visual culture as a whole, was to a significant degree experienced but unspoken, indeed beyond speech.

In the romaniness of Sol and Luna we find a possible example of this that is relatively straightforward. One could argue that the “harmony of tension in opposition” of Sol and Mithras in their unified duality of “Roman” (Sol) and “foreign” (Mithras) embodied a fundamental feature of the “Roman experience”, of what it “meant” to be an inhabitant of the Roman empire. Sol and Luna represent the “Roman” or “imperial” in each inhabitant, Mithras the “other” or “regional” which was also part of almost every inhabitant’s identity, and Sol Mithras the successfully achieved harmony of these aspects seemingly at odds with each other. This is certainly not what the tauroctony or Mithraism as a whole is meant to symbolize in any discursive sense. But it is precisely such non-discursive meanings - or should we speak of effects? - of art that we are seeking to stress. To quote Tanner (2001, 260): “‘Expressive symbolism’, objectified as ‘art’ ..., is the primary medium through which affect or feeling is culturally shaped and socially controlled ... thereby motivating commitment to certain social rules or systems of cultural representation” (my emphasis). Without expressly verbalizing it the Mithraist may have intuitively felt recognition and acknowledgement of his own “duality” in the duality of Mithras and Sol. If that was the case, there can be little doubt that Mithraism helped shape his attitudes


130 One can think in particular of the obvious importance of light effects, evident for instance in the practice to cut out Sol’s rays so that they would literally shine if a lamp or torch were placed behind. See C2c.45, 49, 56, 62.

131 Beck 2005, in particular chpt: 7 (102-152).

towards that duality as well. For while Mithraic art acknowledges and indeed stresses the cultural differences between the Roman Sol and Persian Mithras, the resulting tension is resolved and the ultimate harmonious unity is stressed.

One may counter that on certain side scenes Sol appears to pay homage or submit himself to Mithras, hardly the way Rome could or would have been depicted vis-à-vis non-Romans. I believe that this submission too could have been read at different levels, but that is not my point. I am not trying to establish what the tauroctony “meant” in any discursive sense, but am trying to circumscribe just one of the numerous ways in which it may have been felt or experienced by some Mithraists. As such it is but one example of the many types of non-discursive meaning an image like the tauroctony could, perhaps, have embodied. Whether it ever did for any Mithraists is a largely a matter of conjecture, although further research may shed some light on this. But my aim is not to establish what non-discursive meanings the tauroctony could embody for Mithraic initiates. For the present study it suffices to stress the potential of an image such as the tauroctony to reflect and shape unarticulated feelings in the viewer - feelings of identity in our example, but by no means restricted to that.

This is important because just as with ritual we cannot assume that Roman Mithraists placed as little worth on the experiential aspects of Mithraic art as we have. To grasp the essence of the visual meanings of Mithraic art we must realize that if, as seems likely, Mithraists experienced ritual as “real” rather than “symbolic”, as we noted above, it follows that the visual and architectural elements incorporated in the ritual - the Mithraeum and its art - partook of that unsymbolic “reality”, which has implications well beyond Mithraism for Roman art (and architecture) in general.

The manner in which carefully orchestrated effects of light and darkness were apparently deployed in Mithraea illustrates the importance attached to enhancing the experience and effect of the rituals involved.133 Comparable is the “miraculous” statue of Sol moving to kiss Serapis in the Serapeum at Alexandria, discussed below (G1e). Exploring this experiential dimension of viewing further falls well beyond the scope of this study, but more research into Roman interaction with the visual is badly needed. Such research should preferably be inspired by recent work on embodiment, which is much more focussed on the non-discursiveness of meanings than for instance the semiotic approach taken by me in this study can be, given how deeply semiotics is embedded in verbal and symbolic meanings.134

Mithraic Cosmology

As stated above, we did not discuss the possible connotations of romanness of Sol and Luna in Mithraic art to argue that this was an important element of their meanings or even to establish that it was part of their meanings at all. Our purpose was simply to use it as an example of the kinds of meanings the tauroctony may have generated. The possibility that Sol and Luna carried connotations of Rome and Empire is still an hypothesis requiring further research.

---

133 E.g. C2c.24, 62; cf. C2a.12.

Far less hypothetical is a more obvious area of meaning that cannot be ignored here: the cosmological dimension of Sol (and Luna). Long an advocate for the importance of ancient astronomy as key to understanding the main concepts of Mithraism, Beck is well-known for his interpretation of the tauroctony as a rendering of the main constellations from Taurus to Scorpio. This reading, and the astral nature of Mithraism in general, appears to me to be beyond dispute, although it is still often overlooked or even rejected outright. Indeed, Beck (2006) interprets the mithraeum as a whole as a model of the cosmos and the tauroctony, one of the focal points in the mithraeum and, presumably, its rituals as a very significant “statement” of the stars. This is where the notion of “star talk” becomes important. As we have seen above, Beck coins the term “star talk” for the “language of the heavens”, that is the notion that the stars and planets utter a figurative language through their movements, either as speakers themselves or as tools of some higher power.

The stars “talk” through there actual motion, but in order to speak there must be a language, and where there is a language, it can be used by those who know it to speak. Beck argues that the tauroctony as a whole is an example of the Mithraists doing just that, namely using the idiom of star talk to convey the message of the triumph of Sol over Luna in an “ideal” month. This ‘ideal” month is one in which the sun is in its most important house, leo, while the other heavenly bodies - most notably the moon - are in an “ideal” or idealized position which in reality could never occur. The details of this notion as developed by Beck involve rather complex astronomical explanations with which we will not concern ourselves here, but in general terms, the sun’s victory in the “ideal” month counterbalances the solar eclipses that actually could occur in a given “real” month. These “victories” of the moon over the sun, Beck postulates, were a cause for concern despite their predictability and transience. With the tauroctony the Mithraists use star talk to express an ideal response.

For our purposes the precise details of Beck’s exegesis of the tauroctony as a text in “star-talk” do not matter. What is important are the broader principles. Rather than as a straightforward illustration depicting the main event of Mithraic myth, now lost to us, Beck reads the tauroctony as a polysemous image with multiple levels and types of meaning, rooted in a non-verbal language. The small, marginal figures of Sol and Luna play a minor role in Beck’s analysis. They in effect duplicate Mithras (sun) and the bull (moon) but Beck stresses that this is not a problem as it is typical of the way various strands of meaning are constructed, indeed must be constructed simultaneously in a visual “text”.

135 Beck 2006, 31 argues this on statistical grounds.


137 On the concept of star talk and the notion of star talk as a language, see Beck 2006, 153-189. For examples of the application of “star talk” see Beck 2006, 190-239.


Within the star talk text the strand of meaning constructed by Sol and Luna in the upper corners is connected with Cautes and Cautopates in particular, according to Beck, in a sometimes supporting, more often chiastic juxtaposition. The sun and Cautes refer to ascent (and all its connotations), the moon and Cautopates to descent. But their meanings extend well beyond this specific Mithraic one. In the language of Roman art Sol and Luna are also cosmic, but signify eternity. On coins they are attributes of the personified Aeternitas from Vespasian onwards, and familiarity with the symbolism can be demonstrated in the Augustan era if not earlier. In that sense they serve on the tauroctony as markers of its cosmological dimension or meaning in general. Again this is not their “primary” meaning, nor is it something that can be conveyed through the Sol-Luna pair only. The Seasons, the four Winds, the Planetary deities can all contribute to or elaborate on aspects of this.

Beyond serving as a marker of cyclical cosmic eternity. we also find Sol and Luna again mediating a transition of sorts, in this case between two types of reading of the tauroctony, the “narrative” and the “cosmological”. At the narrative level, the tauroctony presents itself as a myth, a story with a sequence of events of which Mithras killing a bull was apparently the climax, with other events including Mithras carrying the dead bull to a cave, a festive dinner of Mithras and Sol, etc. Sol, we have seen, plays an active role in a number of scenes in this story, including the tauroctony itself in which he sends forth a raven and a ray of his light to Mithras. But the static, symbolic nature of the Sol-Luna pair on the tauroctony is at the same time also a marked contrast to the dynamic event being depicted and signifies another dimension of the depiction, cosmological rather than narrative. This cosmological reading, if we follow Beck, is the sun in Leo defeating Luna in an “ideal month”. In it, the role of Sol and Luna as counterparts to Cautes and Cautopates was again modest, but not negligible, and just as the importance of the climactic narrative “event” of the tauroctony is clear, so too the theological importance of the ideal cosmic event depicted is evident.

Conclusion
Clearly there is a great deal more to say about Sol in Mithraic iconography, but for our purposes this discussion has already delivered significant results. I have attempted, in my various preliminary readings of selected snippets of Mithraic art, above all to remain conscious of the visual system of meaning and meaning production to which the objects of my exegeses belonged. This is difficult. The verbality of my text imposes a sequential or temporal order on my analyses that the images do not possess. For example, I have no choice but to discuss the mythical and cosmological readings of the tauroctony separately and sequentially, but the relief itself communicates both readings simultaneously and instantaneously. In terms of clarity, the sequential, verbal communication of these various readings appear, to us at least, superior to the visual and instantaneous. This then raises the question what role the Mithraic images, such as the tauroctonies, played in Mithraism. Our usually unspoken assumption has been that their purpose is to evoke or trigger the (verbal) narrative of Mithraic myth and/or doctrine. While this is

---


142 See chapter 7.
certainly possible, I have argued that in the Roman world it was not uncommon to find visual monuments such as the column of Trajan that were not meant to communicate a narrative despite the fact that a significant portion of the monument was dedicated to the detailed visualisation of that narrative. The story, in such cases, is apparently integral to the message, but the message does not consist of the narration of the story. The viewer does not have to read the story to understand the monument.

If we transpose this to Mithraic images such as the tauroctony it means that the presence of Mithraic myth/doctrine may be integral to the tauroctony without implying that communication of that myth/doctrine is the tauroctony’s purpose. The tauroctony may depict Mithras killing a bull without meaning to tell the story of Mithras killing the bull.

This opens the way to a whole range of different understandings of the tauroctony in which only the essence, not the narrative of Mithraic myth/doctrine plays a role. I have toyed with one such understanding, suggesting that the tauroctony may embody the duality of identity - Roman and local - that was characteristic of so many inhabitants of the Roman world. While this may serve as an example of the types of understandings I think the tauroctony was intended to evoke in Mithraic viewers, I must stress that the example itself is largely hypothetical. I am not suggesting it was one of the main “meanings” of the tauroctony, and have no actual evidence that it was one of the intended meanings at all. I do think that this hypothesis, and others like it, offer promising approaches for further research of Mithraic art.

The issues are complex and go to the heart of the problems of visual communication which we cannot explore in detail here. The very notion of “narrative” images is controversial, with many theorists positing that images are essentially presentational and non-discursive. This is predicated in part on the notion that there is no visual syntax which allows for the coherent organization of images into a visual narrative in a predictable and widely understood fashion. Others see this differently, and the semantics and rhetoric of art have received much attention in recent decades. There are two trends contributing to the greater respect accorded to the communicative power of the visual. On the one hand there is the increased recognition of the agency of verbal communication, i.e. the structuring role of language. Concomitant with this is the increased attention for what can be loosely termed non-discursive signification. We have already seen that a strict division between art as non-discursive and language as discursive is debated, but Roman visual practice would appear to pose a challenge to that division that has yet to be addressed. I say “would appear” because much depends on how we define Roman visual practice, but as we have seen Roman art was to a significant degree a sophisticated semantic system which deployed not only images (with their remarkably durable iconographies) but also style, material, location and context to construct often complex meanings. The polysemous

---


145 This is a main concern of various schools of 20th century philosophy. Besides the “linguistic turn” (Rorty 1967, White 1973, cf. Spiegel 2005, in particular the chapters by Eley and Stedman Jones), one can think of Gadamer’s philosophical hermeneutics, of Foucault, Derrida, etc.
tauroctony is a case in point. In this sense Roman art was apparently a language, with a vocabulary and syntax, capable of producing a wide array of readily comprehensible messages. The syntactic dimension in particular of Roman art requires further research, but at the very least a rudimentary syntax cannot be denied.\textsuperscript{146}

I do not know where that conclusion will take us, and I do not raise these issues with the aim to further explore them here. That would require a more thorough analysis of the fundamentals of Roman visual communication than I think is currently feasible, set against a stronger understanding of current visual theory than I can offer. What I do hope to have achieved is an awareness of how important it is for us the examine our pre-understandings concerning the process(es) of viewing (Roman) art, in particular against the background of current visual theory. I believe that this will not only enhance our understanding of Roman visual practice. The remarkably “linguistic” nature of that practice may also contribute to the further development of visual theory, given that in its structure Roman art differs so strongly from the modern and postmodern artistic practices which constitute some of the dominant referents of current visual theory.

In terms of our study of the images of Sol, the examination of Mithraic art in this chapter has yielded a number of useful results. At the fundamental level of Roman viewing and visual practice, I have explored the seeming contradiction between content and medium in Mithraic art. I have tried to show that we can “read” Mithraic art in numerous different, more non-discursive fashions where visual communication is at its strongest (and far more effective than the verbal) and have argued that the mere fact that a narrative is inscribed upon a visual monument does not mean that the monument is necessarily meant to support or disseminate that narrative. This understanding of Roman visual signification reinforces the importance of differentiating between verbal meaning(s) of Sol and visual meanings of the image types [sol].

Bearing this in mind, we can formulate a number of preliminary conclusions about the image types [sol] suggested by the manner in which it is deployed in Mithraic art:

1. **Sol and Mithras:**

The Roman Sol outside Mithraism cannot be iconographically differentiated from Sol within Mithraism. Typically Mithraic, however, is the unity of Sol Invictus Mithras. That unity cannot be extended to Sol in other, non-Mithraic contexts, because Mithras does not occur in non-Mithraic contexts on a comparable scale and in a comparable fashion. Hence while Sol is of central importance to Mithras’ identity, Mithras is not an integral part of Sol’s identity in the Roman world.

2. **Aeternitas**

In their occurrence on the tauroctony relief, Sol and Luna as pair can be interpreted as representation of (cosmic) eternity, in line with the meaning scholarship has long associated with them.\textsuperscript{147}

3. **Liminality**

The *aeternitas*-role of Sol and Luna is enhanced, both by their placement relative to other

---


\textsuperscript{147} Déonna 1948.
figures (Cautes, Cautopates) and by additional iconographic features (raven, extended ray), so that they also occupy an intermediate position between the two major potential readings of the tauroctony we discussed, the mythical/narrative and the theological/cosmological reading. In the narrative, Sol and Luna serve primarily as markers of the cosmological dimension, though Sol also has a minor narrative role. In the cosmological reading, however, the “cosmic” Sol and Luna are almost superfluous, although they do reinforce the cyclical dimension of Cautes and Cautopates.

4. Romanness

In name and iconography Sol (and Luna) are manifestly Roman elements that stand in clear contrast to the non-Roman name and iconography of Mithras, Cautes and Cautopates. Consequently they inject a fairly strong element of romanness into this self-styled Persian cult.

These “conclusions” are, of course, simply working hypotheses with various degrees of strength. The first two are not new and appear to be increasingly secure. The other two have yet to stand the test of repeated evaluation that all such working hypotheses must constantly undergo. New insights in the potential meanings of the image [sol] can add to our understanding of his role and meanings in Mithraic art; further study of Mithraism, in particular along the lines set out by Beck (2006) promises also to shed further light on the potential meanings of the Sol-image in general.

C2d. Jupiter Dolichenus

-1. Munich, Prähistorische Staatssammlung.
   Dülük.
   Bronze.
   Ca. AD 50 (LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus; Höring & Schwertheim 1987); 3rd c. AD (LIMC Helios/Sol).
   Votive triangle; Jupiter Dolichenus and another god shake hands; below, busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate, chlamys.

-2. Private collection.
   Dülük.
   Bronze.
   Ca. AD 50 (LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus; Höring & Schwertheim); 3rd c. AD (LIMC Helios/Sol).
   Votive triangle; Jupiter Dolichenus, below, busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate (7 rays), chlamys.

-3. Pl. 24.1-2

-4. Pl. 24.4
   Bronze.
   Late 2nd c. AD.
   Votive triangle surmounted by a winged Victory with palm-branch and wreath, and with a handle at the bottom. Four registers: in the top register and eagle; in the next, busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (9, possibly 10 rays), whip; in the main
register Jupiter Dolichenus and Juno Dolichenena facing each other; in the lower register the two Dioscuri. On the other side, star above a hand holding a thunderbolt, between two peacocks and, below, two eagles.
LIMC Helios/Sol 332 (with ref.); LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus 51; Hörig & Schwertheim 1987, 294.

Hedernheim.
Bronze.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Upper part of a triangular plaque. Preserved are a bust of Jupiter Dolichenus-Sarapis at the apex, below it the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate (9 rays), whip, and three stars.
LIMC Helios/Sol 334 (with ref.); Hörig & Schwertheim 511.

-6. Pl.25.2
Rome, Mus. Cap. 9750.
Rome, Aventine, Dolichenum.
Marble.
3rd c. AD.
Lower register: Jupiter Dolichenus and Juno Dolichenena flank Isis and Serapis; upper register: in the corners busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (5 rays), chlamys; between them the Dioscuri.
LIMC Helios/Sol 364; LIMC Dioskouroi/Castores 84 (with ref.); LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus 47; Hörig & Schwertheim 1987, 386.

-7. Corbridge, Corbridge Roman Site Museum.
Corbridge.
Sandstone.
3rd c. AD.
Frieze, originally thought to have depicted Sol and Luna, the Dioscuri, and Apollo and Diana flanking Jupiter Dolichenus; only Sol, one Dioscuro and Apollo remain. Sol, beardless, radiate, tunica, r. hand raised, radiate, rides a winged horse r.
LIMC Helios/Sol 367; Speidel 1978, 33-4, 43 fig. 4.; CSIR Great Britain I.1, 18-9 nr. 52, pl. 15; Matern 2002, 261 B112; Hörig & Schwertheim 568.

-8. Pl. 25.1
Klagenfurt, Landesmuseum 132.
Lamprechtsgkogel.
Limestone.
Early 3rd c. AD.
Aedicula-shaped votive stele. In tympanum an eagle, in the acroteria frontal head of Sol (left), radiate (9? rays) and head of Luna (right). In the main field Jupiter Dolichenus (left) and Juno Dolichenena.
LIMC Helios/Sol 358 (with ref.); LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus 45; Hörig & Schwertheim 1987, 347.

Mauer an der Url.
Bronze, silver- and gold-plated.
1st half 3rd c. AD.
Votive triangle with a handle at the bottom. Five registers: in the top register an eagle; in the next, busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (4, possibly 5 rays); in the third register a quadriga with two horses to the left and two to the right, with two charioteers, a woman leaning towards the right and holding the two right-hand horses by the reins, and a man, bare-headed, nude but for a chlamys billowing out behind him, springing towards the left behind the two other horses; the woman holds and attribute in her left hand, possibly a whip,\(^1\) the man a small staff (or whip?) in his right hand. In the next register Jupiter Dolichenus and Juno Dolichenena to either side of an altar; in the lowest register, Victory on a globus above an altar, between Jupiter and Juno Dolichenus, each with a military standard behind them.
LIMC Helios/Sol 331 (description of Sol erroneous; with ref.); Spätantike, 546-548 (with ref.); Noll 1983.
It is difficult to determine whether the two figures in the “split” quadriga are Sol and Luna, as the LIMC suggests; they lack defining attributes (pace LIMC, Sol definitely does not have a nimbus nor does he hold a whip in his left hand).

\(^1\) I do not see how it could be a double axe - cf. Spätantike 546, also clearly hesitant on this identification.
-10. Szentes Mus., Hungary. Potaissa (Turda). Bronze. 3rd c. AD. Upper part of a two-sided votive triangle. Side A: at the apex an eagle, below it the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (four rays); Side B: mirror image of side A. LIMC Helios/Sol 333 (with ref.); Hörig & Schwertheim 1987, 142.

-11. Pl. 24.3 Budapest, Nat. Mus. 10.1951.106-107. Kömlőd-Lussonium. Bronze. Severan. Two-sided votive triangle. Side a: busts of Sol (left), radiate, chlamys, and Luna above Jupiter Dolichenus on the back of a bull, being crowned by a Victory; in the lower corners busts of Hercules (left) and Minerva (right). Side b: at the apex an eagle, below which the busts of Sol (left), radiate, chlamys, whip, and Luna; in the main register Jupiter Dolichenus and Juno Dolichenia facing each other; in the lowest register Jupiter Dolichenus in a decorated shrine between the Castores (?). LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus 50 (side b), 58 (side a); Hörig & Schwertheim 1987, 201-2.

-12. Veliko Târnovo, Mus. Hist. Unknown, possibly Novae. Bronze. 1st half of the third c. AD. Triangular incised plaque, originally with an object on the upper point (statuette of Victory?), now broken off. In the upper register bust of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate. In the main register Jupiter Dolichenus (left), facing inwards, standing on the back of a bull. Above and to the right of him a flying Victory in the act of crowning him. To the right, Juno Dolichenia on a cow. Between Jupiter and Juno a burning altar. According to Najdenova, the figures in the lower corners are again Jupiter Dolichenus (left) and Jupiter Dolichenus (right). Najdenova 1993 (with ref.); LIMC Zeus/Iuppiter Dolichenus 48; Hörig &
**C2d. Jupiter Dolichenus**

Sol, generally with Luna, occurs with some frequency in connection with numerous other deities. The reliefs and other forms of visual representation involved offer scope for the same type of analyses of visual meanings as we briefly explored in the previous section on Mithras, but I have not attempted that here. I have limited myself to a brief review of the most salient features of each group.

In the art of the cult of Jupiter Dolichenus the role of Sol and Luna is most prominent on the distinctive bronze votive triangles. Relatively few such triangles have survived, but no doubt a great number were melted down to reuse the bronze. The surviving triangles come from the Rhine provinces and the Balkans as well as from Dülük itself, the original home of the cult. It is reasonable to assume that such triangles were a standard element of Dolichenic shrines, and it is clear from the surviving evidence that Sol and Luna were fairly standard figures on such triangles. The iconography of the triangles is less standardized than that of, say, the Mithraic tauroctony, and there is notable variation both in the figures depicted and in their position. Clearly there is no narrative inscribed on the image, but this does not diminish its rich visual symbolism. A glance at the catalogue will show that the variation in composition is significant. Sol and Luna, however, normally appear as busts, that is as less elaborate figures than Jupiter, Juno and Victory. This is the format they take on as cosmic symbols of *aeternitas*, and that would appear to be their role here. The element of *romanness* may also be present, given the iconographic contrast between the iconography of Jupiter and Juno which clearly is modelled on older, Hittite examples, and the Graeco-Roman iconography of Sol and Luna, as well as Victory and the Dioscuri.

The three stone reliefs represent three very different monuments. On the relief from the Aventine Dolichenum (C2d.6) the Roman/non-Roman contrast is neatly delineated, with the Dolichenic Jupiter and Juno to either side of the Graeco-Egyptian Isis and Sarapis in one register, and Sol, Luna, and the Dioscuri in the other. Here and on the Klagenfurt relief (C2d.8) Sol and Luna also occupy quite marginal positions typical of their *aeternitas*-symbolism. Whether that was also the intention on the Corbridge relief (C2d.7) is less clear, given its state of preservation. Certainly the depiction of Sol and Luna in Dolichenic shrines could take on different forms. The two altars from the Aventine Dolichenum in Rome (C2b.2), dedicated to Sol and Luna respectively, are a good example.

---

149 The following figures are depicted on one or more of the surviving votive triangles on which Sol occurs: Jupiter Dolichenus, depicted in various ways, including - in (neo)-Hittite tradition - standing on the back of a bull and brandishing an axe (C2d.1-4, 9, 11-12); Sol, as radiate bust (C2d.1-5, 9-12); Luna, as bust (C2d.1-5, 9-12); Victory, often crowning Jupiter (C2d.3-4, 9, 11-12); Juno Dolichenia, depicted in the Hittite tradition on the back of a cow or hind. (C2d.3-4, 9, 11-12); Sarapis (C2d.5); the Dioscuri (C2d.4, 11); Bearded men emerging from rocks and holding leaves (C2d.3); Hercules (C2d.11); Minerva (C2d.11); Eagle (C2d.4, 9-11); Peacock (C2d.4).

150 On C2d.9 the two figures on the frontal split quadriga may be Sol and Luna.

151 Cf., e.g., K9.18.
C2e. Jupiter-Giant Pillars

1. Mainz, Mittelrheinisches Landesmuseum
   Mainz.
   Limestone.
   AD 57-67.
   Jupiter-Giant pillar, found in 1904/5, shattered into 2000 pieces. In WWII the pillar suffered further damage. It consists of a base, an intermediate socle, a column with five sculpted drums, the capital and the statue on top (the latter almost wholly lost). On the rectangular base: Jupiter, Fortuna and Minerva, Hercules, Mercurius and Salus; on the rectangular intermediate socle: inscription, Dioscure, Apollo, Dioscure; on each of the five column-drums four gods except the top drum which has three: a. Mars, Victory, Neptune, Diana; b. Amazone-like woman (Honos?, personification?); Vulcan, Amazone-like woman (Virtus?, Roma?), Ceres; c. four goddesses, none identified with certainty (suggested identifications: Venus, Vesta, Proserpina, Pax; Aequitas, Gallia, Italia, Pax); d. Genius, Lar, Liber, Lar; e. Juno, Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), chlamys, whip, in quadriga, and Luna in biga.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 363; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 162-3 nr. 272-275; Bauchhenß 1984 (with extensive bibliography); Matern 2002, 66, 70 n. 527, 218 Q67 (with refs.).

2. Mainz, Mittelrheinisches Landesmuseum
   Mainz.
   Limestone.
   Last quarter 1st c. AD.
   Rectangular block of a Jupiter-giant pillar, inscription on the front, full-length figures of Fortuna on the right, Luna on the back, and Sol, radiate nimbus (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in right hand, staff in left, on the left hand side. The inscription is a dedication by the inhabitants of a new vicus of Mainz.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 256; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 167-8 nr. 292 pl. 33.1; CSIR II.3, 32-3 nr. 21, pls. 30-33; Matern 2002, 88-9, 90 n. 527, 174 n. 957, 225 G2.

3. Auxerre, Mus. Lapidaire.
   Auxerre.
   Limestone.
   2nd c. AD.
   Capital with busts of four deities on the sides: Mercury, female deity, Sol/Apollo with torch and chlamys (head largely destroyed), Mars. Discovered at the same time as the statue of Jupiter on horseback (Espérandieu IV, 2885), and therefore believed to have been the capital of a Jupiter-Giant pillar.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 264; von Mercklin 1962, 179 nr. 433 figs. 841-3; Sol fig. 841, right.

4. Pl. 26.4
   Darmstadt, Hessisches Landesmuseum
   A1956:796.
   Butzbach.
   Sandstone.
   Ca. AD 200 (found in a well with material dating to ca. AD 230).
   Jupiter-giant pillar with cylindrical block depicting the seven planetary deities full figure. Sol is nude but for a clumsily portrayed chlamys over his left arm, radiate (9 rays), with a whip in his r. hand and a globe in his l.
   Matern 2001, 93-94, nrs. 177-180, pls. 66-71 (Sol: nr. 178, pl. 68).

   Jagsthausen.
   Sandstone.
   170-250.
   Cylindrical block of a Jupiter-giant pillar depicting the planetary deities, full figure, in niches. Sol has a radiate nimbus, is nude but for a chlamys, and holds a whip in his right hand, a patera in his left hand.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 282; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 149 nr. 229; Matern 2002, 92, 228 G22.

   Pforzheim-Brötzingen.
   Sandstone.
   2nd-3rd c. AD.
   One of three Viergöttersteine removed in 1818 from the wall of the cemetery of Brötzingen. On this block: a goddess too
poorly preserved to identify with certainty, but possibly Luna; Vulcan; Sol, nimbus, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand; Venus. LIMC Helios/Sol 257 (with ref.); Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 205 nr. 427 (with ref.).

-7. Pl. 27.1
Mannheim, Reiss-Museum Inv. Baumann 16.
Neckarelz.
Sandstone.
late 2nd to 1st half 3rd c. AD.
Cylindrical block of a Jupiter-giant pillar depicting the planetary deities, full figure, in niches. Sol has a radiate nimbus, is nude but for a chlamys, and holds his right hand raised to his head. LIMC Helios/Sol 257; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 205 nr. 427 (with ref.).

Godramstein.
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Rectangular block of a Jupiter-giant pillar; on the front an inscription, on the sides and the back two pairs and a trio of planetary deities respectively. Sol has a radiate nimbus. LIMC Helios/Sol 278; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 137 nr. 192 (with ref.).

-9. Pl. 26.3
Stuttgart, Landesmuseum RL 56.8.
Stuttgart-Plieningen.
Sandstone.
2nd-3rd c. AD.
Cylindrical block of a Jupiter-giant pillar? depicting a number of deities in niches. Sol, nimbus (no rays?) is nude but for a chlamys. His r. arm and lower left arm are missing. Matern 2002, 106, 146 n. 806, 234 121, fig. 44.

-10. Pl. 26.2
Stetten am Heuchelberg.
Sandstone.
Late 2nd - 1st half 3rd c. AD.

Cylindrical block of a Jupiter-giant pillar, depicting Sol, Luna, Venus, Juno (?), Neptune, Mercury, and an unidentified goddess (Fortuna?, Rosmerta?). LIMC Helios/Sol 262; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 228 nr. 498 pl. 46.1 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 106, 146 n. 806, 234 120, fig. 43 (appears to identify this, incorrectly, as a Wochengöttersäule).

Environs of Rommerskirchen.
Sandstone.
2nd quarter 3rd c. AD.
Fragments of a rectangular pilaster supporting a Jupiter-giant group. On each side a number of registers in which deities are represented full-figure. Registers I and III are completely preserved, register II only partially. It cannot be determined how many registers the pilaster originally had. Register I: Mercury, Mars, Virtus and Sol; register II: Minerva, Victoria, Neptune and an unidentified goddess, possibly Fortuna; register III: Juno, Luna, Hercules and Sol, radiate (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, globe in left hand, whip in lowered right hand. According to Noelke (followed by Matern) Sol also wears a Phrygian cap, but from the photographs at my disposal I believe that he has a "wreath-coiffure". LIMC Helios/Sol 259; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 475-6 nr. 176 pl. 92.4 (with ref.); Bauchhenß 1984, 331 fig. 4; Matern 2002, 90, 226 G10.

Dieburg.
Sandstone.
Ca. AD 225-250.
Part of a Jupiter-giant pillar consisting of a rectangular Viergöttersäule and a cylindrical segment with the planetary deities. Sol, among the planetary deities, is poorly preserved (head and lower arms lost). He is nude, but for a chlamys. LIMC Helios/Sol 282; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 144 nr. 114 (with ref.).

-13. Pl. 27.2
Kassel, Hess. Landesmuseum SK 53.
Mainz.
Sandstone.
Ca. AD 220-230.
Cylindrical socle of a Jupiter-giant pillar depicting the busts of the seven planetary deities and, in an eighth field, the full-length figure of a Genius. Sol is radiate (5 rays), wears a chlamys and has a whip by his left shoulder.
LIMC Helios/Sol 281; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 175-6 nr. 317; CSIR II,3 59-60 nr. 59.

-14. Pl. 27.3
Mainz, Mittelrheinisches Landesmuseum S657 [26249].
Mainz Kastell.
Sandstone.
Ca. AD 240.
Part of a Jupiter-giant pillar consisting of a rectangular Viergötterstein and an octagonal block with busts of the planetary deities on 7 sides and an inscription on the eighth. Sol is radiate (7 rays), chlamys. Inscription: IN / H(onorem) / D(omus) / D(ivinæ)
LIMC Helios/Sol 280; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 182-3 nr. 355-6; CSIR II,3 48-9 nr. 43.

-15. Pl. 27.4-5
Mannheim, Reiss-Museum Inv. Haug 1.
Kirchheim a/d Eck.
Sandstone.
3rd c. AD.
Rectangular block of a Jupiter-giant pillar: inscription on the front, back lost, sides partially preserved with Luna in biga (?) on one side, Sol, bare-headed, chlamys, whip in raised right hand, in quadriga, on the other side.

Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt.
Sandstone.
3rd c. AD.
Hexagonal block of a Jupiter-giant pillar, with six of the seven planetary deities (Saturn not represented); Sol, radiate, holds a whip (?) in his lowered left hand, right hand raised.

LIMC Helios/Sol 279; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 234 nr. 527 (with ref.).
Found together with a pillar and an altar on which Saturn is represented.

-17. Pl. 28.1
Metz.
Havange, Canton Audun-le-Roman.
Limestone.
Undated.
Octagonal block of a Jupiter-giant pillar, depicting the planetary deities on seven sides and an inscription to Jupiter on the eighth. Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, holds his right hand raised to his head.
LIMC Helios/Sol 280 (with ref.).
Espérandieu Recueil V, 446-7 nr. 4414; Duval 1953, 268.

-18. Pl. 26.1
Frankfurt, Mus. für Vor- und Frühgeschichte a7108.
Nida (Frankfurt-Heddernheim).
Sandstone.
Undated.
Jupiter-giant pillar consisting of a Viergötterstein, an octagonal block with the planetary deities (busts), a pillar, a capital, and a crowning relief depicting Jupiter and Juno. The busts of the planetary deities are executed with little detail.
Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 126-7 nr. 156

Butterstadt.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Remains of two Jupiter-giant pillars which stood next to each other: two Viergöttersteine, one octagonal block with planetary deities, one pillar, two capitals, and one horseman-giant group; it is not certain which sections belong together. On the octagonal block the planetary deities are depicted as busts on 7 sides (Sol with nimbus), while Victoria is represented full-figure on the eighth side.
Espérandieu Germanie 72; Duval 1953, 287; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 110, nr. 95; Matern 2001, 145-6, pl. 122 (Sol not visible).
Pforzheim.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Hexagonal block on which the planetary deities are depicted (Venus and Jupiter together on one side). Sol is nude, holds a whip across his breast; his head is largely missing, but appears to have been radiate. Found together with various fragments of at least two Jupiter-giant pillars.
Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 204 nr. 422.

Ransweiler.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Fragment of a Viergötterstein of a Jupiter-giant pillar, depicting (full-length): Mercury, Fortuna, an unidentifiable figure, and Sol, radiate (?) nimbus, whip in right hand.

Altrip, reused in the wall of the late-Roman castellum; the pillar originally may have stood in Ladenburg (Lopodunum).
Sandstone.
Undated.
Rectangular block of a Jupiter-giant pillar. On the front: inscription; on the sides and back two pairs and a trio of planetary deities (busts) respectively. Sol is radiate and has a whip.
LIMC Helios/Sol 278; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 87 nr. 7 (with ref.).

Stuttgart-Zazenhausen.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Cylindrical block of a Jupiter-giant pillar with the seven planetary deities, full-figure, in six niches formed by pillars carrying arches (Jupiter and Venus together); Sol is radiate, nude but for a chlamys, with a whip in his lowered right hand.
Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 235 nr. 531 (with ref.).


Neckartailfingen.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Octagonal block of a Jupiter-giant pillar, with the seven planetary deities and a giant (all full-figure). Sol, head lost, nude, torch (?) in raised right hand.
LIMC Helios/Sol 279; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 195-6 nr. 395 (with ref.).

-26. Pl. 28.2
Wiesbaden, Städtisches Mus. 382.
Frankfurt-Heddernheim (Nida).
Sandstone.
Undated.
Octagonal block of a Jupiter-giant pillar, depicting the seven planetary deities and Fortuna, all full-figure. Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, holds a whip in his right hand and may have held a globe in his left.
(Description of Sol based on a photograph kindly provided to me by the museum).
LIMC Helios/Sol 280; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 130 nr. 171, pl. 18.1; Matern 2002, 106, 234 122

Rottenburg.
Sandstone.
Undated.
Two fragments of an octagonal block of a Jupiter-giant pillar. Of the planetary deities, Sol, Luna and Venus are preserved.
Haug & Sixt 1914, 249 Nr. 138

Heidelberg-Neuenheim (excavated in Spring
C2e. Jupiter columns

Jupiter-giant columns, known in German as Jupitergigantensäulen are a strictly regional phenomenon, characteristic of the Rhine border and its hinterland. They were votive monuments to Jupiter Optimus Maximus in the form of elaborately decorated, freestanding columns supporting a statue of Jupiter on horseback trampling a giant underfoot. A typical monument could consist of a high, rectangular base with a relief carving of a standing deity on each side (often referred to as a Viergötterstein), surmounted by a cylindrical, hexagonal, or octagonal socle decorated with the planetary deities or other gods, on which rested the actual column which could be undecorated, patterned (e.g. with a motif of scales or even oak leaves), or decorated with reliefs of deities. The corinthian or composite capital of the column supported the statue group of Jupiter and the defeated giant.

Sol appears on a significant number of Jupiter columns either as bust, standing figure, or charioteer in his standard Graeco-Roman iconography. He can be depicted on the base, the socle, the column drum, or even the capital. Most common is Sol as planetary god alongside the other planets. Usually the planets are depicted on the intermediate socle, occasionally on three sides of the rectangular base (two pairs and a trio) with the dedicatory inscription on the fourth side. Alternatively Sol is paired with Luna and they are depicted with other deities on the capital, the shaft of the column, the socle, or on two sides of the rectangular base. In some cases not all the figures have been sufficiently preserved and Luna cannot be explicitly identified, so that we cannot exclude that there were a few Jupiter columns on which Sol, but not Luna, was depicted.

---


153 C2e.4-5, 7-8, 9?, 12-14, 16-20, 22-28.

154 C2e.1-2, 3?, 6?, 10-11, 15, 21?

155 The three possible columns are C2e.3, 6, 21. On all three there are the traces of unidentifiable figures who may have been Luna.
A wide range of deities could be depicted on Jupiter columns and none had a fixed place except Jupiter. This makes it difficult to estimate how common Sol was on these monuments. In many cases only one or two sections survive and it is then impossible to establish which deities adorned the lost parts of the monument. However, Sol, Luna and the planetary deities would appear to be characteristic of the more elaborate columns, but usually omitted on less lavishly decorated ones. What is clear is that Sol and Luna were potential elements of these columns from the outset. They flank Juno at the top of the oldest surviving column (C2e.1) which dates to the reign of Nero. Thus we may conclude that Sol, with Luna or in the company of all the planetary deities, formed a characteristic, but not essential element of the Jupiter columns.

A full evaluation of Jupiter columns is difficult given their fragmentary survival and the lack of information on the potentially significant context of these monuments. A further problem is the fact that no trace has survived of wooden columns which may or may not have existed. Some columns make clear reference to oak trees, and although the earliest columns are mid first century there are remarkably few surviving stone columns prior to the second half of the second century. We also have evidence from some sanctuaries in the region for isolated posts erected without an architectural function. It is not known whether these posts were decorated and we cannot be certain that they had a ritual function, far less that they were related to the stone Jupiter columns. Nonetheless the represent a potential parallel.

Despite the problems a few general aspects do emerge clearly. It is obvious that the Jupiter columns combine local and Roman-imperial elements. Local elements include the sky-god on horseback identified with Jupiter, the regular inclusion of local deities, the references to (holy?) oak trees, and the geographic limitation of the monument-type. Roman-imperial are the identification of the sky god as Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the use of stone and the column-with-capital format, the iconography of most deities and the Latin of the inscriptions. Sol, with Luna or with the planetary deities, is depicted as cosmic power in Roman guise with countless parallels outside the region of the column. As such he constitutes a Roman-imperial and cosmic element in the overall conception of the monument type.

C2f. So-called “Danubian Riders”.

-1. Sarajevo, Mus.
   Han Compagnie-Vitez
   Lead
   3rd c. AD
   Two columns supporting an arch frame a complex scene in four registers. In the two upper corners a snake. In the upper register under the arch, Sol in frontal quadriga (two horses jumping to either side), right hand raised, chlamys, radiate (7 rays) globe and whip in left hand. In the next register, twin horsemen facing inwards flank a woman variously interpreted as goddess or priestess, frontal, holding a cloth in front of her; there is a fish below the left hand horseman, and behind him a solder with helmet and spear; a prostrate nude man lies below the right hand horseman, and behind there is a woman/goddess with right hand raised to her

---

156 A good example of the importance of context is the column from Bad Cannstatt (C2e.16). It depicts only six of the seven planetary deities. Saturn is omitted, but was apparently supplied by the context given that an altar to Saturn was found nearby.


mouth. In the third, largest register a semi-circular couch with three diners and table, on which a dish with a fish. Two nude figures approach the diners from the right. To the left an animal-headed figure stands to the left of a tree from which the (headless?) skin of an animal is being hung by a second figure. In the lowest register, a crater (centre) stands between a lion (left) and a snake (right). In the right-hand corner a cock, in the left hand corner a three-legged table bearing a fish.

Tudor 1969, I, 68 nr. 117 (with ref.)

-2. Budapest, Mus.
  Intercisa
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 72 nr. 123 (with ref.)

-3. Dörögdpuszta (now lost?)
  Dörögdpuszta
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 93 nr. 165

-4. Kaposvár Mus. (Hungary)
  Magyar Egres, Somogy Distr., Hungary
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 72 nr. 124

-5. Pécs Mus. (Hungary)
  Lugo Florentia, Dunaszkešő, Baranjo distr., Hungary
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 75-6 nr. 130

-6. Székesfehérvár, Mus 9888
  Gorsium-Herculia, Tác-Fővenypuszta
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 93 nr. 166 (with ref.).

  Singidunum (Moesia Sup.)
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 30 nr. 51 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 53, 125, 241-2 162.1

  Horreum Margi (Kuprija)
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.

  Singidunum (Moesia Sup.)
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 35 nr. 60

-10. Zagreb, Mus.
  Bassiana (Petrovči, Ruma distr.)
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 77-8 nr. 133; Matern 2002, 53, 125, 241-2 162.4

  Unknown
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 93 nr. 164

-12. Northampton (Mass.), Smith College
  Museum of Art
  Hungary?
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 105 nr. 186 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 53, 125, 241-2 162.3

  Horreum Margi (Kuprija)
  Lead
  3rd c. AD
  Identical with previous.
  Tudor 1969 I, 35 nr. 61
14. Pl. 29.3
Univ. of Missouri, Mus. of Art and Archaeology 90.5
Unknown (Pannonia or Dacia)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Lane 1993-4, 60-1 fig. 5.

15. Pl. 28.3
Mainz, Römisch-germanisches Zentralmuseum 0.34585
Ilok
Lead
3rd c. AD
Rectangular plaque; the scenes are framed by two columns supporting an arch. In the corners above the arch: two snakes. Directly under the arch, Sol in frontal chariot (two horses to the right, two to the left), chlamys, tunica, radiate (7 rays), right hand raised, globe and whip in left hand. Below Sol three registers: in the first, frontal goddess/woman in the centre, holding a cloth in front of her, between two horsemen facing inwards; behind the left-hand horseman a soldier (helmet, shield, spear) and behind the right-hand one a woman holding her hand to her mouth. Below the left hand horseman a fish, below the right-hand one a prostrate man. In the next register three men sit on a semicircular couch behind a round table with draped table-cloth; on the table a fish; two nude men approach from the right, at the left a tree on which a man is hanging a headless carcass; behind him an anthropomorph figure with a ram’s head. In the bottom register (from left to right) a three-legged table with a fish on it, a lion, a cantharos, a snake, and a cock.
LIMC Helios/Sol 231; Tudor 1969 I, 38-9 nr. 68 (with ref.).

16. Budapest, Mus.
Carnacum (Sotin), Vukovar distr.
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 82-3 nr. 141 (with ref.).

17. Budapest, Mus.
Pannonia

18. Szegszárd, Mus., Hungary
Tűskepuszta, Tolna distr., Hungary
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 83 nr. 142

19. Zombor, Dr. Imre Frey coll.
Ad Militare, Batina
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 76 nr. 131

20. Belgrade, Mus
Sabač
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 83 nr. 144

Nakučani (Pannonia Inf.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 411 (with refs.)

22. Belgrade, Mus.
Ušće (Moesia Sup.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 412 (with refs.)

23. Zagreb, Mus.
Teutoburgium (Dalj, Osijek distr.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.

24. Zagreb, Mus.
Bassiana (Petrovči, Ruma distr.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 78 nr. 134

-25. Zagreb, Mus.
Burgenae (Novi Banovci, Stara Pazova distr.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 83 nr. 143 (with ref.).

Unknown
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 93 nr. 163 (with ref.).

-27. New York, MMA 21.88.175
Acquired in Rome
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 105 nr. 185 (with ref.);
Weitzmann 1979, 196-7 nr. 176; Matern 2002, 53, 125, 131 n. 702, 241-2 162.2

-28. Sarajevo, Mus.
Halapić (Glamoč distr., Dalmatia)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Two columns supporting an arch frame a complex scene in four registers. In the two upper corners a snake. In the upper register under the arch, Sol in frontal quadriga (two horses jumping to either side), right hand raised, chlamys, head and left hand missing. In the next register, twin horseman facing inwards flank a goddess/woman, frontal, holding a cloth in front of her; 2 stars; a fish below the right hand horseman, and behind him a woman/goddess with raised right hand; a prostrate nude man below the left hand horseman, and behind a soldier with helmet and spear. In the third, largest register a semi-circular couch with three diners and table, on which a dish with a fish. Two nude figures approach the diners from the right. To the left an animal-headed figure stands to the left of a tree from which the (headless?) skin of an animal is being hung by a second figure. In the lowest register, a crater (centre) stands between a lion (right) and a snake (left), with a small amphora hanging above and behind each animal. In the right-hand corner a cock, in the left hand corner a three-legged table bearing a fish.
Tudor 1969 I, 67-8 nr. 116 (with ref.).
Mackintosh 1997 (identical relief in private British collection).

-29. Budapest, Mus.
Sirmium
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 75 nr. 118 (with ref.).

-30. Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts
Lugio-Florentia (Dunaszekcső, Baranya distr., Hungary
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 75 nr. 129 (with ref.).

Pannonia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 94 nr. 167 (with ref.).

-32. Belgrade, Mus.
Region of Singidunum (Moesia Sup.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 31 nr. 54 (with ref.).

-33. Zagreb, Mus.
Sirmium (Stremska Mitrovića)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 74 nr. 127; Matern 2002, 53, 125, 241-2 162.4.

-34. Cluj, Mus.
Dacia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 17 nr. 30 (with ref.).
-35. Pl. 28.5
Univ. of Missouri, Mus. of Art and Archaeology 90.4
Unknown (Pannonia or Dacia)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Lane 1993-4, 59-60 fig. 4.

-36. Budapest, Mus.
Čalma, Sremska Mitrovića district
Lead
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque with curved pediment and two acroteria. In pediment: fish. In main field at the top a crater between two snakes and a bust of Luna in the left-hand corner and bust of Sol, radiate, in right-hand corner. Below the crater a woman standing on (above?, behind?) a table or single-legged pedestal, between two horsemen. Below each horse a prostrate man; behind the horsemen, left, a man, and right a woman holding her hand to her mouth. Below (left to right): three-legged table with two cups and a round object, a candelabrum, a dagger, a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree, a cantharus below three balls (loaves? fruit?) and a cock above a ram's head.
Tudor 1969 I, 82 nr. 138 (with ref.).

-37. Budapest, Mus.
Pannonia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 94 nr. 169 (with ref.).

-38. Budapest, Mus.
Pannonia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 94 nr. 170 (with ref.).

Cibalae (Vinkovci)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 80-1 nr. 137 (with ref.).

-40. Sremska Mitrovica, Mus.
Mačvanska Mitrovica (Pannonia Inf.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 430 (with refs.)

-41. Budapest, Mus.
Pannonia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Roundel. At the top, standing woman holding her hand to her mouth, between busts of Sol (left), radiate (7 rays) and Luna (right). Below, a woman between two horsemen; beneath the horses two prostrate men; to the left a cock, to the right an attendant. Under the prostrate men (from left to right): a cantharos, a candelabrum, a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree and a lion.
Tudor 1969 I, 94 nr. 171 (with ref.).

-42. Mačva, Mus.
Prnjavor
Lead
2nd half 3rd - early 4th c. AD
Identical with previous.
Krunić 1994/5, 166 fig. 3.

-43. Zagreb, Mus.
Unknown
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 92 nr. 162 (with ref.).

-44. Pl. 28.4
Univ. of Missouri, Mus. of Art and Archaeology 90.2
Unknown (Pannonia or Dacia)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Lane 1993-4, 58-9 fig. 2.

-45. Belgrade, Mus.
Obrenovac (Moesia Sup.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 435
-46. Zagreb, Mus.
Popin (Stara Pazova distr.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Roundel. In the centre a goddess/woman holding out her apron, behind a three-legged table bearing a fish. Two snakes, two stars, Sol and Luna flank her head; below these, also flanking the central woman, two horsemen trampling two men underfoot. The head and shoulders of a male attendant are visible behind the right-hand one. In the exergue a cantharos between a cock and a ram above three rings.
Tudor 1969 I, 82 nr. 140 (with ref.).

-47. Pl. 29.1
Univ. of Missouri, Mus. of Art and Archaeology 90.1
Unknown, probably Pannonia or Dacia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Lane 1993-4, 57-8 fig. 1

Unknown
Lead
3rd c. AD
Fragment of a roundel, identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 81-2 nr. 139.

-49. Unknown
Pannonia
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 94 nr. 172

-50. Belgrade,Mus.
Landolje (Moesia Sup.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 413 (with refs.).

-51. Zagreb, Mus.
Divos (Stremska Mitrovića distr.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque with small rounded tympanum and two large acroteria. In}

-52. Szegszárd, Mus., Hungary
Öcsény, Tolna distr., Hungary
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 80 nr. 136

Beljin (Moesia Inf.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 416 (with refs.).

-54. Pl. 29.2
Univ. of Missouri, Mus. of Art and Archaeology 90.6

200
Unknown (Pannonia or Dacia)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Lane 1993-4, 61-2 fig. 6.

-55. Sofia, Mus. 7025
Gabare (Bêla Slatina distr., Bulgaria)
Lead
3rd c. AD
In the centre of the upper register, an eagle holding a wreath in its talons perches above a small, horizontal column with capitals at either end; to its left a raven, and in the corner a bust of Luna; to its right a cock and a bust of Sol, radiate, with whip. The upper register is separated from the main scene below it by two arches, springing outwards from each end of the small horizontal column to two vertical columns which frame the central scene. Below each arch a horseman, facing inwards, each crowned by a Victory; behind each horseman a woman with her hand to her mouth. In the centre, below the horizontal column, a frontal goddess/woman holding each horse by the bridals. Below her a three-legged table with a fish, flanked to the left by a lion and an unclear, heart-shaped object, and to the right by a bull and a candelabrum-like vertical object. A thin line defines the lower register, with (from left to right) a tree, a dagger or sword, three candelabra (?), three-legged pedestals, a large crater between two snakes, three rings with a dot in the middle below three triangles, a ram’s head (?) above four oblique lines, and a tree.
LIMC Heros Equitans 439; Tudor 1969 I, 72-3 nr. 125 (with ref.).

-56. Ghighen Mus.
Ghighen
Lead
3rd c. AD
Fragment of a plaque, identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 43 nr. 74

-57. Bucharest, Dr. S. Stefanescu coll.
Romula
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 20-1 nr. 36.

-58. Zagreb, Mus.
Sirmium (Stremska Mitrovića)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque with small rounded tympanum between two acroteria. In the tympanum a fish and four stars. A roundel encompasses the main scene, leaving open the four corners with four busts (winds or seasons); within the roundel at the top a woman holding her hand to her mouth between busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (5 rays). Behind Sol a three-legged table bearing three objects, behind Luna a jug and an indistinct object. In the centre of the main field a goddess/woman and to either side a horseman, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot. Behind the left-hand horseman an attendant, behind the right-hand one four rings and a lamp. Below: a cock, a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree, a candelabrum and an indistinct object.
LIMC Heros Equitans 433; Tudor 1969 I, 72-3 nr. 125 (with ref.).

-59. Split, Mus. H4975
Bigeste (Humac)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 67 nr. 115 (with ref.).

-60. Belgrade, Mus.
Jalovik
Lead
2nd half 3rd c. - early 4th c. AD
Identical with previous (D131)
Krušić 1994/5, 165 fig. 2.

-60. Bucharest, Mus.
Sucidava
Lead
1st half 3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque. In the tympanum, busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate, between two serpents. In the main field a woman between two horsemen, of whom the left-hand one is trampling a man underfoot.
In the next register (from left to right): three
altars, a three-legged table with a fish, three rings on a low table and above them three triangular objects. In the lowest register, from left to right: a table with three rings, a candelabrum, a lion, a cock, a cantharos, a raven and a bull.

LIMC Heros Equitans 422; Tudor 1969 I, 24-5 nr. 42 (with ref.).

-61. Bucharest, Mus.
Orlea, (near Sucidava)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 25 nr. 43 (with ref.).

-62. Turnu Severin (Rumania), Pojíle de Fier Museum
Drobeta
Lead
3rd c. AD
Fragment, identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 II, 12-13 nr. 206 (with ref.).

-63. Ghighen Mus. (Bulgaria)
Oescus (Ghighen)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque. In the tympanum, Sol (left), radiate, and Luna (right), between two peacocks in the corners. The tympanon is separated from the main scene by a narrow register with (from left to right) a bull, an eagle, a cock, and a lion (or possibly a dog?). The main scene has a goddess/woman (polos) between two horsemen (whose horses she holds by the reins), behind whom are two female figures dressed like the central goddess/woman. Below the central goddess/woman a three-legged table, perhaps bearing a fish. Below each horseman a snake facing inwards, head just above the table. Below the left hand snake an indistinguishable object, a prostrate nude man facing inwards, a fish or dolphin facing inwards and a crater (?); similar figures, but without the indistinguishable object, below the right hand figure. In the lower register (from left to right) a horse (?), three altars with three rings, a three-legged table with a fish, a crater, a ram, and an unidentifiable vertical object.

Tudor 1969 I, 41-2 nr. 72 (with ref.).

-64. Turnu Severin (Rumania), Pojíle de Fier Museum
Romula
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
LIMC Heros Equitans 419; Tudor 1969 I, 20 nr. 35 (with ref.).

-65. Óbud, Aquincum Museum
Aquincum
Lead
3rd c. AD
Roundel; at the top, centre, a standing woman holding her hand to her mouth, above a star; she is flanked left by the bust of Luna and a cock and right by the bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays) and a ram's head. In the main field below two horsemen facing inward, above two prostrate men; the woman who normally stands between them is missing; behind the horsemen various objects. Below, from left to right: a lion, three circles below him, a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree, a star and a ram.
Tudor 1969 I, 70-1 nr. 120 (with ref.).

-66. Formerly Salaško (Croatia), now lost
Salaško
Lead
3rd c. AD
Identical with previous.
Tudor 1969 I, 71 nr 121

Rome or environs of Rome
Bronze
2nd-3rd c. AD
Bronze plaque. In the upper corners, busts of Sol (left), radiate, chlamys, and Luna (right), each accompanied by a star. They are separated from the main field by two snakes who rise up from two cypresses which frame the main scene, and with their heads facing inwards form a kind of arch. Between the snakes' heads, at the top centre, a lion's head, frontal. In the main scene, a horseman rides to the right over a man lying prostrate, face downwards. Behind him a bearded man with a ram's head in his raised right hand and a
man’s head in his left hand. Facing the horse a woman; behind her a bearded man; above her head a rectangular object (gridiron? cista?). Below the prostrate man (from left to right): a lamp above a ram, a bull, a three-legged table with a fish below the woman, and a crater above a raven. LIMC Heros Equitans 361; Tudor 1969 I, 97 nr. 174

-68. Terracina, Mus.
Terracina
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Relief in two registers; in the upper register a woman behind a three-legged table between two horsemen; below each horse a prostrate, nude man; above: frontal bust of Luna with a bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys, to either side. In the lower register (from left to right): an altar, a ram, a cock.
Tudor 1969, 98-9 nr. 176

-69. Ghighen Mus.
Ghighen
Lead
3rd c. AD
Fragment of a plaque; two columns (right hand column missing) support an arch. Above and to the right of the arch, bust of Luna, to the left (lost) Sol. Upper register under arch lost. Main register: two horsemen flanking a goddess/woman (lost); two prostrate, nude men under the horsemen. Various other attributes. Lower register almost completely lost.
Tudor 1969 I, 43 nr. 73 (with ref.).

-70. Plovdiv Arch. Mus. 2103
Plovdiv
Marble
1st half 3rd c. AD
Round-topped votive relief. Three-headed rider galloping r. towards altar with two figures. Behind the horse a standing figure, below: Cerberus attacking boar. Upper l. corner bust of Luna (?), upper right Sol (?). Both busts lack clear distinguishing characteristics.
LIMC Heros Equitans 580.

-71. Razgrad (Bulgaria), Mus.
Ezerče
Marble
3rd c. AD
Slightly oval roundel. In the centre, goddess/woman behind a table with an object (fish?) on it. Above her, busts of Sol and Luna. The goddess/woman stands between two horseman, facing inwards. Below the horses two figures (prostrate men? One fish and one man?). In the exergue, two snakes, heads facing inwards, and below them (from left to right), a cock (?), a ram's head (?), an altar with a fish, a column (?) and a lion (?).
Tudor 1969 I, 31 nr. 86 (with ref.).

-72. Sofia, Mus.
Novae
Lead
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque. In the apex an eagle with a wreath in its beak, two stars, and a dagger or sword. Slightly lower to the left Sol, radiate (7 rays), whip, with a lamp (?) next to him. To the right Luna and a snake; a second snake between Sol and Luna. In the main field a goddess/woman stands in the centre behind a three-legged table with a fish on it. Flanking her are two horsemen facing inwards. The right-hand one is crowned by a small Victory and behind him a goddess/woman stands with her hand to her mouth. A goddess (?) with a spear stands behind the other horseman. Two prostrate men lie under the horses. At the bottom (from left to right): a lion, a kantharos, an altar, a cock, and a ram.
LIMC Heros Equitans 428; Tudor 1969 I, 49-50 nr. 83 (with ref.).

-73. Sofia, Museum
Almus (Lom, Bulgaria)
Marble
3rd c. AD
In top corners, Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate, chlamys. In centre of the main field, frontal goddess/woman, almost disappearing behind two horseman, facing inwards, flanking her. Behind each horse a woman, below each a prostrate man. A snake above each horse's head. In the lower register (from left to right): 3 candelabra, 3 loaves, 3
apples, a ram, a three-legged table with a fish and a dagger or sword, a cock, a lion and a bow (?).
LIMC Heros Equitans 414; Tudor 1969 I, 40 nr. 71 (with ref.).

Biala Čercova (Pavlikeni distr.)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Plaque; main figure is a single horseman facing right above a prostrate man being attacked by a lion. Behind the horseman a woman holding her hand to her mouth. Lower right hand corner contains a three-legged table with three loaves and a fish, behind which stands a frontal goddess/woman. Above her head a platter with three objects. In top right hand corner a female bust, possibly Luna. To the left of the bust a disc and two crosses. A second disc, possibly Sol, behind the head of the horseman.
Tudor 1969 I, 47 nr. 79.

-75. Sofia, Mus. Nat.
Rebro (Breznik distr.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped plaque. In tympanum: eagle. Main field: Two horsemen, facing inwards, flank a frontal goddess/woman who is holding the reins of the horses. Behind the left hand horse a woman holding her hand to her mouth, behind the right hand horse a man. At the edges, two snakes rearing upwards towards two busts in the upper corners: Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate (7 rays). Below each horse a prostrate, nude man. In the lower register (from left to right): a candelabrum, 7 round objects (pieces of fruit or loaves of bread?), a lion, a three-legged table bearing a fish, with a ram's head below the table, a bird, a gridiron, a quadruped, a nude man.
LIMC Heros Equitans 427; Tudor 1969 I, 48-9 nr. 81 (with ref.).

-76. Sofia, Mus. Nat.
Sapaneva Bania (Stanke Dimitrov distr.)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Roundel (fragm.): in the centre a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table bearing a fish. She stands between two horsemen, with above their heads traces of two busts, probably Sol and Luna. Below each horse a prostrate man. In the lower register (most of which is lost) a part of a snake can be made out.
Tudor 1969 I, 61-2 nr. 105 (with ref.).

-77. Lost (formerly Varna Mus.)
Varna
Marble
3rd c. AF
Rectangular plaque, only the upper left hand corner is preserved. Along the top three busts: Sol, with whip (?) in the corner, and at a short distance to the right a male bust (bearded, according to Tudor, but this is not clear from the sketch) and a female bust; below, the upper part of one horseman and the head of his horse, facing inwards, are preserved, as well as the head of the central goddess/woman.
Tudor 1969 I, 54 nr. 92

-78. Budapest, Mus.
Potaissa
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD
Plaque with relief-decoration in three registers. Upper register: Sol (left), chlamys, and Luna (right) in the corners; two snakes rearing up to a cantharos in the centre. Main register: in the centre a horseman riding to the right over a prostrate man; behind him two attendants; in front of him two women, the second of whom holds her hand to her mouth, and a man. Lower register (from left to right): left corner missing; in centre a man holds something over an altar; at the right a seated man holds an object towards a three-legged table on which another object is lying.
LIMC Heros Equitans 362; Tudor 1969 I, 5-6 nr. 9 (with ref.).

-79. Budapest, Mus.
Area of Dacia Superior
Marble
3rd c. AD
Plaque with relief decoration in three
registers; in the upper register traces of three busts (including Sol and Luna?); in the main register (partially preserved) a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table between two horsemen; in the lower register (partially preserved) three men. Tudor 1969 I, 15-16 nr. 28 (with ref.).

-80. Budapest, Mus. Kápolna (Distr. Heves, Hungary) Marble 3rd c. AD Roundel; at the top the busts of Sol and Luna above two horsemen to either side of a goddess/woman behind a table. Below each horse a prostrate man. In the lower register various indistinct objects, including a woman raising her hand to her mouth. Tudor 1969 I, 69-70 nr. 119 (with ref.).

-81. Belgrade, Mus. Belgrade Lead Late 2nd - mid 3rd c. AD (Found in a closed well in conjunction with pottery dating from the late 2nd to mid 3rd c. AD). Relief in two registers. Above, in the centre, a goddess/woman holds the horses of two flanking horsemen by their bridles; below the right-hand horse a prostrate man, below the left-hand one a fish, behind the left-hand horse a woman holding her hand to her mouth. In the lower register a large number of objects, animals and figures: in the centre a man with Phrygian cap, whip behind his right shoulder, left hand raised; to the right a kantharos and a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree; to the left a three-legged table, a cock, a lion, two candelabrums, a dog, a pair of horns, a star, and an unclear object. Two upright snakes, bending inwards near the top, border the scenes; at the top, between the snakes' heads, a sphere between an eagle and a cock. In the upper corners beyond the snakes, the busts of Sol (left) with radiate nimbus and Luna (right). Krunić 1994/5, 164 fig. 1 (description in English on p. 172). Despite the Phrygian cap, Krunić identifies the central figure on the lower register as Sol.

-82. Belgrade, Mus. II/1562 Danube-valley Lead 3rd c. AD Aedicula-shaped plaque; in upper corners above the pediment two flying Victoriae; in the tympanum, busts of Sol and Luna to either side of an eagle (?) in the main field a goddess/woman between two horsemen; in the lower register a crater, a cock (?) and other objects, now indistinguishable. Tudor 1969 II, 14-5 nr. 210; Iskra-Janošić 1966, p. 65 nr. 1 pl IV/2.

-83. Belgrade, Mus. Belgrade (Singidunum, Moesia Sup.) Marble 3rd c. AD Rectangular plaque with relief-decoration in three registers. Upper register: in centre bust of a woman between the busts of two bearded, hooded men; next two bearded men holding a fish (an altar by the left-hand one), next busts of Sol (left, almost completely lost) and Luna. Main register: a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table bearing a fish, between two horsemen and two attendants (left: Victory; right: male figure); below each horse a prostrate male. Lower register (from left to right): a cock above an unidentified object, a woman holding her hand to her mouth with a second round object at her feet, two men holding the skin of a ram in front of a third man, three vessels above a ram. LIMC Heros Equitans 426; Tudor 1969 I, 30 nr. 50 (with ref.).

-84. Belgrade, Mus. Viminacium (Kostolač) Lead 3rd c. AD Roundel with relief in four registers. Upper register: eagle between two snakes and busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right); main register: woman, holding out her apron, behind a three-legged table (?) with two stars (?) beside her head; she stands between two horsemen trampling two prostrate men underfoot; in a narrow band below the main register three rings, a three-legged table, and a small house with gabled roof; in the lower register
various figures, almost all too damaged to be recognizable.
LIMC Heros Equitans 423; Tudor 1969 I, 32-3 nr. 56 (with ref.).

-85. Belgrade, Mus.
Paračin
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD
Round-topped relief-plaque. In the main field a horseman riding right over a prostrate man who is being attacked by a lion; to the right three women, one behind the horse and two next to it, of whom one raises her hand to her mouth; in the upper left-hand corner bust of Sol, in the right-hand corner bust of Luna. In the lower register (from left to right): a ram's head, a gridiron or spiral column, a three-legged table bearing a fish and three round objects, an eagle, a star and a snake (?)
LIMC Heros Equitans 367; Tudor 1969 I, 36-7 nr. 64 (with ref.).

-86. Niš, Mus.
Mediana (Brzi Brod)
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD
Round topped plaque. At the top, busts of Sol and Luna, below whom a horseman is riding to the right over a prostrate man who is being attacked by a lion. To the right of the horseman a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table on which a fish is lying; behind the horseman a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth and - above - a Victory. In the lower register unclear objects.
LIMC Heros Equitans 359; Tudor 1969 I, 34 nr. 59 (with ref.).

-87. Sremska Mitrovica, Mus.
Kuzmin (Pannonia Inf.)
Lead
3rd c. AD
Roundel; within two encircling snakes, scenes in three registers. At the top, busts of Sol (right, radiate, 7 rays) and Luna. Main register, a frontal goddess/woman above a 3-legged table, approached from either side by a horseman trampling a prostrate figure underfoot. There is a kantharos behind the left-hand horseman, and a goddess/woman raising her hand to her mouth behind the right-hand one. In the lower register, from left to right, a candelabrum, a man disembowelling an animal, a tree, a lion, and a bird.
LIMC Heros Equitans 418

-88. Lost
Viminacium
Bronze (reportedly)
3rd c. AD
Roundel. Above busts of Sol, radiate, and Luna to either side of a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth; behind Sol a bird, behind Luna a three-legged table. In the main field a goddess/woman between two horsemen trampling two prostrate men; behind the left-hand horseman an amphora and a ram's head, behind the right-hand one an amphora (?) and a cock. Below (from left to right): a lion, a vessel, a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree, a candelabrum and a ram.
LIMC Heros Equitans 432; Tudor 1969 I, 33 nr. 57

-89. Sinj (Croatia), Franciscan Church Museum
Aequum (Čiluk)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Plaque in three registers. Upper register: vessel between two snakes, two stars and two busts (Sol and Luna, although they lack defining attributes). Main register: a goddess/woman standing in the centre between two horsemen trampling two prostrate men underfoot; behind each horseman an attendant; behind the head of each horseman a star, to either side of the head of the woman a crescent; lower register: various objects.
Tudor 1969 I, 66 nr. 113 (with ref.).

-90. Split, Mus.
Salonae (Split)
Marble
3rd c. AD (Tudor), 2nd-3rd c. AD (LIMC).
Rectangular plaque with relief in three registers. Upper register: eagle between two snakes and two busts (Sol and Luna, although defining attributes cannot be made
out); to the left of the left-hand bust a bird. Main register: a horseman riding to the right, trampling a prostrate man underfoot; behind him a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth, in front of a column; in front of him a woman holding out her apron in a pouch attended by a man. Lower register: various objects. Tudor 1969 I, 63 nr. 107 (with ref.). LIMC Heros Equitans 364.

-91. Split, Mus. Unknown Marble 3rd c. AD Upper part of a round-topped plaque. In the upper register and eagle between two busts (Sol and Luna) and two indeterminate objects. Only the upper part of the main register is preserved, depicting a goddess/woman between two horsemen; behind the left-hand one a woman, behind the right-hand one a man and a woman. Tudor 1969 I, 65-6 nr. 112 (with ref.).

-92. Zagreb, Mus. Sirmium (Stremska Mitrovića) Lead 3rd c. AD Aedicula-shaped plaque with small rounded tympanum (acroteria at the corners missing). In the tympanum a fish between four stars. A roundel encompasses the main scene, leaving open the four corners with four busts (winds or seasons) of which only two survive; within the roundel at the top a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth between busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (5 or 6 rays, but almost certainly not 7 as Tudor states). Behind Sol a three-legged table bearing three objects, behind Luna a lion with its forepaws on a vessel. In the centre of the main field a goddess/woman between two horsemen trampling two prostrate men underfoot. Tudor 1969 I, 4 nr. 6 (with ref.).

-93. Klagenfurt, Mus. Virunum (Zollfeld) Copper 3rd c. AD Rectangular plaque with relief-decoration in two registers. In the upper register a goddess/woman stands in the centre holding a piece of cloth in front of her, between two horsemen, of whom the left-hand one is trampling a prostrate man underfoot. Behind the horses two upright snakes, bending inwards, heads facing each other to either side of the central woman's head. In the upper corners busts of Sol (left), radiate, and Luna (right). In the lower register (from left to right): a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree, a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth, a three-legged table bearing three fruit (?), a loaf (?) and a crescent-shaped object, with two amphorae between the legs of the table, a fish, a dagger, a cock, a vessel, a lion, and a man with a ram's head. Tudor 1969 I, 95 nr. 173.

-94. Alba Julia Mus. 294/IHe 10.575 Unknown Dark marble 3rd c. AD Rectangular plaque. In the upper corners busts of Sol (left), radiate, and Luna (right). In the centre frontal standing goddess/woman behind a three-legged table bearing a fish; she stands between two horsemen trampling two prostrate men underfoot. Tudor 1969 I, 4 nr. 6 (with ref.).

-95. Lost; plaster copies in Alba Julia, Mus. & Rome, Museo di Gessi Dacia Marble 3rd c. AD Roundel, divided into three registers. Upper register: veiled female bust between two hooded male busts. To the left, a three-legged table with a fish, two attendents and in the corner a small bust (Sol); to the right a man holding a fish and a bust (Luna). In the main field a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table bearing a fish, between two
horsemen, each with a male attendant and each trampling a prostrate man underfoot. In the lower register (from left to right) a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth, two men holding a skin of a ram in front of a person (woman?), and a bull below a ram.

Tudor 1969 I, 2-3 nr. 3 (with ref.).

-96. Formerly Dr. Lestyán Jozséf collection, lost in WWII
Unknown
Marble
3rd c. AD

Rectangular plaque. In the upper half a goddess/woman stands between two horsemen trampling two men underfoot; Tudor assumes that busts of Sol and Luna were in the upper corners, but this is not visible on the drawing. Below, a three-legged table at the centre bearing a fish, next to which stands a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth. At each side a man; various other, unidentifiable objects.

Tudor 1969 I, 4-5 nr. 7 (with ref.).

Romula (Tudor); found in the Teslui river (LIMC).
Lead
3rd c. AD

Rectangular plaque, decorated in four registers. Top register: an eagle in the centre between two male busts, two figures carrying vessels and the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (5 double rays), whip. In the main register a goddess/woman stands in the centre behind a three-legged table bearing a fish. She stands between two horsemen, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot. Above the horses two stars and two snakes. In the next register (from left to right): a ram’s head, a bull, a crater between two snakes, a lion and a dagger. In the lowest register (from left to right): three rings, three candelabres, and a branch.

LIMC Heros Equitans 417; Tudor 1969 I, 21-2 nr. 37.

-98. Bucharest, Mus.
Danube, near Sucidava
Terracotta
3rd c. AD

Aedicula-shaped applique, much worn. Above the pediment a raven between two busts (Sol and Luna); in the pediment three busts, between two snakes. Below, a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table bearing a fish, between two horsemen. Below the horsemen, next to the table, to the left three altars above a crater and an indistinguishable object, and to the right a lamp, an amphora (?) and a snake curled around a tree.

Tudor 1969 I, 23-4 nr. 41.

Orlea (near Sucidava)
Lead
3rd c. AD

Roundel, very poorly preserved; most of the decoration impossible to make out. In the upper register to the left the radiate head of Sol is still visible.

Tudor 1969 I, 25-6 nr. 44.

-100 Formerly Bucharest Mus., now lost.
Dacia inferior
Lead
3rd c. AD

Roundel. Above: frontal busts of Sol (left), radiate (6 rays), and Luna with an upright snake between them; to the left an animal skin, an eagle and a dagger; to the right a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth. Below Sol and Luna a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table, between two horsemen, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot; each horseman is crowned by a Victory. In the exergue (from left to right): a lion, a kantharus above a cock, an unidentifiable object, a ram, a second unidentifiable object.

LIMC Heros Equitans 431; Tudor 1969 I, p. 28 nr. 48.

Castelu, Constanța district
Marble
3rd c. AD

Rectangular plaque. In the centre a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table with a fish on it, between two horsemen, trampling two prostrate men (?) underfoot.
In the upper corners, two busts (Sol and Luna).
LIMC Heros Equitans 415; Tudor 1969 I, 56 nr. 97.

-102. Bucharest, City Museum 6273/1949 & 444/1957
Moesia Inferior
Marble
3rd c. AD
Fragment of a plaque. Preserved are a goddess/woman standing behind a table, two horses’ heads and the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left) with balteus, to either side of the woman’s head.

-103. Călărași Mus. (Rumania)
Durostorum (Silistra)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Fragment of a roundel; what remain are the upper part of a right-hand horseman and a bust of Sol in front of him.
Tudor 1969 II, 21 nr. 229.

-104. Cluj, Mus.
Potaissa (Turda)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Two fragments of a rectangular plaque divided into three registers. Upper register (complete): crater between two snakes, two hooded male busts, and the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right). Of the main register only the upper part is preserved, showing a goddess/woman between two horsemen. Of the lower register only the left-hand corner remains, with a spiral pillar, a cock and a ram.
Tudor 1969 I, 7 nr. 11 (with ref.).

-105. Cluj, Mus.
Brucla (Aiud)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Large fragment of an (unfinished?) round-topped plaque. In the centre a goddess/woman, two busts (Sol and Luna) to either side of her head, between two horsemen; of the left-hand one enough is preserved to also reveal a prostrate man below him. In the lower register a bird, a large altar, and a man.
Tudor 1969 I, 11-2 nr. 20 (with ref.).

-106. Cluj, Mus.
Dacia Superior
Marble
3rd c. AD
Roundel. In the centre a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table; to the left and right above her head two busts (Sol and Luna). She stands between two horsemen, the right-hand one accompanied by a lion, the left-hand one trampling a prostrate man underfoot and followed by an attendant. In the lower register a cock, three men with a ram, and a crater, all below two snakes.
LIMC Heros Equitans 421; Tudor 1969 I, 15 nr. 27.

-107. Deva, Mus.
Sarmizegetusa
Marble
3rd c. AD
Upper left-hand corner of a rectangular plaque. In the upper register an egg-shaped vessel between two snakes, flanked to the left by a bust (Luna, according to Tudor). Only the top of the next register is preserved, showing (from left to right): the heads of two attendants, a horseman, a horse, and a woman. The plaque can have depicted only one horseman.
Tudor 1969 I, 9 nr. 15 (with ref.).

-108. Deva, Mus.
Sarmizegetusa
Marble
3rd c. AD
Upper part of a rectangular plaque. In the centre of the upper register an eagle above the bust of a woman between the busts of two hooded men, two standing men each holding some object, and two busts in the corners (Sol, very worn, and Luna). Only the upper portion of the main register remains, with a goddess/woman in the centre between two horsemen, each followed by an attendant.
Tudor 1969 I, 12 nr. 19 (with ref.).

-109. Galați (Rumania), Mus.
Barboși (Galați district)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Roughly aedicula-shaped plaque, originally serving a different function but reused as Danube-rider relief. In the apex of the tympanum an eagle above the bust of a woman between the busts of two hooded men and of Sol (left) and Luna (right). In the main field a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table between two horsemen, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot and each followed by an attendant goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth.
LIMC Heros Equitans 429; Tudor 1969 I, 57 nr. 99 (with ref.).

-110. Lugoj (Rumania), Mus. Tibiscum (Jupa)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Upper left-hand corner of a rectangular plaque. In the top register (from left to right) the bust of Sol, chlamys, on a base, the legs of a person, and the remains of two draped busts. In the main register the preserved figures are (from left to right) a female attendant, a horseman below a snake, and a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table bearing a fish.
Tudor 1969 I, 11-2 nr. 22 (with ref.).

-111. Lost
Porolissum (Moigrad)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Upper right-hand corner of a plaque, preserving a horseman riding to the left; in front of him a bust, possibly Sol.
Tudor 1969 I, 5 nr. 8 (with ref.).

-112. Lost
Potaissa (Turda)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Upper right-hand corner of a plaque. In the upper register two snakes to either side of an egg-shaped vessel; to the right in the corner a bust, probably Sol, possibly Luna. In the main field (from left to right) head an forelegs of the horse of the single horseman, a goddess/woman, a second goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth, and a male attendant at the right-hand edge.
Tudor 1969 I, 6-7 nr. 10.

-113. Lost (formerly collection of Count Joseph v. Kemény)
Potaissa (Turda)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Rectangular plaque; only two, inaccurate, descriptions survive. Upper register: bust of a woman between the busts of two hooded men, and the busts of Sol and Luna. Main register: goddess/woman behind a three-legged table with a fish, between two horsemen each trampling a prostrate man underfoot. In the lower register various figures and objects.
Tudor 1969, 8-9 nr. 12 (with ref.).

-114. Lost (formerly collection of Count Joseph v. Kemény)
Potaissa (Turda)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Roundel; only two, inaccurate, descriptions survive.
Tudor 1969, 9 nr. 13 (with ref.).

-115. Lost (formerly collection of Count Joseph v. Kemény)
Potaissa (Turda)
Marble
3rd c. AD
Roundel; only two, inaccurate, descriptions survive.
Tudor 1969, 9-10 nr. 14 (with ref.).

-116. Lost
Sarmizegetusa
Stone
3rd c. AD
Right-hand part of a rectangular plaque in three registers. Upper register: in the right-hand corner a bust, probably Luna; next to her a ring (according to Tudor the back part a rearing snake). In the main register (from left to right): a single horseman, partially preserved, riding to the right and trampling a prostrate figure underfoot, and three figures. In the lower register two figures and a three-
-117. Sibiu, Brukenthal mus.
Apulum
Marble
3rd c. AD
Round-topped plaque, broken at the left.
Upper border: two snakes. Main field: a horseman trampling a prostrate man underfoot; behind him an attendant, in front of him two women on a pedestal, the first one holding out an apron, the second holding her hand to her mouth. Above them a snake entwining a tree and a bust of Sol. In the lower register: a lion, a ram, a three-legged table bearing a fish, a crater with three drinking horns, a cock, a spiral column, and an unidentifiable object.
Tudor 1969 I, nr. 1.

-118. Sighișoara, Mus.
Sarmizagetusa or environs
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD
Round-topped plaque, lower right-hand corner missing. At the top, an eagle between two busts (Sol and Luna). In the main field: a goddess/woman in the centre, seated, behind a three-legged table with a fish, between two horsemen, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot, of whom the left-hand one is attacked by a lion. In the lower register, from left to right: a bird, an animal, a person holding his/her hand to the mouth, and a group of three persons.
LIMC Heros Equitans 436; Tudor 1969 I, 10-1 nr. 18 (with ref.).

-119. Timișoara, Mus.
Pojejena
Marble
3rd c. AD
Rectangular plaque, lower right-hand corner missing. In the centre a sketchily rendered figure behind a one-legged table. Above her head two busts (Sol and Luna). She stands between two horsemen, each trampling an even more sketchily rendered prostrate man underfoot. In the lower register, the cursory representations (from left to right) of: a cock, a crater below a ram's head, three figures and a ram.
Tudor 1969 I, 14 nr. 25 (with ref.).

-120. Timișoara, Mus.
Tibiscum, Roman camp, building B
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD
Round-topped rectangular plaque, broken into 7 pieces. Three registers; in the upper register: bust of a woman between two male, hooded busts and the busts of Sol and Luna in the corners (heads damaged). In the main register a single horseman trampling a prostrate man. Behind him stands a male attendant, in front of him a woman and a man. In the lower register (from left to right): a spiral column, a vessel below a cock, a three-legged table between two men, and two bases.
LIMC Heros Equitans 200; Tudor 1969 II, 9 nr. 200 (with ref.).

-121. Private collection; clay copy in Timișoara, Mus.
Tibiscum
Marble
3rd c. AD
Rectangular plaque. Three registers: in the upper register; an egg-shaped vessel between two snakes and the busts of Sol and Luna in the corners. In the main register a single horseman trampling a prostrate man. Behind him stands two male attendants, in front of him a woman with open arms, a second woman with her hand to her mouth and a man. In the lower register (from left to right): a bird, a man dragging a ram towards an altar, a seated man below three conical vessels, an unidentified object, and a three-legged table with a ram's head.
Tudor 1969 II, 11 nr. 203 (with ref.).

-122. Timișoara, Mus.
Tibiscum, civilian settlement, apsidal building
Marble
3rd c. AD
Rectangular plaque, right corners broken. Three registers; in the upper register: bust of a woman between two male, hooded busts and the busts of Sol and Luna in the corners (damaged). In the main register two
horsemen, each trampling a prostrate man, flank a goddess/woman with two snakes to either side of her head. In the lower register (from left to right): a spiral column on a base, a crater below a cock, a three-legged table with a fish, and below a vessel a four-legged table between two men, and an animal's head (damaged).

Tudor 1969 II, 11-2 nr. 204 (with ref.).

-123. Turnu Severin (Rumania), Porțile de Fier Museum
Romula
Lead
3rd c. AD

Rectangular plaque. The lateral borders are formed by two spiral columns from which spring two arches. Outside the arches two bearded busts in the corners, holding a horn to the mouth (the one at the left very damaged) and an eagle in the centre. Within the arches the busts of Luna (right-hand arch) and Sol (left-hand arch), radiate, whip (? Tudor describes this as a bow and quiver; I cannot make this out from the picture). Between them, below the joint of the two arches, a vessel between two snakes. Below this vessel, in the main field, a woman above a horizontal dagger, between two horsemen, each trampling a prostrate figure underfoot. Behind the left-hand one a soldier, behind the right-hand one a male attendant. Only two heads are preserved in the lower register.

Tudor 1969 II, 12 nr. 205 (with ref.).

-124. Turnu Severin (Rumania), Porțile de Fier Museum
Drobeta
Marble
3rd c. AD

Roundel. In the centre a goddess/woman behind a table. Above her head two busts (Sol and Luna). She stands between two horsemen, the right-hand one accompanied by an attendant. Only two heads are preserved in the lower register.

Tudor 1969 I, 19-20 nr. 34 (with ref.).

-125. Poetovio (Ptuj), Herberstein-Proskau Castle Mus.
Poetovio (Ptuj), sacellum of a private house.
Marble
3rd c. AD

Rectangular plaque. In the upper corners two busts, Sol (left, broken) and Luna. In the main register a goddess/woman in a niche standing behind a three-legged table; two snakes by her head. She stands between two horsemen each trampling a prostrate man underfoot. In the next register a crater between a lion and a fish. In the lower register (from left to right): three men (the middle one with a ram's mask), a candelabrum, a three-legged table with a round object, a woman stretching her hand to the table, and a man skinning a ram hanging from a tree.

Found in a complex - partially excavated - consisting of over 14 rectangular rooms in two parallel rows, some rooms with antechambers. Rooms A-B and E-P revealed no finds “out of the ordinary”, but rooms C and D revealed primarily sacred objects (reliefs, fragments of statues, altars). The excavators interpret these two rooms as a small shrine in a private complex. The finds were poorly preserved and fragmentary. The inscriptions on the three altars (one bilingual) do not preserve the names of the deities to whom they were dedicated. Four fragmentary Danube Rider Cult reliefs (identified as Kabirenreliefs) were found, as well as reliefs, statues, and inscriptions related to Liber-Bacchus, Silvanus, Venus, Aesculapius and Hygieia, a Nutrix, and many otherwise unidentifiable fragments. The state of the finds suggests to the excavators that they were purposefully destroyed. The origin of the site is placed in the last decades of the 2nd c. AD. The bilingual altar was dedicated by an Επίτροπος εβαστο (procurator Augusti) pro salute sua filiaeque et coniugis. Two inscriptions from Mithraeum I at Ptuj mention the imperial procurator C. Antonius Rufus. A large number of tilestamps were
found, but not dated by the excavators. Various small finds (lamps, terra sigillata) should also be datable.

LIMC Heros Equitans 420; Tudor 1969 I, 89 nr. 155 (with ref.); Abramić 1914, 94-5, fig. 70.

-126 Nitra, Mus. of the Arch. Inst. of the Slovak Academy Transylvania? Marble 2nd-3rd c. AD Rectangular plaque. Upper register: round object between two snakes; a bust in each corner (Sol and Luna). In the main register a horseman trampling a collapsing man underfoot; behind him an attendant; in front of him a goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth and a man. I.e. the woman/goddess and the three-legged table are absent. In the lower register (from left to right): a bird, a three-legged table with a fish, a standing figure, a seated figure holding an object, and a standing figure.

LIMC Heros Equitans 363; Tudor 1969 I, 104 nr. 183 (with ref.).

-127. Private collection, Czech or Slovak republic. Unknown Marble 3rd c. AD Round-topped rectangular plaque. Two busts (Sol and Luna) at the top, above a goddess/woman behind a three-legged table with a fish; she stands between two horsemen, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot, while the left-hand one is apparently also being attacked by an animal. The items in the lower register are hardly recognizable.

Tudor 1969 I, 88-9 nr. 154 (with ref.).

-128. Present location unknown, formerly Bulgaria, private collection Dimum (Beleni), Bulgaria Marble 3rd c. AD Round-topped plaque. In the centre, behind a three-legged table bearing a fish, a goddess/woman (hardly visible) between two horsemen trampling two prostrate men underfoot. Above: two busts (Sol and Luna). In the lower register (from left to right): spiral column, two men holding something in front of a third man, and a cock above a round object.

Tudor 1969, 45 nr. 76.

-129. Private collection; drawing in the Royal Library, Windsor: Dal Pozzo-Albani Drawings II, Fol. 30, 8285 Unknown Marble 3rd c. AD Rectangular relief in three registers; top: bust of Sol in the left corner and bust of Luna in the right corner, both on bases; next to them two men in Phrygian caps, the one next to Sol holding a fish, the one next to Luna a sceptre; in the centre an eagle above the bust of a woman between the busts of two bearded men with Phrygian caps. Main field: Two horsemen, facing inwards, to either side of a frontal goddess/woman who is holding the reins of the horses. In front of her a three-legged table bearing a fish. Below the left-hand horse a prostrate man, next to the right-hand one a running dog. Behind each horseman an attendant, above each a snake. Lower register: in the centre a man with two attendants holding up a skin. To the left a standing goddess/woman holding her hand to her mouth; behind her indistinguishable objects. To the right a ram and a bull lying on the ground.

Tudor 1969 I, 103-4 nr. 182 (with ref.).

-130. Rome? (formerly Mus. Kircheriano, present whereabouts unknown) Unknown Limestone 3rd c. AD Relief in two registers; main register: frontal goddess/woman in centre behind a three-legged table with a fish, her head between the busts of Sol and Luna. She is approached from each side by a horseman, each trampling a prostrate man underfoot. Lower register (from left to right): spiral column (most missing), candelabrum, woman, table bearing a round object, quadruped.

Tudor 1969 I, 98 nr. 175 (with ref.).

-131. Pl. 29.4
C2f. The “Danube Riders”.
A large number of fairly small lead and marble plaques from the Danube provinces constitute virtually our only evidence for a cult of some regional significance which flourished from the latter part of the second century to the fourth century AD. 159 Almost all aspects of this cult are enigmatic. We do not even know the names of the main protagonists of these reliefs, a woman - priestess or goddess - behind a three-legged table and two riders riding towards her. 160 Virtually no inscriptions are associated with these plaques and they are mostly stray finds so that we also lack potentially informative contextual evidence. 161

The most comprehensive discussion of these plaques is still that of Tudor (1969). The lead plaques were produced in large numbers from moulds, and the distribution of identical plaques suggests that there were various production centres in the region. Sirmium, for example, was apparently the production centre for most plaques found in Pannonia Inferior. 162 Because so few plaques have been found in situ, dating them has depended on style and iconography, problematic under the best of circumstances and especially hazardous in the case of such mass-produced, provincial objects. 163 It is generally thought that the aedicula-shaped plaques are the oldest and began to be produced under the Severi, while the round plaques are thought to belong to the second half of the third century and the earlier part of the fourth. The plaques appear to have been bound to person as well as to place. A few were found in military camps, others in small shrines in civilian settlements, and yet others in tombs. 164 In at least one case, discussed by Popovic (1991), a plaque was discovered in the tomb of a woman, indicating that this cult was not limited to men. There is also no evidence that it was a predominantly military cult.

---

159 A very small number of plaques has shown up outside the Danube region, for instance in Gaul (Popovic 1991, 237) and Britain (Mackintosh 1997, 363). On the provenance of Danubian rider plaques cf. Mackintosh 1995, 58.

160 On about 15% of the plaques, only one horseman is depicted.

161 Popovic 1991, 235-6. Only eight inscriptions are associated with the cult, of which only three can be satisfactorily deciphered, and none mention the name of a deity. Cf. Mackintosh 1997, 363.


Suggestions for the origin of the cult range from Dacia to the East.\textsuperscript{165}

This is not the place to speculate on the nature and social place of the cult. A number of points of interest nonetheless present themselves in the material gathered here. The plaques are richly decorated with a large number of images or symbols and show a significant degree of variation in content and organization, although there are a number of basic and fairly constant elements. Most plaques are divided into zones or registers, the most important of which are a celestial zone characterized by Sol alone in a frontal quadriga or Sol and Luna together as busts, and a terrestrial zone characterized by the goddess or priestess flanked by two approaching riders reminiscent of the Dioscuri. A third, symbolic, zone usually follows below, and incorporates numerous objects as well as the scene of a ram or ram’s skin hanging from a tree to which various other figures may be linked. On the lead plaques we often find a fourth zone as well, above the symbolic one, but below the riders, depicting diners on a couch by a table. Sol is invariably depicted in his standard iconography. As charioteer he often has his right hand raised, and holds a globe and/or whip in his left hand. As bust he is always clean-shaven and usually radiate. Together with Luna, he is the only figure whom we can identify with certainty. For all other figures, various possibilities have been put forward, but none are conclusive.\textsuperscript{166} This obviously makes it difficult to further analyze the role of Sol on these plaques. It is generally assumed that the cult involved was a mystery cult that required initiation.\textsuperscript{167} The comparison with Mithraism presents itself, and some have interpreted the cult as an actual Lunar counterpart to that solar cult. In this interpretation the woman flanked by the twin riders is identified as Luna.\textsuperscript{168}

Mackintosh (1997, 372-3) argues that as in Mithraism (for which she cites various studies by Beck) most of the main components of these plaques can be related to constellations or planets: the twin riders to Gemini, the ram to Aries, the fish (on the table before the priestess/goddess and/or below one of the riders) to Pisces, the lion to Leo, the snake to Hydra, and the vase to Crater. At the same time the various scenes (banquet, skinning of the ram) would refer to elements of the cult myth or initiation.

This is a promising approach which requires further analysis, for instance to establish the type of coherence that Beck can demonstrate for the Mithraic star chart of the tauroctony. But it seems unlikely that the connection with Mithraism is as strong as has been suggested. The identification of the central woman/goddess as Luna lacks convincing supporting evidence, for iconographically there is nothing to suggest that she is Luna or Diana, and we have no other evidence for her identity.\textsuperscript{169} Other suggestions for her identity include Atargatis (because of the fish on the table in front of her) or the Celtic goddess Epona, who is closely connected with

\begin{thebibliography}
\item\textsuperscript{165} Dacia: Tudor 1969 vol. II, 81; Orient: Popovic 1991, 245.
\item\textsuperscript{166} For a good summary: Mackintosh 1997, 368-73.
\item\textsuperscript{167} Mackintosh 1997.
\item\textsuperscript{168} Zotovic 1978; Mackintosh 1997, 370-3; Popovic (1991) appears less committed to this view than Mackintosh suggests.
\item\textsuperscript{169} The suggestion that she is Luna is based on two Danube rider reliefs. On one there are two crescents next to her head, on the other a painted crescent is visible above her head. Mackintosh 1997, 371.
\end{thebibliography}
horses. While neither proposal is conclusive, the evidence for either one is stronger than the evidence for the suggestion that she is Luna. The cult is also much more strictly regional than Mithraism, which is difficult to explain if there was a significant connection between the two. The nature of the evidence also differs remarkably. No Danube rider temples or shrines have been identified and we have no large-scale Danube rider art. Whether in lead or marble, the Danube rider reliefs are almost always small enough to be carried with ease by one person, a striking difference with monumental Mithraic art. As indicated above, this suggests a much more person-bound rather than place-bound function for the plaques which implies a fundamentally different form of religious experience.

The similarities that scholars see between Mithraism and the Danube riders therefore do not, I think, reflect a close kinship between the two cults, but are more the result of the utilization of the same subset of Rome’s visual language. This is to be expected if both cults have a strong astronomical or cosmic content; the number of planets and constellations is limited. In Beck’s terms we could then identify the subset used as star talk and conclude that in Mithraism and the Danube rider cult we have two Roman cults that use the visual language of the stars to express their respective cultic or doctrinal messages. Whether the Danube rider plaques actually make any coherent pronouncement(s) in star talk has yet to be established. If they do, it would be very informative to subject the role of Sol in Mithraism and the Danube rider cults to a closer, comparative analysis, but on our present understanding of the rider cult plaques that is not yet feasible.

We can, however, make a few final remarks about Sol on these reliefs. He is at times more prominent than we have come to expect. On a number of plaque-types only Sol is depicted, without Luna, dominating the upper register in his frontal quadriga. That Sol alone is meant here, with a meaning that is apparently not synonymous with the depiction of Sol and Luna together, may be implied by one of the types on which the central Sol appears to be flanked by small busts of Sol and Luna. However, we should not make too much of this as most other reliefs depict Sol and Luna instead of Sol alone.

On the Danube rider plaques Sol appears to be a less carefully deployed symbol with a less specific role. There is no connection between Sol and another figure on the plaques comparable to the connections between Sol and Mithras. Sol apparently represents the celestial sphere, but the cyclical eternity of the cosmos is not emphasized, nor is there any specific contrast between Sol’s sphere and earth. There is no sign in the Danube rider plaques of the types of tension and oppositions that are so clearly part of the visual rhetoric of, in particular, the Mithraic tauroctony. We should be careful, therefore, not to assume that Sol has the same range of meanings in both contexts. The cosmic significance of Sol is also more strongly accentuated on the Jupiter columns, on which Sol is often depicted as planetary god. To the best of my knowledge the planetary gods are not depicted as a group on Danube rider plaques. In short, Sol has no clearly apparent, specific role to play on the Danube rider plaques other than to denote the celestial register and the cosmic dimension of the imagery. There is one other element that may

\[\text{170} \text{C2f.1-14, 28-35, 51-54.}\]

\[\text{171} \text{C2f.51-54}\]
be at play here in the connotations of Sol. The Danube riders are a distinctly regional phenomenon, which makes it tempting to see Sol contributing an element of *romanness* again. But the iconography in other respects does not sustain a duality of regional or non-Roman and Roman as was the case in the iconographies of Mithras, Jupiter Dolichenus, and the Celtic Jupiter columns, so the *romanness* of Sol, if a factor at all, is certainly less marked. The relatively late development of the Danube rider iconography (and cult?) may account for this.

**C2g. Hosios kai Dikaios**

-1. Afyon, no inv. Nr.
   Unknown
   Limestone
   2nd c. AD
   Votive altar with partially preserved dedicatory inscription to Hosios. On left side, bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys; on the right side bust of Hercules; on the rear, 5 ears of corn.
   Ricl 1992, 98-9 nr. 5, pl. 10.

-2. Eskişehir A83-81
   Karikos
   Marble
   2nd c. AD
   Votive relief. In tympanon draped bust of Sol (?)
   Matern 2002, 28 n. 211, 34 n. 263, 182 n., 991, 254 B64. Ricl 1992, 97-8 nr. 3 pl. 9
   Ricl proposes that the bust is that of Hosios kai Dikaios, which appears likely.

-3. Pl. 30.1
   Afyon, Mus.
   Unknown
   Marble
   2nd - 3rd c. AD
   Altar with an inscription to Hosios and Dikaios. On the front, bust of Diana; on the r. side, Hercules; l. side, bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, globe below the bust.
   Matern 2002, 176 n. 963, 177 n. 972, 182 n. 991, 253 B59, fig. 76 (incorrect ref. to Ricl).

-4. Eskişehir, Mus. 96-82
   Bozan
   Marble
   2nd-3rd c. AD
   Altar with an inscription to Hosios and Dikaios. Within the inscription, bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys, above protomes of four horses.

-5. Eskişehir inv. 4199
   Dorylaeum
   Marble
   2nd-3rd c. AD
   In the tympanum, Cybele. Below: Sol in quadriga to the right and bust (of a woman?).
   Ricl 1991, 15 nr 27, pl. 6

-6. Istanbul, Mus. 748
   Dorylaion
   Marble
   early 3rd c. AD
   On a stele, Sol on a quadriga (two wheels) with four small horses jumping up to the right. Above him: three deities. At the top, riding deity with dog. Below, dedicatory inscription to Hosios and Dikaios.
   Matern 2002, 67, 217-8 Q64 (with refs.).
   Ricl EpigrAnat 18, 1991, 10-11 nr. 20 pl. 3

-7. Pl. 30.2
   Istanbul, Mus. 4481
   Inönü
   Marble
   3rd c. AD
   Naiskos framed by pilasters, with a dedication to the Mother of gods, Phoebus, Men, Hosios, Dikaios and others. Sol, dressed in a short chiton and chlamys, on a quadriga r., radiate (12? Rays), whip in r. hand, reins in l. Above Sol is Zeus Brontos, below him are Men and Dionysus.

   Yaylababa village
   Marble
   3rd c. AD
   Fragment of a stele; in tympanon: bust of Sol, radiate nimbus; below, figures of Hosios
and Dikaios
1991, 24 nr. 47, pl. 9

Yaylababa village
Marble
3rd c. AD
Fragment of a stele; in tympanon: bust of Sol, radiate nimbus; Below, figure of Dikaios.
Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 254 B68. Ricl
1991, 25 nr 49, pl. 10

-10. Eskişehir A65-67
Dorylaion
Marble
Undated
Altar dedicated to Hosios and Dikaios. On one side, bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays), chlamys, on a globe; on the other sides, Apollo Lykaios above a wolf, a bust defaced with a cross, and a figure with a set of scales (Dikaios).
Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 254 B63; Ricl
1991, 11 nr. 21 pl. 4

C2g Hosios kai Dikaios
In Asia minor we find a substantial number of votive altars and stelai dedicated to Hosios and Dikaios on which Sol, or rather Helios is depicted in his canonical Graeco-Roman guise. In seven cases the bust of Sol is depicted, once above four protomes of horses, and in three cases Sol is depicted driving a quadriga. Sol is always radiate, sometimes with the addition of a nimbus. In two cases only Sol is depicted (C2g.2 and C2g.4), and in the other eight cases Sol is one of a number of gods. The range of deities is broad, and there is no apparent pattern. Diana/Artemis occurs once (C2g.3), but not explicitly paired with Sol, and in general Sol is depicted apparently on par with other deities. Hosios (with rod or measuring stick) and/or Dikaios (with scales) are depicted on only three of the ten reliefs.

It is interesting that on these reliefs dedicated to the seemingly abstract concepts Hosios ("holy") and Dikaios ("just"), the image type [sol] occurs in a less formulaic and abstract form than is commonly the case. In contrast with the small-scale, framing figures of Sol and Luna common on for instance tauroctonies, or the planetary deities as on the Jupiter columns, or the cosmic sky of the Danube rider plaques, the image type here is deployed to depict Sol on par with

---


173 In the case of C2g.2, the bust may not be Sol.
Hercules (C2g.1, 3), Cybele (C2g.5), Zeus, Men and Dionysus (C2g.7), Apollo Lykaios (C2g.10), and other deities (C2g.6), not to mention Hosios and/or Dikaios (C2g.8-10). Sol is not a very common figure on Hosios and Dikaios reliefs.

Arnold (2005, 441-2) stresses the moral role of Hosios and Dikaios, as well as other Anatolian deities, as overseers of correct conduct and punishers of transgressors. In that role, according to Arnold, these deities are mediators or emissaries of the divine. Perhaps we should see all deities depicted on these monuments as guarantors of all that is sacred and just - as elements, that is, of the divine forces that comprise Hosios and Dikaios. But this is speculation and further pursuit of the meanings of Hosios and Dikaios reliefs is beyond the scope of this study. As far as the images of Sol are concerned, there is no clear pattern of context or manner of depiction suggestive of a specific symbolic meaning. Clarification of his role here requires further research.

C2h. Saturnus

-1. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
   Le Kheneg
   Stone
   Late 1st - early 2nd c. AD
   Facade of a temple; in the tympanum: Tanit. Below: bust of Sol (left) and (probably) Luna (right).
   Leglay 1966, 42 nr. 12

-2. Thala, reused as threshold in a house
   Thala
   Stone
   Late 1st - early 2nd c. AD.
   Fragment of a stele. Three registers remain, each divided into small compartments. Above, centre, two cornucopiae, flanked, in a tondo to the right, by a bust of Sol, radiate ("rayons étoilés"). The corresponding tondo with Luna to the left is lost. In the next register two sphinxes and a dolphin. In the main register, below, the two dedicants (man and woman).

-3. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
   Le Kheneg
   Stone
   Early 2nd c. AD
   Upper left-hand corner crescent; upper right-hand corner bust of Sol; between them a wreath and a Tanit-sign. Below: arch with dedicant.
   Leglay 1966, 45 nr. 22.

-4. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
   Le Kheneg
   Stone
   Early 2nd c. AD
   Upper left-hand corner crescent; upper right-hand corner bust of Sol; between them a wreath and a Tanit-sign. Below: arch with dedicant. (Very similar to C2h.7)
   Leglay 1966, 45 nr. 23

-5. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
   Le Kheneg
   Stone
   Early 2nd c. AD
   Upper left-hand corner crescent; upper right-hand corner bust of Sol; between them a wreath and a Tanit-sign. Below: arch with dedicant.

-6. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
   Le Kheneg
   Stone
   Early 2nd c. AD
   Façade of a temple with two pillars supporting an architrave and frieze; on the frieze: Bust of Sol in the centre between crescent and rose (left) and a schematic Tanit and wreath (right).
   Leglay 1966, 43-4 nr. 18.

-7. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
   Le Kheneg
   Stone
   Early 2nd c. AD
   Stele in the form of a temple-facade; of the upper part only a bust (of Sol?) and a crescent survive; below: dedicant and bull.
   Leglay 1966, 45-6 nr. 24

-8. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
9. Le Kheneg, Mus.
Le Kheneg
Stone
Early 2nd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade; on the architrave various symbols, including the bust of Sol, radiate (?) right, and a crescent moon (left).
Leglay 1966, 46 nr. 25

12. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 24
Timгад
Stone
2nd half 2nd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left). In the main niche below, dedicant (in this case a woman) by an altar. Below this, a ram and a bull.
Leglay 1966, 144 nr. 34.

13. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 36
Timгад, Therme des Philadelphes
Limestone
1st half 2nd c. AD
Above: bust of Sol (sic), chlamys, between the busts of Luna (right) and Saturn (left). In the main niche below, dedicant between two Genii. Below this a small man leading a ram.
Leglay 1966, 134-5 nr. 7, pl. xxvii,4

14. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 35
Lambafundi (Henchir Touchine)
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Above: reclining Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. In the main niche below, dedicant beside an altar.
Below this, a bull.
Leglay 1966, 120-1 nr. 6, pl. xxv,7.

15. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 45
Timгад, environs of the Therme des Philadelphes
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna and Sol. In the main niche below, dedicant, with a ram behind him.

16. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 74
Timгад
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Above: a bird. In the main niche below, the dedicant by an altar; in the upper corners the busts of Saturnus (left) and, perhaps, Sol (right).
Leglay 1966, 140-1 nr. 24, pl. xxvii,9.

17. Tunis, Bardo Mus.
Djebel Bou-Kournein
Stone
AD 139-145
Fragment of a stele, preserving only a bust of Sol, radiate, in the upper left-hand corner and part of the inscription.
Leglay 1961, 37 nr. 1.

-18. Tunis, Bardo Mus.
Djebel Bou-Kournein
Stone
AD 166, December 13.
Stele, broken into various pieces. At the top, bust of Saturn within a tympanum, with the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left, lost) outside it. Below: inscription.
Leglay 1961, 37 nr. 1.

-19. Tunis, Bardo Mus.
Djebel Bou-Kournein
Marble
February 18 or April 20, 182 AD
In tympanum, Saturn, between Sol (left), radiate, whip, and Luna (right).
Cat. Mus. Aloui C 651, pl. xvii; Toutain, MEFR 12 (1892), 21 nr. 13 pl. 1 fig. 3.

-20. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
Mechea-Nahar
Stone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Saturn, flanked to the left by bust of Sol (bust of Luna to the right lost).
Leglay 1966, 21 nr. 3.

-21. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
Le Kheneg
Stone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade; in the tympanum a crescent between a lozenge (left) and a star (right); in the spandrels bust of Sol (left) and sign of Tanit (right). Below, in the central rectangular niche the dedicant.
Leglay 1966, 48-9 nr. 29

-22. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
Le Kheneg
Stone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade; in the tympanum a tanit-sign between a two-pointed crown and a rose; in the spandrels bust of Sol (left), radiate, and a crescent (right). Below, in the 'entrance" of the temple the dedicant.
Leglay 1966, 49-50 nr. 31

-23. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
Le Kheneg
Stone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade; above the pediment bust of Sol (left) and an unidentifiable bust (right); in the tympanum a tanit-sign flanked to either side by a two-pointed crown. Below, in the "entrance" of the temple two dedicants.
Leglay 1966, 50 nr. 32

-24. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
Le Kheneg
Stone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade; above the pediment a palm and a two-pointed crown (left) and a damaged symbol, either a crescent or a Tanit (right); in the tympanum a bust of Sol, radiate. Below, in a vaulted niche, the dedicant.
Leglay 1966, 50 nr. 33.

-25. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier?
Le Kheneg
Stone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade; above the pediment a crescent surmounted by a disc (left) and a bust of Sol, radiate, with a Tanit (right); in the tympanum a bust of Saturnus. Below, in a vaulted niche, two women holding a ram by a horn.
Leglay 1966, 49 nr. 30.

-26. Lambæse, Mus.
Lambæsis
Stone
2nd - early 3rd c. AD
In tympanum bust of Saturnus between two damaged busts, presumably Sol and Luna.
Leglay 1966, 85 nr. 6.

-27. Lambæse, Mus.
Lambæsis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Heavily damaged stele. In tympanum traces of the bust of Saturnus between the damaged busts of, presumably, Sol and Luna. In a niche below, a man and a woman. Leglay 1966, 86 nr. 11.

Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in three registers. Upper register: the bust of Saturnus between the busts of Sol (left), radiate nimbus (8? rays), chlamys and whip, and Luna (right). In a niche below, a dedicant by an altar. In the lower register a sacrificial animal. Leglay 1966, 87 nr. 13, pl. xxiii,2

-29. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Stele in the form of a temple-facade. Pediment: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Sol (right) and Luna (left). In a niche below, a priest. In the lower register a sacrificial animal. Leglay 1966, 87 nr. 14.

-30. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd - early 3rd c. AD
Rectangular stele of which only the upper part is preserved. Above: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Sol (right) and Luna (left). In a niche below, a dedicant. Leglay 1966, 88 nr. 15.

-31. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the damaged busts of Sol and Luna. Below, between two pillars, the dedicant by an altar. Leglay 1966, 89 nr. 17.

-32. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-early 3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the traces of two busts of which Luna (left) is still recognizable. Below, in a niche, the dedicant by ram on an altar. Below the niche two dolphins. Leglay 1966, 89 nr. 18.

-33. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd - early 3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. Below, in a niche, the dedicant. Below the niche a ram. Leglay 1966, 89-90 nr. 19, pl. xxiv,1.

-34. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd - early 3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top: bust of Saturnus between two busts of which that of Sol (left) is still recognizable. Below, in the entrance of the temple the dedicant by an altar. Leglay 1966, 90 nr. 20.

-35. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left). Below, the dedicant (head only survives) Leglay 1966, 90 nr. 21.

-36. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top: bust of Saturnus between the worn busts of Luna and Sol. Below, the dedicant (head only survives) Leglay 1966, 90 nr. 22.

-37. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right). Below, the dedicant (head only survives).
Leglay 1966, 90-1 nr. 23.

-38. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the profile busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right). Below, in a niche, the dedicant by an altar on which lies a ram.

Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left). Below, the dedicant (head only survives).
Leglay 1966, 92 nr. 27.

-40. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top: garland; below it three small niches with bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. Below, the dedicants, man and woman.
Leglay 1966, 92 nr. 28.

-41. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left). Below, in the main register, the dedicant. In the lowest register a ram.
Leglay 1966, 92 nr. 29.

-42. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate, whip behind left shoulder. Below, the dedicant. The lower part of the stele is broken off.
Leglay 1966, 92-3 nr. 30, pl. xxiv.2

-43. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate, whip behind his right shoulder. Below, in a niche, the dedicant by an altar on which lies a ram.
Leglay 1966, 93 nr. 31.

-44. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus within the tympanum, between two busts, difficult to identify, outside the pediment (Sol & Luna). Below, in the entrance of the temple the dedicant. Below the dedicant in a separate niche a ram.
Leglay 1966, 93 nr. 33.

-45. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: three busts, difficult to identify; probably Saturnus, Sol & Luna. Below, in a niche, the dedicant, possibly a priestess. Below the dedicant in a separate niche a ram.
Leglay 1966, 93-4 nr. 34.

-46. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right). Below, in a niche, the dedicant by an altar.
Leglay 1966, 94 nr. 35.

-47. Lambèse, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-early 3rd c. AD
At the top, bust of Saturn, between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (5 rays), chlamys. Below, in a niche: dedicant. Below the niche, a ram.

-48. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 11
Timgad
Limestone
2nd-early 3rd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate, whip. In the main niche below, dedicant by an altar. Below this, a ram.
Leglay 1966, 143 nr. 30.

-49. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 33
Lambafundi (Henchir Touchine)
Limestone
Late 2nd-3rd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate (6? rays). In the main niche below, two dedicants, man and woman. Below this, a ram.
Leglay 1966, 119-20 nr. 4, pl. xxv,5.

-50. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 36
Lambafundi (Henchir Touchine)
Limestone
2nd-early 3rd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right). In the main niche below, dedicant by an altar. Below this, two kneeling Telamones. On the horizontal upper face of this altar two nude men, one next to a double axe, the other with raised arms.
Leglay 1966, 118-9 nr. 3, pl. xxv,3-4

-51. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 68
Timgad
Limestone
2nd-early 3rd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate. In the main niche below, the dedicant by an altar. Below: a ram.
Leglay 1966, 143 nr. 31.

-52. Tunis, Bardo
Haidra
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
In the upper register, bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate nimbus. Below, the two dedicants (man and woman).
Leglay 1961, 330 nr. 13, pl. xii,6.

-53. Aumale, Place Publ. inv. nr. 53
Aumale
Stone
3rd c. AD
Upper register: bust of Saturn, *capite velato*, between a bust of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. Below Saturn a lion devouring a hare. In the main register two dedicants, a man and a woman, to either side of an altar.
Leglay 1966, 309 nr. 3

-54. Djemila, Mus.
Djemila
Stone
Mid 3rd c. AD
Stele in three registers. In the upper register, large bust of Saturn between two slightly smaller busts, of Luna (right) and Sol (left), chlamys and chiton, whip in right hand; in the next register two dedicants, one man, one woman, to either side of an altar; in the lowest register a bull and two persons.
Leglay 1966, 227 nr. 31 pl. xxxiv,4

-55. Fedj-Mzala
Diana Veteranorum (Zana)
Limestone
3rd c. AD
In the tympanum: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Sol (left), radiate, and Luna (right). In the main niche, dedicant.
Leglay 1966, 77-8 nr. 4, pl. xxxi,4.

-56. Ksar-Toual-Zammeul
In situ
Stone
3rd c. AD
Stele, fragment. Two registers survive; in the upper register, reclining Saturnus. In the lower register, the dedicant (in this case a woman); in the upper corners of this register the busts of Sol (right), radiate nimbus, and Luna (left).
Leglay 1961, 236 nr. 5.
-57. Ksar-Toual-Zammeul
   *In situ*
   Stone
   3rd c. AD
   In the tympanum, two doves face a palm branch. In the next register bust of Saturnus between busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate. In the main register below, the dedicant.
   Leglay 1961, 236-7 nr. 6.

-58. Pl. 31.1
   Lambèse, Mus. Lambaesis
   Limestone
   Early 3rd c. AD
   Stele in the form of a temple-facade. At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Sol (left), radiate and Luna (right). In a niche below, a priest or more probably (according to Leglay) a priestess. Below his/her feet a ram.
   Leglay 1966, 88-9 nr. 16, pl. xxiii,3

-59. Lambèse, Mus. Lambaesis
   Limestone
   3rd c. AD
   Upper part of a round-topped stele. At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left). Below, the two dedicants (man and woman) to either side of an altar.

-60. Lambèse, Mus. Lambaesis
   Limestone
   3rd c. AD
   At the top: bust of Saturnus within the tympanum, between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate (6 rays) outside the pediment. Below, in the entrance of the temple the dedicant by an altar. Below the dedicant in a separate niche a ram.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 357 (with ref.); Leglay 1966, 86-7 nr. 12.

-61. Lambèse, Mus. Lambaesis
   Limestone
   3rd c. AD
   At the top: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right). Below, in a niche, the dedicant by an altar. Below his feet a ram.
   Leglay 1966, 91 nr. 25.

-62. Sétif, Jardin d'Orléans Sétif
   Stone
   Early 3rd c. AD
   Four registers. At the top, within a tympanum, a rosette with a garland around it, between two doves. Below, between two double pillars, the busts of Saturn (centre), Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (7 rays). Below these, under an arch, the dedicant by an altar. In the lowest register, a large altar between two sacrificial bulls.
   Leglay 1966,, 281-2 nr. 32 pl. xxxviii,3.

-63. Sétif, Jardin d'Orléans Sétif
   Stone
   2nd half of the 3rd c. AD
   At the top: bust of Saturnus within the tympanum between the busts of Sol (left), radiate and Luna (right) outside the pediment. Below: two standing dedicants and the bust of a third person above them. In the lowest register two rams facing each other.
   Leglay 1966, 283 nr. 36

-64. Tébessa, Mus. Henchir Rohban
   Limestone
   3rd c. AD (LIMC)
   In the upper, round-topped niche Saturnus (right) and Ops-Caelestis (left) seated on thrones between rams and bulls respectively. In a separate niche below, a frontal lion's head between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate (7 rays), chlamys. Below this an inscription.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 324; Leglay 1961, 352-4 nr. 47.

-65. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 1 Timgad
   Limestone
   Early 3rd c. AD
Rectangular stele in three registers. In the upper register, throning Saturn flanked by two persons each standing by a horse. At first glance these are the Dioscuri, but the right-hand one is clearly a woman (she is dressed in a short himation girded just below her breasts), while the left-hand one is a nude male, suggesting that the two are actually conflations of the Dioscuri and Sol & Luna. In the large central niche: dedicant. In the lower register, a bull between two funerary Erotes leaning on inversed torches. Leglay 1966, 149-51 nr. 46, pl. xxviii,6.

-66. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 13
Timгад
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Above: reclining Saturn between the standing Luna (right) and standing Sol (left), radiate, tunica, trousers (or long chiton?). In the main niche below, dedicant by an altar. Below this, a ram and a bull. Leglay 1966, 152 nr. 47, pl. xxvii,7.

-67. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 34
Lambafundi (Henchir Touchine)
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Above: reclining Saturn between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right). In the main niche below, dedicant beside a ram. Leglay 1966, 120 nr. 5, pl. xxv,6.

-68. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 45
Timгад, Capitolium
Limestone
2nd half 3rd c. AD
Above: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. In the main niche below, dedicant. Below, a bull. Leglay 1966, 153-4 nr. 53.

-69. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 69
Timгад
Limestone
2nd half 3rd c. AD
Above: reclining Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), whip. In the main niche below, the dedicant by an altar. Below: a ram and a bull Leglay 1966, 152 nr. 48.

-70. Timгад, Mus. Inv. 78
Timгад
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Above: reclining Saturn, leaning on the bust of Luna (right); the corresponding bust of Sol (right) has virtually disappeared. In the main niche, two dedicants (man and woman) embracing. Leglay 1966, 152 nr. 49.

-71. Timгад, Mus.
Timгад
Limestone
Early 3rd c. AD
Upper register of stele, Saturnus om throne between Sol, nude but for a chlamys and radiate (7 rays) and Luna. They are each holding one horse as if they were the dioscuri. LIMC Saturnus 82

-72. Tunis
El-Ayaida (Tunisia)
Sandstone
November 8th, 323 AD
Round-topped stele in three registers. In the upper register throning Saturn with sceptre and harpe; above the harpe frontal head of Sol, radiate nimbus (9 rays). In the middle register a man by an altar leading a ram. In the lower register, an inscription. Leglay 1988, 209-211 nr. 31; LIMC Saturnus 88

This is the youngest of the dated monuments dedicated to Saturnus Africanus.

-73. Lost
Masqueray/Sour-Djouab (Rapidum)
Stone
Undated
At the top: triangle between busts of Sol and Luna. Below: sacrificial bull. Leglay 1966, 312 nr. 7.

-74. Philippeville, Mus.
Lambaesis
Sandstone
Undated
In the tympanum, bust of Saturn between the busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right). Below: dedicant.
-75. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Limestone
Undated
In the tympanum, bust of Saturnus. Below the tympanum, an arch, with a bust (of Sol?) in the left-hand corner above the arch; no bust has survived in the right-hand corner. Under the arch the dedicant. On the arch five holes, probably to fasten stars.

-76. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Stone
Undated
Above, the bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left, largely destroyed). Below, in a niche, two dedicants, a man and a woman, embracing each other. LIMC Helios/Sol 356; Leglay 1961, 339-40 nr. 12, pl. xiii,1; S. Gsell, Musée de Tébessa 1902, 19 pl I,3 (not I,2 as Leglay states).

-77. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Limestone
Undated
In the tympanum a palm branch. Below: large bust of Saturn between the smaller busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right); each bust in a separate rectangular field. In the main register below this, representing an entrance, the dedicant (only his head survives).
Leglay 1961, 341 nr. 15

-78. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Stone
Undated
In the tympanum a radiate bust (Sol) surrounded by a garland. Below: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left); each bust in a separate rectangular field. In the main register below this (only the top survives), the dedicant.
Leglay 1961, 342-3 nr. 24

-79. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Limestone
Undated
In the tympanum bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays). Below, the dedicant by an altar.

-80. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Limestone
Undated
Upper part of a stele. At the top, bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (left) and Sol (right), radiate. Below: dedicant.
Leglay 1961, 345 nr. 29.

-81. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Majel
Limestone
Undated
Rectangular stele. Above, large bust of Saturnus between the smaller busts of Sol (right), radiate, and Luna (left). Below, a bull, two rams and an inscription.
Leglay 1961, 354-5 nr. 48, pl. xiii,3

-82. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Majel
Stone
Undated
Worn, rectangular stele in five registers. Above, in a large central niche, throning Saturn, between the busts of Sol (left), radiate (5 rays), chlamys, above four frontal horses and Luna (right) above an animal next to an altar. Below Sol and Luna the two Dioscuri on horseback; together with two bulls below them they flank the dedicant, seated below Saturnus with a ram at his feet. Below this, seven women bearing large baskets with pine-cones on their heads. At the bottom: inscription.
LIMC Helios/Sol 356; Leglay 1961, 355 nr. 49.

-83. Formerly Tébessa, private collection; now lost.
Henchir-El-Hamacha
Stone
Too worn to be dated
Above, in a large central niche, throning Saturn, between the busts of Sol, above four
frontal horses (three survive) and Luna. Below Sol and Luna the two Dioscuri on horseback; together with two bulls and two rams below them they flank the dedicant, seated below Saturnus. Below this, seven pine cones (six survive).

Leglay 1961, 357 nr. 52.

-84. Formerly Tébessa, private collection; now lost.

Henchir-El-Hamacha
Stone
Too worn to be dated
Upper part of a rectangular stele. At the top: six pine cones between the busts of Sol and Luna; four frontal horses below the bust of Sol. In the central niche below, the seated dedicant between the Dioscuri and by two bulls. The rest of the stele is lost.

Leglay 1961, 357 nr. 53

-85. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 9

Timgad
Stone
Undated
Above: bust of Saturn between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), whip. In the main niche below, dedicant between two Genii. Below this, a ram.

Leglay 1966, 141 nr. 25.

-86. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 45

Timgad
Limestone
Undated
Above: bust of Saturnus between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. In the main niche below, two dedicants (only their heads are preserved).

Leglay 1966, 142 nr. 27.

-87. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 89

Timgad
Limestone
Too poorly preserved to be datable
Above: bust of Saturn, between the bust of Sol (right), whip, and a small standing person (left), perhaps with crescent (Luna?). In the main niche, two dedicants (man and woman).

Leglay 1966, 154 nr. 54.

-88. Timgad, Mus. Inv. 130

Timgad
Limestone
Not dated
Fragment of a stele, preserving part of the upper register with bust of Luna at the right. Corresponding bust of Sol at the left lost.

Leglay 1966, 155 nr. 63.

-89. Unknown

Bordj-Douimes
Stone
Undated
In the tympanum: bust of Sol. Below: inscription.

Leglay 1961, 269 nr. 12.

-90. Pl. 30.3

Carthage, Museum
Djebel Bou-Kournein
Marble
Undated.
Stele. At the top, bust of Saturn within a tympanum, with the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (4 rays), whip, outside it. Below: inscription. At the bottom, a bull led by a man (only the head of the latter survives) and a ram.

Leglay 1961, 63-4 nr. 115.

-91. Tunis, Bardo Mus.

Djebel Bou-Kournein
Marble
Undated.
Stele. In the middle, Saturnus, between the busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), whip. Below: inscription.

Leglay 1961, 67 nr. 141. Toutain 1892, 53-4 nr. 160, pl. 1.2

-92. Tunis, Bardo Mus.

Djebel Bou-Kournein
Marble
Undated.
Stele. In the middle, Saturnus, between the busts of Luna (right, but largely broken away) and Sol (left), radiate, whip. Below: inscription.

Leglay 1961, 67-8 nr. 151. Toutain 1892, 56 nr. 179
-93. Tunis, Bardo Mus.
Djebel Bou-Kournein
Marble
Undated.
Stele, fragment: only the harpe of Saturnus and the head of Sol survive, plus a fragment of the inscription.
Leglay 1961, 72 nr. 207.

-94. Kairouan, Tunisia
Henchir-es-Srira
Stone
Undated
Stele, triangular top. At the top, symbols related to Saturnus. In the main register below: head of Sol, radiate, surrounded by palms. In the register below: altar, two rams and two goats.
Leglay 1961, 317-8 nr. 30

-95. Ksar-Toual-Zammeul
In situ
Stone
Undated
The tympanum is lost. In the next register bust of Saturnus between busts of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate. In the main register below, the dedicant.
Leglay 1961, 237 nr. 7.

-96. Ksar-Toual-Zammeul
In situ
Stone
Undated
In the tympanum, two doves face a palm branch. In the next register Saturnus on his throne between the standing Dioscuri (dressed in tunica or short chiton) and two standing figures in the corners, dressed in long robes; the right-hand one lacks attributes but the left-hand one may be Sol as he is radiate. His body is largely chipped away and as a result other identifying attributes may have been lost. The main register below is almost completely lost.

-97. Ksar-Toual-Zammeul
In situ
Stone
Undated
In the tympanum, two doves face a palm branch. In the next register bust of Saturnus between busts of Luna and Sol. In the register below, a bull.
Leglay 1961, 238 nr. 10.

-98. Private collection?
Oued-Laya, near Sousse
Stone
Undated
In the tympanum, pine-cone between busts of Sol and Luna.
Leglay 1961, 257 nr. 2.

Sousse
Stone
Undated
Stele, unfinished, later used as sarcophagus-lid. Above, pine-cone. Below, triangular, Tanit-like figure between Sol and Luna.
Leglay 1961, 257 nr. 10.

-100. Aïn Drinn, Aïn Boubenana road, reused in the wall of a fountain by a farm-house (near Lambaesis).
Lambaesis
Stone
Undated
At the top: bust of Saturn between the busts of Sol and Luna. Below, the dedicant by an altar, and below, left, a frontal ram.
Leglay 1971, 142 nr. 14, fig. 14; Leglay 1988, 215 nr. 41.

-101. Lambaesis, Museum
Aïn Drinn, Aïn Boubenana road, same farm-house (near Lambaesis).
Stone
Undated
At the top: bust of Saturn between the busts of Sol and Luna. Below, the dedicant by a ram.
Leglay 1971, 145 nr. 16, fig. 16; Leglay 1988, 215 nr. 43, fig. 15.

-102. Modern village at Lambaesis, reused in a wall
Lambaesis
Stone
Undated
Above: three small niches with busts, Saturnus in the centre, Sol and Luna to either
side. Below, niche with dedicant. Lower part of stele apparently missing.
Leglay 1971, 145 nr. 18, fig. 18; Leglay 1988, 216 nr. 45.

-103. Modern village at Lambaesis, garden of the prison director
Lambaesis
Stone
Undated
Above: busts of Saturnus in the centre, Sol, radiate, and Luna to either side. Below, niche with two dedicants.
Leglay 1971, 147 nr. 21, fig. 21; Leglay 1988, 216 nr. 48.

C2ha Saturnus - Sol represented by a symbol (limited selection)

-1. Constantine, Mus. Gustave-Mercier
Le Kheneg
Stone
1st c. AD
Tanit between a crescent (left) and a flower (right) = Luna and Sol?
Leglay 1966, 38 nr. 4

-2. Henchir R'Mel, Henchir Djal region
In situ?
Limestone
1st c. AD
Votive stele. In the tympanum: crescent surmounted by a radiate disc and between two palms. In main niche: the dedicant, and below a ram. Very sketchy sculpture.
Leglay 1988, 202 nr. 15

-3. El-Afareg (Tunisia)
In situ?
Limestone
Late 1st - early 2nd c. AD
Stele in three registers; in the upper register a crescent surmounted by a rayed disc and between various objects. In the main register, inscription. Below: ram.
Leglay 1988, 205-7 nr. 26; Mahjoubi 1967, 149-50 nr. 3 pl. 3. Cf. C2ha.7

-4. Lambése, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Upper part of a stele. At the top, bust of Saturnus; below, three symbols: harpe (Saturnus) flanked to the right by a crescent (Luna) and to the left by a whip (Sol). In a niche below: dedicant.
Leglay 1966, 93 nr. 32.

-5. Lambése, Mus.
Lambaesis
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
At the top: bust of Saturnus between two rosettes in place of Sol and Luna. Below, in a niche, the dedicant. In the lowest register, a ram.
Leglay 1966, 94 nr. 37.

-6. Tébessa, Mus.
Henchir Rohban
Limestone
Undated
In the tympanum a palm-tree flanked by two birds (probably doves). Under the arch below, the dedicant (only her head survives); a star (left) and a crescent (right), symbolizing Sol and Luna?
Leglay 1961, 343 nr. 25.

-7. Modern village at Lambaesis, reused in a wall
Lambaesis
Stone
Undated
Niche with dedicant. Below, a ram; in the upper corners outside the niche: whip (Sol) and crescent (Luna).
Leglay 1971, 145 nr. 17, fig. 17; Leglay 1988, 215-6 nr. 44.

-8. Formerly Batna (Algeria), now lost
Lambaesis
Stone
Undated
Above: crescent surmounted by a star and between two roses; according to Leglay these symbols represent Saturnus, Sol and Luna. Below: niche with dedicant.
Leglay 1971, 147 nr. 23, fig. 23; Leglay 1988, 217 nr. 50.
C2h Saturnus

The cult of Saturnus was an important regional cult in the part of North Africa that coincides roughly with Africa Proconsularis and Numidia, and represents a continuation of the Punic cult of Baal in this region. From the second century BC to the fourth century AD dedicants erected stelai in honour of Saturnus in a large number of places and in a wide range of styles. Iconographically, the stelai show a fair amount of regional variation and a significant amount of change over time. All have in common, however, that the dedicant is depicted more prominently than the deity. The earliest stelai depict very simply sketched frontal figures of the dedicant in low relief with round head, rectangular body, and raised arms holding offerings. Above the dedicant we usually find a crescent, sometimes with the addition of a rosette. Such stelai often have no inscription at all, or else have an inscription in either neo-punic or Latin. Dating these early stelai is difficult. They range from the second century BC to the first or early second century AD. By the early second century AD the stelai tend to be more elaborate. The relief is deeper, with greater volume and far more detail. The iconography becomes more complex with a greater number of figures, notably deities. We find gabled or round-topped stelai, for instance, with the dedicant or dedicants in a deep niche framed by columns and surmounted by a gable, with deities above the gable and/or in the tympanon, and sacrificial scenes below.

On the earlier stelai, Sol and Luna are not depicted, although there is often a crescent, sometimes with a rosette, above the head of the dedicant. The rosette is usually interpreted as a solar symbol, but the crescent is deemed to represent Baal Hammon, rather than Luna. Various other symbols such as a rayed disc and a star have also been interpreted with varying degrees of likelihood as solar symbols. Their use is not restricted to early stelai, but will not concern us here further. On the more elaborate reliefs, from the late first century AD onwards, Sol and Luna in the standard image type become the most common added figures, although by no means essential. Sol is almost invariably depicted as a bust (97%), sometimes with whip, and on three stelai from Tébessa above four horses. On over 80% of the stelai on which Sol occurs he is depicted with Luna as flanking busts, usually to either side of Saturnus who himself is depicted as bust, as seated on a throne or as reclining figure. Sol can be depicted to the left or to the right of Saturnus, with a slight preference for the left side (about 60%). On stelai from Le Kheneg (castellum Tidditanorum) the bust of Luna is sometimes replaced by a crescent. Sometimes Sol is replaced by a whip, and Saturnus may be represented by his harpe. In other cases, the bust of Sol may be

---


175 For images cf. Leglay 1961, pl. XV 1-3; Wilson 2005, figs, 1, 2.

176 C2ha.1-3, 5-6, 8; Leglay 1961, 66; Wilson 2005, 404.

177 E.g. C2h.10, 19, 28, 48, 85, 87, 90-92.

178 C2h.4-7, 21-22, 25.

179 C2ha.4, 7.
depicted alone, for instance in a tympanum.\textsuperscript{180} In one case the bust of Sol is central and flanked by Luna and Saturnus.\textsuperscript{181} On two occasions, Sol is depicted with the other six planetary deities.\textsuperscript{182}

Rare, but quite interesting are the depictions of Sol as standing figure. On a stele from Timgad the depiction is fairly straightforward: Sol (left) and Luna (right) stand to either side of the reclining Saturnus.\textsuperscript{183} On a stele in Ksar-Toual-Zammeul a enthroned Saturnus is similarly flanked by the standing figures of Sol and Luna, this time with the addition of the two Dioscuri.\textsuperscript{184} The Dioscuri also occur on two reliefs from the environs of Tébessa, this time on horseback.\textsuperscript{185} On two other stelai, both from Timgad, Sol and Luna are also depicted as standing figures to either side of Saturnus on a throne. Sol is radiate, but in a unique variation of his standard image type is holding a horse, as is Luna. There can be no doubt that Sol and Luna are meant (the former is radiate, the latter in both cases clearly female), but the addition of the two horses adds an element of the Dioscuri.\textsuperscript{186}

The Baal-Hammon or Saturnus stelai of Numidia and Africa Proconsularis are rich in symbolic images, both neo-Punic and Graeco-Roman in origin. Punic, for example, are the Tanit figures that are depicted in particular on the stelai from Le Kheneg, in Constantine.\textsuperscript{187} Graeco-Roman is the iconography of Saturnus, Sol and Luna, the Dioscuri, and often the dedicant (wearing a toga), to give some examples. Stylistically the stelai range from completely indigenous to substantially Graeco-Roman. The composition, iconography, and style naturally change in the course of the five centuries or so that these stelai were produced, and can also vary from region to region. The image type \textsuperscript{[sol]} occurs on a substantial number of stelai, but still only a minority of the total. This is a complex and varied group that requires a great deal more attention than we can give it here, before we can arrive at conclusions concerning the interactions between the various symbols and their meanings.

That the image type \textsuperscript{[sol]} is used here as a symbol rather than a depiction of the sun god is evident from the fact that he is generally depicted as a small, peripheral or emblematic bust, together with Luna. On occasion he is simply represented by a whip or perhaps some other symbol. On the rare occasions that he is depicted as a full-length figure, Sol also takes a peripheral or flanking position together with Luna. It is telling that on two occasions the standing Sol doubles for a Dioscure through the addition of a single horse, presumably to enhance the

\textsuperscript{180} C2h.24, 78, 79, 89.

\textsuperscript{181} C2h.13.

\textsuperscript{182} C2h.9.

\textsuperscript{183} C2h.66.

\textsuperscript{184} C2h.96.

\textsuperscript{185} C2h.82-3.

\textsuperscript{186} C2h.65, 71.

\textsuperscript{187} C2h.1, 4-6, 21-22, 24-25, 99 (from Sousse).
range of symbolic meanings conveyed.

The combination of Sol, Luna and Saturn brings together three adjacent deities of the week, but this is not emphasized. Preference is given to a central position for Saturn between Sol and Luna, which breaks the order. Nonetheless, although the planetary deities are depicted only rarely in anthropomorph type,\textsuperscript{188} there is evidence that the notion of the seven-day planetary week was present and could be incorporated through the inclusion of seven symbols.\textsuperscript{189} Also interesting is the stele from the Philadelphia Baths in Timgad on which Sol is in the middle, with Saturnus to the left and Luna to the right, i.e. in their correct weekday order.\textsuperscript{190} At the same time the peripheral and subordinate position of Sol and Luna as small busts sets them apart from the often more elaborate enthroned or reclining Saturnus and articulates them typically as the sign for cosmic \textit{aeternitas}. This is reinforced by the presence of and in particular the conflation with the Dioscuri.

The large variety of the stelai itself also reinforces the symbolic nature of the imagery, while the lack of uniformity suggests that these stelai were not intended to communicate complex or detailed messages. But while the reading may have been fairly straightforward to the lower or middle class indigenous dedicants, we should take care not to take the meanings for granted.\textsuperscript{191} One potential issue, for instance, is the meaning of the crescent which is sometimes thought to symbolize Baal Hammon, while on other occasions it clearly represents Luna. Another issue that requires closer attention is the deployment of non-anthropomorph symbols and their meanings. The styles of the stelai may also be a fruitful object of analysis, in particular in terms of regional variation and the coexistence of different styles.\textsuperscript{192} In short, there is a great deal that we can still learn about these stelai and that may shed further light on the meanings of the image type [sol].

\textbf{C2i. Planetary deities, alone}

\begin{enumerate}
\item Pl. 32.1  
Palmyra, temple of Bel, N.-Thalamos  
\textit{In situ}  
Stone  
AD 32  
Ceiling-relief: bust of Jupiter in the centre, surrounded by the six other planetary deities in arbitrary order (above Jupiter's head: Mars, followed anti-clockwise by Sol, Mercury, Saturn, Venus and Luna), within a zodiac circle.  
LIMC Helios in per. or. 15 (with ref.); Gundel 1992, nr. 44.
\item Ostia, Mus. 625  
Ostia (possibly from the Mitreo Sabazeo)  
Marble  
3\textsuperscript{rd} c. AD  
Two fragments of a frieze decorated with busts; Sol, Luna, Mars are preserved on the one, Jupiter and Venus on the other.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{188} C2h.9, C2ia.1.

\textsuperscript{189} One example of such symbols are the seven pine cones on reliefs from Tébessa: C2h.82, 83, 84(?).

\textsuperscript{190} C2h.13.


\textsuperscript{192} The dating of the stelai is problematic and in many cases is based primarily on the dubious and problematic criterium of style (Wilson 2005, 403).
-3. Unknown
Auxerre?
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Relief with the busts of the seven planetary deities, from Saturn to Venus.
LIMC Planetae 15; Espérandieu Recueil IX, 7155; Duval 1953, 287.

-4. Unknown
Plumpton, Abbotsford
Stone
3rd c. AD
Base (?) with five of the seven planetary deities; from left to right: Venus, Mars (Matern: Hercules), Mercury, Sol, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, not radiate, Jupiter.
LIMC Helios/Sol 261 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 106, 234 I23, fig. 46.

-5. Mannheim, Museum
Neckarauberg
Sandstone
Undated
Fragment of a pillar (Jupiter-giant monument?) with a niche in which the bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys, is preserved, between two other busts, almost completely broken away.
Espérandieu, Germanie 435; Duval 1953, 287.

Godramstein
Sandstone
Undated
Block (of a Jupiter-giant pillar) in the form of an irregular octagon, one side mutilated. Preserved are six of the seven planetary deities; Venus and the representation on the eighth side are lost. Sol is preserved only in outline.
LIMC Helios/Sol 278; Bauchhenß-Noelke 1981 137 nr. 193 (with lit.).

C2ia. Planetary deities, with others
-1. Leiden, RMO HAA3
Acquired in 1823 in Tunisia and said to be from the environs of ancient Vacca and Sicca Veneria.
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Fragment of a relief dedicated to Saturnus; planetary deities, running from Saturn (left) to Venus (right); Sol, radiate nimbus, is nude and holds a whip.

-2. Épinal, Mus. dép.
Soullosse
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Altar; front: standing, bearded male figure in a niche, holding a staff in his right hand and an unidentifiable attribute in his lowered left hand. Below him in two rows the seven busts of the planetary deities, their individual features and attributes no longer distinguishable.
Espérandieu, Recueil VI, 4848

-3. Vienne
Vienne
Limestone
Ca. AD 200
Octagonal altar (?) With busts of the seven planetary deities (heads defaced) and of Septimius Severus. Sol has a chlamys, perhaps a whip behind his r. shoulder, and long wavy hair. Whether he was radiate can no longer be ascertained. Below the busts of Jupiter and Venus (?), dedicatory inscription to Jupiter Optimus Maximus.
Espérandieu, Recueil I, 412; Duval 1953, 287; Lusnia 2004, 526, 529 fig. 11 (Sol and Luna on r. hand photograph).

-4. Pl. 32.2
Wiesbaden, Mus. Wiesbaden 237 Hedderheim
Sandstone
2nd-3rd c. AD
In the main field, Minerva, Vulcan and Mercury; above: planetary deities, from Saturn (left) to Venus (right); Sol is radiate (7 rays) and wears a chlamys.
Épinal, Mus. dép.
Frémifontaine
Reddish sandstone
3rd c. AD
Triangular stele with two rows of busts, three above, seven below; the busts are uniformly executed and lack distinguishing characteristics, making it impossible to determine whether the lower seven are the planetary deities, as Espérandieu tentatively puts forward.
Espérandieu, *Recueil VI*, 4784

Frankfurt a.M., Mus.
Heddernheim
Sandstone
Undated
Aedicula-shaped relief, damaged. In the main field, Minerva (?) upper part of her body and head missing), Vulcan and Mercury. In a frieze above them, the busts of the planetary deities, running from Saturn (left, most missing) to Venus (right). In the tympanum, unidentified bust.
Espérandieu, *Germanie* 98.

Harisa, convent (moved to Beirut, Mus.?)
Fiki
Limestone
Undated
Octagonal altar depicting the planetary deities and Allat. Sol, nude but for a chlamys, radiate, whip in r. hand, patera (?) in l. hand. Next to Allat is Mercury, followed, from r. to left, by the other planetary deities in order and ending with Mars. Jupiter, Mercury, and Venus are depicted in the guise of the Heliopolitan triad.
Stern, *Cal.* 173-4 p. 32.3; Hajjar 149ff nr. 136 pls. 47-50; Matern 2002, 92, 98, 228, G21; LIMC Planetae 8; LIMC Selene/Luna 28; Hajjar 1977, 136, pl. XLVII.

C2i. The Planetary deities
The planetary deities representing the seven planets occur with significant frequency in Roman art. The reliefs collected in this section represent only a small proportion of the total number
images in various media. These deities were the seven linked to the “wandering stars” or planets: the Sun, the Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. Precisely when and how these deities became attached to their specific planet is not certain, but certainly not long after the wandering stars were recognized as a separate group. The Greeks acquired this knowledge from the Babylonians quite early, and the connection between these gods and their planets is certainly pre-Classical. It was maintained throughout the Hellenistic and Roman period, with some variation of deities. This should not be surprising, for throughout this period the divinity of the planets was relatively uncontested. Nonetheless the concept of divine planets has troubled many many scholars because of its perceived ungreek irrationality. Some therefore suggest that under the impetus of Hellenistic science the connection between the planets and their deities was downplayed and a more “objective” rather than religious nomenclature was sought. Following this scientific phase there was then a revival of what is termed “planetary religion” from the end of the first century AD. But as Beck points out, the names of the associated deities were almost always mentioned with “their” planet throughout the Hellenistic period. Furthermore, the notion that the planets were divine was not a voluntary article of faith, but a widely accepted philosophical tenet or, in anachronistic terms, scientific fact. This divinity of the planets is an issue which deserves our attention.

**Hellenistic astronomy and the problem of the wandering stars**

By the (late) Classical era, Greek astronomers and philosophers generally understood the cosmos in terms of the perfect shape (sphere) and movement (circular). The basic form of their model for the universe had the earth at the centre, surrounded by eight spheres. The outer sphere was

---

193 For other depictions of the planetary deities cf. A1a.3, A2d.1, C1a.3a, C2e.29, 54, 67, C2e.4-5, 7-8, 12-14, 16-20, 22-27, C2h.9, D2.1-5, E3.1-4, F1b.7, F3.1-2, 4, F4.4, G1f.1, H10k, J2b.1, 8-9, J2e.1, J3.3-4, J6.1, K5, K6.1, K9.34.

194 Beck 2007, 72-3; Eilers 1976; Cumont 1935.


196 Wallraff 2001, 92-3, citing Cumont and Gundel.

197 Beck 2007, 73 n.3. Wallraff (2001, 93 n. 18), citing Cumont, claims that the planets were not directly named as Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, etc. (rather than “planet of Saturn etc.”) until the first century BC in Latin and the second century AD in Greek (“Im lateinischen Sprachraum werden die Götternamen ohne weiter Zusätze erst am Ende der römischen Republik zur Bezeichnung der Planeten verwendet, im griechischen Sprachraum sogar erst ab dem 2. Jh. n.Chr.” - the latter is not actually what Cumont (1935, 37) says, as the Greek papyrus of the 2nd c. AD that he quotes is, according to Cumont, definitely a copy of a text composed “à une date plus ancienne”). This argument is not entirely clear but appears to be that naming the planet directly by its deity’s name is the result or an exponent of the renaissance of planetary religion, while speaking of the “planet of [deity]” is less religious. I do not find this distinction convincing, because I don’t understand which problem it is trying to solve. It is clear that Cumont (1935) feels that divine planets were not consonant with the “rationalisme scientifique” of Alexandrine scholarship, but as Beck points out, this idea is anachronistic. There is no reason to assume that the divinity of the planets would be considered irrational among Alexandrian scholars, as the concept had impeccable philosophic credentials.

198 Wright (1995, 37-55) gives a good overview of the variety of theories.
that of the fixed stars. The seven other spheres were for the planets. All spheres were thought to
circle the earth from East to West every 24 hours, but in addition to this universal motion the
seven planetary spheres were deemed also to rotate in the opposite direction, each at its own
speed. In this way Greek astronomers attempted to explain why the planets do not have a fixed
spot in relation to the stars, but instead gradually travel through the constellations, from West to
East. It takes the moon a month, the Sun a year, and Saturn 30 years to complete their courses
through the constellations. The band of constellations through which the planets travel is the
zodiac.¹⁹⁹

Spherical forms and circular motions were the foundation for the explanation of stellar
and planetary movements because the sphere and circle were deemed to be the perfect shape and
hence emblematic of the perfection of the cosmos. This cosmic perfection formed the basis for
the tenet that the heavenly bodies were of a higher, and hence divine, order. As the motion of the
planets became more clearly documented, however, they began to form a serious problem for this
notion of cosmic perfection and divinity. For the planets did not appear to adhere to the basic
principle of circular motion, given that they vary in brightness (correctly surmised to mean that
they are not always equidistant to earth) and their Eastward motion (through the constellations) is
not uniform in speed, but varies and can even be retrograde. This erratic movement of the planets
appeared to seriously undermine the fundamental assumption that heavenly motions were simple,
circular, uniform, and regular.

It is not clear when this was first recognized as an important issue. If we follow
Simplicius (as most scholars do), then it was none other than Plato himself who challenged his
students to find a solution that explained planetary wanderings in terms of the postulated
principles of heavenly motion. There is, however, no firm evidence for careful planetary
observations in Greek astronomy prior to the 2nd century BC and it has recently been argued that
the whole issue did not arise until that time.²⁰⁰ But irrespective of when the Greeks began to
explore this issue in full detail, there were, by the Roman era, complex models that explained all
those seemingly erratic planetary movements in terms of combined motions of circles within


²⁰⁰ The view that this goes back to Plato is based on Simp. in Cael. 488.3-24 (Eudem. fr. 148). Accepting
this as an accurate reference by Simplicius to Eudemus is problematic. Baynes (2002) points out that this does not
meet the bar set by his very sensible “Rule of Ancient Citations”. He argues that there is no evidence Greek
astronomers became aware of the stations and retrogradations of the planets until the 2nd century BC and that the
project of “saving the phenomena” (explaining the anomalous movements in terms of simple, universal principles),
in his opinion, thus cannot be attributed with confidence to Plato’s legacy (Baynes 2002, 165-6). His basic point is
that Simplicius is writing with an agenda, and because we cannot corroborate the accuracy with which he cites earlier
sources we need to find other evidence that Plato’s successors (notably Aristotle and his circle) had the knowledge
and concerns with regards to planetary motions that Simplicius ascribes to them. Baynes argues that there is no such
evidence, and that what evidence we have actually implies the opposite, namely that Aristotle was not aware of
planetary stations and retrogradations. A significant weakness in Baynes argument is that Babylonian astronomers
were already aware of the intricacies of planetary motions by the 7th century BC (Baynes 2002, 165), but that does
not prove that the Greek philosophers of the 4th century BC shared the same knowledge. Thus Baynes’ basic point
remains valid: we do not know that the issue of saving the phenomena arose in the latter part of the 4th century simply
because Simplicius states this to be so over 800 years later. For the traditional position on “saving the Phenomena”:
circles, supported with impressive calculations.\textsuperscript{201} This culminated in the model proposed by Ptolemy in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD that remained unchallenged until long after the Roman era.\textsuperscript{202}

**Astronomy, Astrology and Religion**

The religious impact of these models has, I think, been underestimated. In part, at least, this is because few historians of ancient religion are well-versed in ancient astronomy - Roger Beck is a notable exception - and few historians of ancient astronomy are interested in the religious side of their field. We know a fair bit about Greek (and Roman) astronomy, but it is studied (and admired) by historians of science in particular with regards to the mathematical advances achieved in this period. There has, however, been a tendency to divorce these scientific achievements (as we see them) from their conceptual framework (as ancient philosophers and astronomers understood it). As a result the ancient astronomy of many modern studies is divested of its astrological and theological components.\textsuperscript{203} Ancient astronomers would have found that division puzzling. For them, studying what the movement of the stars meant was an integral part of astronomy.\textsuperscript{204} This is clearly expressed by Ptolemy in his introduction to the Almagest. He considers astronomy to be a form of theoretical philosophy and recognizes three main branches of theoretical philosophy:
- theology, being the philosophy that deals with the immutable that is beyond perception;
- mathematics, being the philosophy that deals with the immutable that is perceptible;
- physics, being the philosophy that deals with the changeable and perceptible.\textsuperscript{205}

Stars and planets are perceptible, but also wholly predictable in their movements and seeming changes (such as the waxing and waning of the moon), and in that sense immutable quantities. They differ materially from earthly matter because on earth things change in an unpredictable manner. This material difference between earth on the one hand, and the planets and stars on the other, is fundamental. It was thought to manifest itself not only in the immutability of the cosmos, but also in the patterns of motion. On earth natural motion is downwards as all matter is pulled towards earth. The natural motion of the stars and planets on the other hand was, as we have seen, deemed to be circular and consonant with the spherical shape of the cosmos; heavenly motions were also regular rather than unpredictable, uniform rather than varied, and simple rather than erratic. This qualitative difference in motion was

\textsuperscript{201} Evans 1998, 297; Wright 1995, 48-9.

\textsuperscript{202} For a detailed explanation of the evolving models of planetary motion, see Evans 1998, 289-391.

\textsuperscript{203} This is at the root of the line of reasoning followed by Cumont (1935), probably with an agenda (cf. Beck 2006, 34). A good, recent example is Evans (1998). Typical is also Wright (1995, 55). Lehoux (2007, 35-39) neatly summarizes certain issues that make “some of the distinctions we might like to draw between astronomy and astrology, physics and superstition, or more generally between science and pseudo-science, anachronistic” (p. 37). Cf. Similar comments by Beck (2006, 33), who graphically describes historians of ancient astronomy as panning “for astronomical gold in a stream of astrological grit and gravel”.

\textsuperscript{204} Cf., e.g., McMullin 1984, 43.

\textsuperscript{205} Ptol. Synt. Math. 1.4-5.
associated with the notion that the heavenly bodies were of a different matter than the four earthly elements of water, earth, fire and air. This fifth essence (from which our word quintessence) was variously interpreted by different schools of thought, but however it was viewed, it was invariably understood to be of a higher order than matter on earth. It is in this sense of a “higher order” that the divinity of the cosmic bodies was generally understood.\footnote{Wright 1995, 109-125. Cf., for example, Plut. De Fac. 922B. The stoics deemed the matter of heavenly bodies to be fire, rather than a fifth element, but divine nonetheless. Highly influential, in antiquity, was the notion that the human soul was of this divine substance, descending down from the stars to enter the (earthly) body at the beginning of its life, and ascending back to the stars upon the body’s death. Beck (2006) sees this idea as one of the cornerstones of Mithraism. The most accessible ancient account is Cicero’s Somnium Scipionis.}

The urgency with which astronomers attempted to explain the planetary movements is thus clear. If the planetary movements were not perfect, the whole framework on which the understanding of the cosmos was built would be fatally undermined.\footnote{Wright 1995, 49.} That framework was quite elegant, and went well beyond the limits of astronomy as we understand it. One need but think of the harmony of the spheres, which linked the discovery of the exact proportions governing music to the notion that the celestial spheres were similarly proportioned.\footnote{Wright 1995, 45-7, 135-8; cf. Pl., Rep. 617b-c; Cic. Somn. 6.18-19.} Broadly speaking this notion of cosmic interconnectedness or \textit{sympathia} to give it its Stoic name, was in one form or another widely shared. No wonder, then, that astronomy was a wide-ranging branch of philosophy that was of major importance. For astronomy was concerned with that which is perceptible but also perfect in its immutability, and about which fixed knowledge was hence possible. That attainability of fixed knowledge made astronomy a member of the mathematical branch of theoretical philosophy, but because the objects of astronomical research, stars and planets, their movements, and other astronomical phenomena, were divine or divinely inspired, astronomical research logically extended into the realm of theology. Because heavenly bodies have an unmistakable influence on earth (one need but think of sunburn or \textit{lunacy}, but also of more theoretical issues such as harmony) Astronomy also logically extended to the realm of physics, the field of philosophy which dealt with earthy matters.

Of course we should not suggest that there was only one school of astronomy in antiquity, but we are not concerned with the philosophical debates and the details of their differences of opinion. What we find is that from Plato to Ptolemy and beyond the basic principle of a divine cosmos was mainstream science, and understanding that cosmos was a matter of philosophy. Mathematics and physics had a role to play, but primarily a supporting one (except in materialist philosophies). Thus Aristarchus of Samos (ca. 310-230 BC) probably did not arrive at his heliocentric hypothesis as a result of superior scholarship and mathematics but, as far as we can tell, by a much simpler logic. Having measured the sizes of the sun, earth, and the moon, he concluded that the sun’s diameter was seven times greater than earth’s diameter. This conclusion may have led him to hypothesize that the sun, rather than the smaller earth, should by rights be at the centre of the universe. While his hypothesis happened to be correct, and was later
mathematically corroborated by Seleucus of Seleucia,\textsuperscript{209} it did not gain many followers because it apparently did not solve as many problems as it caused to the simple harmony of the divine cosmos, in which the succession from the outer rim inward (or downward) was one from the perfect to the imperfect. It is telling that Cleanthes, the successor of Zeno in the Stoa, wrote a treatise against Aristarchus in which one of his charges was impiety.\textsuperscript{210}

The divinity of the planets was thus not a trifling matter. On the contrary, the whole idea of “saving the phenomena”, whether Platonic or late Hellenistic, was driven in part by the desire to preserve the postulated “divinity” of the heavenly bodies. If the stars and planets were not of a higher order, then the apparently erratic movements of the planets would not have been an issue. But planetary motion did matter, and explaining their movements within the postulated framework of simple, uniform circular motion afforded the ancient astronomers deep satisfaction. It confirmed, so they felt, that divine order and stability that lay at the root of even seeming cosmic anomalies.

Modern historians of science have deplored the detrimental effect of this philosophical framework on the advances in Greek science, but that does not diminish its importance (although it has diminished the willingness to acknowledge its importance and explore its influence).\textsuperscript{211} Indeed, from our perspective that philosophical framework is the issue, not the mathematical and observational advances of Hellenistic scholars. Nor do we need to immerse ourselves in the debates about that framework among the intellectual elite. We should bear in mind that preserved treatises by ancient scholars at the cutting edge of ancient science, be it astronomy or philosophy, are not representative of the broader social impact of the advances in astronomy of the late Hellenistic and early imperial era. It is that impact that is of interest to us, and that impact was very real. The very significant advances in ancient astronomy in the Hellenistic era profoundly affected almost all levels of society. No doubt the most obvious impact was the Julian calendar reform, which thoroughly redefined the Roman year and its months. The introduction of a stable system of time reckoning which would never again need periodic realignments must have made a deep impression on the man in the street.\textsuperscript{212} It transformed the abstract philosophical notion of cosmic stability and perfection into a fact of life experienced by all at the level of one of the most fundamental organizing principles of human existence: time. It is hard for us to imagine just how profound the impact must have been, but we get a taste of the enthusiasm spawned by the Hellenistic advances in astronomy from the public projects they engendered. The (predictive)

\textsuperscript{209} According to van der Waerden (1987, 527-9) this is how we should understand Plut. \textit{Quaest. Plat.} 8 (See his translation on p. 528). Besides lacking sufficient accurate observations, van der Waerden argues that the trigonometrical methods required to prove Aristarchus’ hypothesis were not developed until after Aristarchus’ death, but would have been available to Seleucus.

\textsuperscript{210} Plut. \textit{De Fac.} 923a; cf. Diog. Laert. VII.174. There were other objections besides the religious ones, notably that the stars had to be unimaginably far away for there to be no perceptible stellar parallax if the earth revolved around the sun.

\textsuperscript{211} One of the most influential 20\textsuperscript{th} century historian of Greek astronomy, O. Neugebauer, was quite emphatic about the detrimental influence of philosophy; cf. e.g. Neugebauer 1975, 572. See also McMullin 1984.

\textsuperscript{212} Cf. Gee 2001, 520.
achievements of astronomy were monumentalized and thus literally (and impressively) put on display in such *tours de force* of calculation and design as the Horologium of Andronicus in Athens or Augustus’ immense sundial in the Campus Martius in Rome, to name but two examples.\(^{213}\) Small portable devices such as the Antikythera Mechanism attest to the wide diffusion of the practical effects of new astronomical discoveries.\(^{214}\) What that meant in religious terms is hard to say, but it seems likely that the visible, and now apparently demonstrated harmony of perfect motion of *all* heavenly bodies will have enhanced the sense of the divine associated with the cosmos. True, McMullin is no doubt right that scholars like Ptolemy remained aware of the tension between the methodologies and results of mathematical and philosophical cosmology respectively, but that does not mean the average Roman necessarily had doubts. Beck points out that even early Christian authors did not easily abandon the notion of divine stars and planets.\(^{215}\)

In a sense, then, I agree with Wallraff that there was an upswing in cosmological religion in the early Empire. This was not, however, a re- or digression from Hellenistic science, but rather the outcome of it. The Romans did not revert back to revering the planets as gods, for they (and the Greeks with them) had always accepted the fact that the stars and planets were of a higher order. Hellenistic astronomy and philosophy reinforced this understanding, and while the astronomers among them will have known that not all astronomical problems had been solved completely, and those schooled in philosophy were aware of the strong differences of opinion between the various major schools, these were at best concerns of a small elite.\(^{216}\) Most Romans (including most scholars) must have felt confident that there was some form of divine inspiration behind the harmony of perfect shapes and motions that characterized the cosmos as they understood it.\(^{217}\) That still left ample room for discussion and disagreement, about the nature of the divine for instance, not to mention the nature of the traditional gods and their cults. But those discussions need not concern us here. How the seven planetary deities were conceptualized did depend, of course, on where one stood in those discussions. But irrespective of where one stood, the planet Venus was not the ravishing goddess born from the foaming mix of sea and the semen of Kronos, wife of the lame Hephaestus, and lover of Ares. If the shift in the nomenclature of the planets discussed by Cumont (1935) and cited by Wallraff (*supra*) reflects a shift in

\(^{213}\) On the horologium of Andronicus, better known as the Tower of the Winds, cf. Kienast 1993, 1997a, 1997b. On the sundial in the Campus Martius, see Rehak 2006. Displays of astronomical knowledge were widespread, and took on many forms. Varro *Rust*. 3.5.9-17, for example, describes an aviary on the grounds of a villa which included revolving morning and evening stars and the like, and which some interpret as replete with cosmological symbolism; cf. Green 1997, 440-3; Sauron 1994.

\(^{214}\) Beck 2006, 124-5.


\(^{216}\) The stark differences between philosophical schools as understood by one member of the late Republican elite are clearly presented by Cicero in his *De Natura Deorum*.

conceptualization it is not that the planets came to be viewed more as gods, but rather that the gods came to be viewed more as cosmic powers, such as planets. The planetary deities represented cosmic, not mythical concepts of divinity.

The planets and their order
The seven planets were the most anomalous heavenly bodies in terms of movement and - in the case of the sun and the moon - visibility and they had posed the greatest challenge to Hellenistic astronomers. It is thus fitting that they became in a sense were emblematic of the perceived scholarly success in solving the riddles of their movement and proving cosmic perfection. Though hard to prove, it seems to me more than likely that this sense of achievement was one of the connotations the depiction of the seven planets evoked, certainly initially.

As we have seen, the planets were thought to be related to seven concentric spheres revolving around the earth. This meant that the planets were not all the same distance from the earth. To determine their relative position, Hellenistic scholars referred to the rate with which each planet traveled through the zodiac, assuming that the faster the planet traveled, the closer it was to earth. On this basis, Saturn, with its 30-year trip through the zodiac, was identified as the planet farthest away, while the moon, which needs a mere month, was deemed to be closest. Next to Saturn was Jupiter (12 years) and then Mars (2 years), but the relative positions of Mercury, Venus, and the sun were less obvious as all three need about the same length of time - one year - to complete their circuit of the zodiac. Various options were proposed, but by the first century BC the one that prevailed placed the sun in fourth position, i.e. in the middle with three planets to either side, as befit what was obviously the most important wandering star. In third position came Venus, followed by Mercury next to the moon. The basic order was thus: Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn.

A glance at the catalogue shows that this is not the order we find in Roman depictions of the planetary deities. Normally, they are depicted (from left to right) as Saturn, Sun, Moon, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter and Venus. This is an astrological order and a fundamental division of time into seven-day cycles (out of which our week emerged) running from Saturn for the first day to Venus for the last day of the cycle. This order has its roots in Hellenistic astrological practice of assigning a planet to each of the 24 hours of a day, beginning with Saturn for the first hour of the first day and proceeding inwards with Jupiter for the second hour, Mars for the third, the Sun for the fourth, Venus for the fifth, Mercury for the sixth, the Moon for the seventh, and then Saturn for the eighth again. The 24th hour of the first day is thus governed by Mars, and the first hour of the second day by the Sun, which consequently also governs the eighth, fifteenth and

---

218 On the complex revolutions each planet was thought to perform within its particular sphere, which served to explain the seemingly erratic movements of the planets, see Evans 1998, 289-443.

219 Beck 2006, 77-9; 1988, 4-7; Rüpke 1995, 456-60; Flamant 1982, 228-233.

220 The only example of the astronomical order in the catalogue in K9.37, a copper amulet of unknown provenance, Roman Imperial in date.

221 On the order of the days on Roman monuments cf. Duval 1953.
twenty-second hour of the second day, so that Mercury governs the 24th hour of the second day and the Moon the first hour of the third day, and so on. There being only seven planets, the week started anew on the eighth day.²²²

One of the earliest testimonies for the seven-day week in Rome is its inclusion on the Fasti Sabini of Augustan date, and it is well-attested in Pompeii (cf. Cat.E3.1), making it safe to say that the seven-day week was well-known in the Roman world no later than the beginning of the first century AD.²²³ It is thus tempting to see the arrival of the seven-day week as a corollary of the Julian calendar reforms (though not as an official part of it). There is no proof for this, however, and considerable debate about the source of the Roman practice. Some stress Jewish influence and argue that the seven-day week arrived in the wake of the practice, purportedly adopted by Augustus and others of the Roman elite, to observe a day of rest every seventh day (on Saturn’s day) in imitation of the Jews.²²⁴ The extent to which this Jewish practice was adopted by non-Jews is difficult to establish. Certainly not as widely as Flavius Josephus would have us believe with his sweeping claims.²²⁵ Most of our sources simply document an awareness, not an adoption of the practice,²²⁶ and Rüpke concludes that there is no evidence that the Jewish example was widely followed.²²⁷ Wallraff on the other hand argues forcefully for a two-stage introduction of the seven-day week, centered initially on the adoption of a Jewish-style rest day on Saturn’s day in the latter part of the first century BC, followed a century or so later by the fully fledged planetary week.²²⁸ The evidence does not support this notion of two stages. To be sure, Roman awareness of the Jewish Sabbat on Saturn’s day can be dated to Augustus and presumably goes back earlier. But the evidence for a seven-day week goes back as far and from the outset is plausibly connected with planets and astrology, rather than Jewish-style Sabbat practices.²²⁹


²²⁴ Wallraff 2001, 92-3; for the opposite view cf., e.g., Gandz 1949, 216-7;


²²⁶ Wallraff (2001, 92 n. 11) refers to Suet. Aug. 76,2; Ovid Rem. 219-20; Hor. S. 1,9,69-70; Aug. Civ. 6,11 (quoting Seneca); Philo Vit.Mos. 2,20-21. In n. 14 he also refers to Tac. Hist. 5,4,3 and Tib. 1,3,17-8. The latter does not refer to Saturn’s day necessarily as a Sabbath, but more likely simply as a day to be careful; it is basic astrology - quite literally, cf. Valens Anth. I,1 - that certain planets were beneficial, others not, and Saturn was generally not; cf. Beck 2007, 73-5; Girardet 2007, 280-1; Riley 1995, 27.


²²⁹ The evidence from Pompeii clearly indicates that the full sequence of deities was so firmly established by the mid first century AD that Wallraff’s chronology is untenable. The medallions (cat. E3.1) in particular indicate this. They date to the mid first century AD (Long 1992, 498) and their context (similar medallions with the four seasons and the twelve months) is unambiguous. We should bear in mind that there is no reason to think that these
importantly, in the Roman week Saturn is invariably the first day, not the seventh as was the case
for the Jews, nor the sixth as it became for the Christians. There is a good astronomical reason for
this, namely that Saturn was the furthest star and hence a “logical” point to begin counting (see
above, on the astrological practice of assigning a planet to each hour). But it means that if the
Romans first adopted the Jewish system of a Sabbat on the seventh day and then grafted onto that
the planetary week, they either 1. did not choose Saturn for the Sabbat, or 2. changed the Sabbat
from Saturday to Friday when they adopted the planetary week, or 3. celebrated their ‘Sabbat’ as
the first day of the week. There is no evidence for any of this, and none of these possibilities is at
all likely.

The best interpretation of the evidence, then, is that the seven-day week had entered
Rome by the late in the first century B.C. and should be understood initially as a concept
connected with the astrological scholarship of the Hellenistic Greek world. There is nothing
inherently religious about the seven-day week, nor was any day particularly sacred, as with the
Jewish Sabbat or the Lord’s day of the Christians. It was, however, an exponent of the stable
continuity represented by the divine cosmos. In that sense it is very telling that our Roman
depictions of the planets normally show them in the order of the week, rather than in
astronomical order. The representation is not of the planets as they are, but of the planets as they
act. We have here a basic but important illustration of Beck’s concept of star talk. By setting the
seven planets in this order they articulate the role of the heavenly bodies in the organization and
measurement of basic rhythms of time on earth. Set the planets in a different order, and the
message changes, and this was in fact the case on occasion within Mithraism. Representing this
specific role of the planets in this manner asserts their relevance for earthly matters in a
fundamental manner.

This is well illustrated in the case of the tondi from Pompeii, originally depicted in one
room together with tondi the four seasons and the twelve months (E3.1). The annual cosmic cycle
really does influence the earth as manifested in the weather and the regularly recurring seasons. It
thus also asserts that the planets, though of a higher order, affect earth, which not only reasserts
cosmic divinity but also articulates the mediating role of the heavenly bodies between earth and
god beyond the spheres.

oldest surviving examples happen to also be the very first instances in the Roman world.

230 Tertullian (nat. 1,13) suggests that in his day it was common for pagans to reserve one day a week to rest
(ex diebus ipsorum [sc. deorum planetarum] praelegistis, quo die lauacrum subtrahatis aut in uesperam differatis, aut
otium et prandium curetis), and links it to the sabbat and Saturn’s day (non longe a Saturno et sabbatis uestris
sumus). Given the importance of Saturn in North Africa - there was an important shrine of Saturn overlooking
Tertullian’s Carthage at Djebel Bou Kournein - this reference to Saturn may not be as straightforward as it seems. In
any case, Tertullian seems to be pushing his case a bit too hard, trying to pin the label ‘sabbat’ on a series of
practices that were much more informal. Though no day was specifically sacred, the days certainly differed in
character. If we follow Valens Anth. I.1, Saturn and Mars were not beneficial planets, Jupiter, Venus and Luna are
beneficial planets, and Mercury and Sol are ambivalent, although Valens discusses them in predominantly positive

231 For example the order of the planets associated with the seven stages of initiation in Mithraism; Beck
Depicting the planets in this manner evokes a specific aspect of the cosmos, namely its construction of time, and offers an accessible way to apprehend the passage of time with precision. As always, we should not overinterpret these meanings nor forget that they are visual, not verbal. Context, such as the type of object, is important. The seven planetary deities on a parapegma (peg calendar) had a different force compared to the same seven on a Jupiter column. Nonetheless, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that cosmic stability expressed through the regular and continuous passage of time was a potential connotation of these images that always hovered near the surface and could easily be evoked in the right context.

C2j. Apollo
-1. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Black Gate Museum
   Whitley Castle
   Stone
   2nd half 2nd c. AD
   Altar with relief sculpture on all four sides, originally set in a socket in a base supported by four low pillars (ca. 35 cms. high) with a dedicatory coin on top of each pillar. Front: Apollo with plectrum and cithara; right side: Sol, nude but for a chlamys, radiate, right hand raised, whip in l. hand; back: Mithras between two torch bearers; left side: bearded man, clad in a tunic, with cup and jug, stands in front of a figure on a low platform; the dedicant offering to a local solar deity?. Fragm. of an inscr.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 265 (with ref.).
   The coins dedicated on each of the four low pillars give a terminus post quem of ca. AD 150. The arguments used by Wright (1943, 38) to reject a 2nd c. date, namely that Mithraism was not prevalent in Northern Britain until the 3rd c. AD, is weak. Although it is widely accepted that Mithraism was late in arriving in Britain (Clauss 1992, 84), a date in the later 2nd c. remains perfectly feasible, while the almost explanatory character of the monument could be seen to support it.

-2. Afyon, Mus E 1920 4423
   Çavdarlı
   Marble (?)
   Undated
   Votive stele dedicated to Apollo and depicting a bust of Sol, long wavy hair, radiate.
   Matern 2002, 253 B58 (with ref.).

C2l. Asclepius
-1. Tenos, Mus. A340
   Tenos
   White marble
   1st c. BC
   Man lying on a couch by a three-legged table; at his feet to the left: Hermes; by his arm to the right: herm and woman on pedestals; above the woman: bust of Sol, radiate, left; above Hermes: crescent.
   LIMC Helios 302 (with ref.).
   Gods of the Asclepius-family, between busts of Sol and Luna on high pedestals. LIMC Helios 298; LIMC Asklepios in Thracia 22 (both with the same, uninformative, reference).

-2. Plovdiv, Arch. Mus. 1021
   Plovdiv
   Marble
   2nd c. AD
   Gods of the Asclepius-family, between busts of Sol and Luna on high pedestals. LIMC Helios 298; LIMC Asklepios in Thracia 22 (both with the same, uninformative, reference).

C2m. Athena
-1. Mālūla (Syria)
   In situ
   Rock
   Undated
   In the face of the rock, a section has been smoothed, and two shallow adjacent niches have been carved. Bust of Sol, radiate (13 rays) in the left-hand niche; bust of Athena in the other.
   LIMC Helios in per. or. 40 (with ref.).

C2n. Dioscuri
-1. Paris, Louvre Ma 746
Larissa
Marble
2nd c. BC
Votive naïskos dedicated to the Dioscuri. In the tympanon, the upper body of Helios, radiate (24 rays), draped, between the frontal protomes of four horses, two jumping to the left and two to the right.
LIMC Helios 83; M. Hamiaux, Les Sculptures grecques 1998, 179 nr. 198; Matern 2002, 51, 208-9, Q8.

Genius
Pl. 33.1
Rome, Mus. Naz. 78197
Rome, Scala Santa
Marble
AD 160-180
Votive relief. On the left-hand side frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays), long wavy hair, chlamys; next to him bust of an older, bearded man, cloaked; the lower right hand corner of the relief is missing and with it, perhaps, the man's left hand and/or attribute. Above his left shoulder a small profile bust of Luna facing Sol. To the right of the bearded man, inscription: SOLI INVICTO / PRO SALVTE IMP(eratorum) / ET GENIO N(umeri) EQ(uitum) SING(ularium) / EORVM, M(arcus) VLP(ius) / CHRESIMVS SACE[r(dos)] / IOVIS DOLICH[eni] / V(otum) S(olvit) L(ibens) [m(erito)]
LIMC Helios/Sol 404; Speidel 1978, 15-6 nr. 17; Schraudolph 1993, 237 L149; Matern 2002, 42, n. 328, 171, 257 B82
As now preserved, the bearded man is identified either as Jupiter Dolichenus, as the Genius Equitum Singularium or as the priest Marcus Ulpius Chresimus, all three mentioned in the inscription. Each identification is possible, although the iconography is very uncommon for Jupiter Dolichenus, and the man would definitely have to have held an attribute in his left hand appropriate to Dolichenus. In view of the dedication (to Sol and the Genius) the figure seems most likely to me to be the Genius; we should also keep in mind however that the form of the relief, broken at the right just beyond the inscription, with two figures to the left of it, implies that there were also two figures to the right of the inscription, now lost.

Isis & Sarapis
-1. Bursa, Mus. 1679
Bursa
Marble
Roman imperial?
Upper part of an aedicula-shaped stele; in the tympanum small frontal bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys; below: busts of Isis and Sarapis.
LIMC Helios 303 (with ref.).

Jupiter
-1. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Mus. 182.1902
Beyşehir (Lycaonia)
limestone
3rd c. AD
Votive altar for Zeus and Helios. On the right, bust of Zeus; on the left, bust of Helios, radiate nimbus (7 rays).
Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 253-4 B62; Budde & Nicholls 1964, 76-7 nr. 124 pl. 41.
-2. Lost
Rome
Marble
Undated
Three fragments of a relief. In the centre, Jupiter standing on a base, eagle by his side, faced by an orant. To either side: Sol, nude but for a chlamys, radiate, whip, on a quadriga, and Luna on a biga.
On the fragment with Sol: DEDIT M(arcus) MODIVS [Agatho] / SANCTO DOMINO / INVICTO MITHRAE / IVSSV EIVS LIBENS / DEDIT CIMRM I, 332-3; MMM II, 234-5 nr. 71bis, b, and fig. 66.

Malakbel
-1. Rome, Mus. Cap. NCE 2412
Rome, Giardini Mattei
Marble
2nd half 1st c. AD
Altar with two inscriptions and relief-decoration on four sides. Side A: frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (7 rays), fairly long curly hair, chlamys, above an eagle with outstretched wings; inscription: SOLI SANCTISSIMO SACRVM / TI(berius)
CLAVDIVS FELIX ET / CLAVDIVS HELEPS ET / Tiberius CLAVDIVS AYPVS FIL(ius) EORVM / VOTVM SOLVERVNT LIBENS MERITO / CALBIENSES DE COH(orte) III. Side B: Sol (?), bare-headed, dressed in chlamys, tunica and trousers, whip in his right hand, stepping into a chariot drawn by griffins; behind him, a winged Victory holding a crown above his head; inscription (Palmyrene): "This is the altar (which) Tiberius Claudius Felix and the Palmyrenes offered to Malakbel and the Gods of Palmyra. To their gods, Peace!" (transl. acc. to Teixidor 1979, 47. Side C: a cypress, with a ribbon at the top and a small boy carrying a sheep on his shoulders emerging from the branches just to the right of the top. Side D. Saturn (?), bearded, capite velato, holding a harpē in his right hand. LIMC Helios in. per. or. 54 (with ref.); Houston 1990 (with ref.); Teixidor 1979, 47-8 (dating the monument in the 3rd c. AD); Simon 1962, 765 (dating the monument mid 1st c. AD); Dirven 1999, 175-180, pl XXI; Matern 2002, 37 n. 289, 41 n. 321, 66, 170, 173, 256 B80, fig. 82. For Bust of Sol above an eagle with outstretched wings cf. C2a.4 in the Vatican.

C2s. Mercurius
-1. Beirut, Mus. 2607
Bted’i
Limestone
Roman Imperial
Small votive altar with fragmentary dedicatory inscription and damaged relief decoration. On the front, bust of Mercurius Heliopolitanus. On the l. side, bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys. On the r. side, bust of Luna. Hajjar 1977, 144-147 nr. 131, pls. 44-5

C2sbs. Nemesis
-1. Zagreb, Arch. Mus.
Scitarjevo/Andautonia (?)
Limestone
AD 86-90
Votive relief on the rear of an older inscription. The votive is dedicated to Nemesis Regina by L. Funisolanus, governor of Moesia Superior between AD 86 and 90. Nemesis stands below an arch, dressed in a short chiton, diadem in her hair. She holds a whip (?) In her right hand, a rectangular shield on her left arm, and emerging above the are a torch, palm branch, and trident. Above the arch, left, frontal bust of Sol, not radiate, chlamys, and right bust of Luna with upturned crescent behind her shoulders. CIL III, 4008 & 4013; Brunsmid 1905, 65 nr. 125.

C2t. Sabazius
-1. Tirana, Arch. Mus. 20
Shalesi, Elbasani distr.
Bronze
2nd-3rd c. AD
Votive plaque. In the tympanon, Luna (left) and Sol (right, radiate, 13 rays, chlamys, left hand holding horse lying in the right hand corner facing him, right arm disappears under his chlamys) flank a Sabazius-hand on a staff held by Luna; she also holds a horse, lying in the left hand corner facing her. The Sabazius-hand on the staff appears to replace the missing raised right hand of Sol. In the main field: throning Sabazius, surrounded by a large number of gods and attributes. LIMC Helios/Sol 335; Albanien. Schätze aus dem Land der Skipetaren (exh. cat. 1988), 402 n. 319.
-2. Plovdiv, Arch, Mus. 3779
Plovdiv
Marble
3rd c. AD (LIMC)
Votive relief in two registers. Above: Sabazius, bearded, short chiton and chlamys, phrygian cap, pine cone in raised left hand, sceptre in r. hand, resting left foot on the badly worn head or skull of a ram (?); in the upper left-hand corner worn bust of Luna above Pan (?) and full-figure of Hermes; in the upper right-hand corner very worn bust of Sol, above Fortuna-Tyche and Daphne (LIMC). In lower register bearded Heros Equitans holding a pine-cone (?) in his raised right hand. In the left-hand corner a bust (Sol?, Luna?), to the right two women, below the horse a dog attacking a boar, below the women a ram. LIMC Heros Equitans 564 (with refs.)
C2u. Silvanus
-1. Rome, Mus. Cap. NCE 2668
Rome
Greek marble
1st- early 2nd c. AD
Votive relief; above, three busts: from left to right Sol, radiate (nine rays), Luna, Silvanus; below, inscription: SOLI LVNAE SILVANO / ET GENIO CELLAE / GROESIANAE / MARCVS SCANIVS / ZOSA EX VISO / POSVIT
LIMC Helios/Sol 403 (with ref.); CIL VI 706; CIL VI.1 Im. 40-41 nr. 12; Schraudolph 1993, 204 G16, pl. 21; Matern 2002, 28 n. 215, 256-7 B81 (error in inscription).

C2v. Unknown Deity
-1. Chesterholm, Mus. Chesterholm
Vindolanda (Chesterholm)
Sandstone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Aedeca-shaped relief: frontal, standing male figure, bearded, lowered right hand holding an unidentified object (damaged) above a rectangular block upon which something is standing (?) Also damaged, a globe (?) in the crook of his left arm; in lower right-hand corner a figure in Roman armor, head lost, cloak (?) over his left arm, holding a spear in his right hand (?) arm lost. Above, in two niches flanking the head of the main figure, busts of Sol (left), 5 rays, and Luna (right) respectively.
Birley 1986, 57 fig. 3; Birley 1977, 74 pl. 33; LIMC Apollon/Apollo 610
Birley identifies the central figure as Mponos (a Celtic god associated with Apollo). Bauchhenss (LIMC Apollon/Apollo 610) rejects this identification.

C2w. Multiple deities
-1. Cairo, Eg. Mus. 26.6.20 nr. 5
Unknown
Gypsum
1st c. BC
Within a naiskos, Cybele seated on a throne between standing Hermes (left) and a goddess with a torch (right). In the tympanum, two reclining lions. Above the pediment at the apex frontal face of Sol ("Sonnengesicht"), radiate nimbus (21 or 22 rays) between three Corybantes on each side.

LIMC Helios/Sol 301.
Palmyra
Limestone
AD 119
Bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, in upper r. corner; corresponding corner on the left broken away. Below, a group of one goddess and three gods.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 31 (with ref.).
Rome, Celio
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD
"Ara Casali", relief depicting the discovery of the adultery of Mars and Venus. In centre inscription surrounded by a wreath; above the wreath to the left Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, in a quadriga; to the right Vulcan, looking downwards. Below: Mars and Venus in bed.
-4. Lost
Oinoanda
Local rock
2nd-3rd c. AD
A complex tentively identified as a fountain, with a range of reliefs and decicatory inscriptions, four of which were recorded before they disappeared in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The reliefs depict the Dioscuri on horseback flanking an unidentified woman, Mercurius, Jupiter, and Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys. The Dioscuri form the central image immediately above the arch of the presumed basin of the fountain, with the bust of Sol immediately to the right of them, still above the arch. There was space for a companion figure (Luna?) to the left of the Dioscuri, but there is no trace of such a figure. Standing full-figure to the right of Sol is Mercurius, followed on the right by a bust of Jupiter. To the left of the arch, possible similar figures did not survive. Each figure has an identity inscription. Below Sol: Ηλιος Μιπρ.
Matern 2002, 262 B120; Milner & Smith
-5. Pl. 33.4-5
Rome, Mus. Cap. Gall. Cong. 1250
Rome, Esquiline, in a wall with numerous other reliefs as spolia, near the church of S. Eusebio.
Luna marble
AD 246
Aedicula-shaped relief, with scenes on the front and on each side. Front: Jupiter, standing, between Mars and Nemesis; left side: Victory; right side: Sol standing, bare-headed (no rays), nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand; behind Sol, very damaged remains of a lion (?).
Kusura, near Aizanoi
Marble
3rd c. AD
Altar with busts of Zeus, Hera (?), Meter Theon, Helios, radiate nimbus, draped, and Men.
Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 254 B69
Kusura, near Aizanoi
Marble
3rd c. AD
Altar with busts of Zeus (?), Meter Theon, Helios, radiate, draped, and Men.
Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 254-5 B70
Kusura, near Aizanoi
Marble
3rd c. AD
Altar with busts of Zeus (?), Meter Theon, Helios, radiate nimbus, draped, and Men.
Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 255 B71
-10. Paris, Louvre MA 4288
Eskişehir
Marble
3rd c. AD
Votive stele. In upper register bust of Zeus in niche, with small busts of Sol radiate nimbus (8 rays), chlamys, and Luna to either side of the niche (Sol left). In lower register, two rows of figures: in upper row from l. to r. an axe-wielding horseman riding r., two standing figures holding hands, and bust of a woman; below, Hercules, Mercurius, two bulls.
Ricl 1991, 13 nr. 24, pl. 3; Matern 2002, 256 B78
-11. Pl. 34.1
Stuttgart, Landesmuseum RL 401
Marbach
Sandstone
1994, 70-76 nr 4, pls XV-XVI.
Undated
Relief, with in the center large figure of Mercurius, between other deities in two registers. Upper register left: Luna, Jupiter, and two unidentified female figures; right: Fortuna, Sol, radiate, and Silvanus. Lower register left: Dioscure and Mars (?); right: Dioscure and Hercules.
Espérandieu 1931, 437 nr. 695

-12. Ljubljana, Nat. Mus. L92
Cmomelj, probably Loka
Limestone
Undated
Votive altar with reliefs on three sides. On the front, the Capitoline Triad. On the left side three women, possibly the Matres. On the right side, Sol and Luna to either side of a male figure, possibly Apollo. Sol, radiate, drives a quadriga.
Sasel Kos 1997 Nr. 135

-13. Tata, Museum
Tata
Limestone
Undated
Rectangular pilaster with niches with deities in three registers, alternated with rectangular reliefs. Top: rectangular reliefs with garland, bucrania and eagle (all four sides); first register: Fall of Phaethon (now lost) on the front, right side Vulcan, left side Apollo with griffin and tripod, rear Juno. Rectangular reliefs between first and second register: lost (front); animals (? right); genii carrying garlands (left); peacock (rear); second register: Sol (front); Venus (right); Silvanus (left); Minerva (rear); rectangular reliefs between second and third register: animals (? Front); genii carrying garlands (right); lost (left); reclining figure (rear); lower register: Luna, walking to right, with torch (front); Mars (right); Diana (left); Victory (rear); below: lost (front); weapons (right); animal (? Left); two winged horses (rear).
Barkócz 1944 46, Taf. LVIII, 1-3

-14. Unknown
Hierapolis in Phrygia
Limestone
Undated
Stele honouring an association for the organization of a festival. In tympanon, Jupiter, between Fortuna and Mercurius, Sol (in quadriga) and - presumably - Luna (biga of oxes).
Webster 1928, 195 fig 1; Matern 2002, 222 Q96a

-15. Unknown
Hierapolis in Phrygia
Limestone
Undated
Stele honouring an association for the organization of a festival. In tympanon, Jupiter, between Fortuna and Mercurius, Sol (in quadriga) and - presumably - Luna (biga of oxes).
Ramsay 1928, 195 fig. 2; Matern 2002, 222 Q96b

-16. Unknown
Zeune
Limestone (?)
Undated
Altar with, on one side, a bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys. Luna is on another side, and Cybele on the third.
Matern 2002, 258 B91

-17. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. I 350
Carthage
Limestone
Undated
Votive stele to Dea Caelestis of the so-called Ghorfa-stele type. Above: Dea Caelestis crowned with crescent and rosette, between busts of Sol, radiate, and Luna. Also between Dionysus and Venus. Below: aedicula with bearded bust in tympanon and standing togatus between the columns. Bottom, sacrificial scene with two figures, bull and altar.
Eingartner 2003, 602 fig. 2.

-18. Pl. 34.2-3
Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. I 354
Carthage
Limestone
Undated
Votive stele to Dea Caelestis of the so-called Ghorfa-stele type. Above: Dea Caelestis crowned with crescent and rosette, between busts of Sol, radiate, and Luna. Also
between Dionysus and Venus. Below:
aedicula with bearded bust in tympanon and
seated togatus between the columns.
Eingartner 2003, 602.
Cf. Tunis, Bardo Mus. inv. cb 964, 966, 970
- 974.

C2x. Emperor
-1. Vatican, Cortile d. Belvedere 1115
Rome
Marble
12-2 BC
Altar of the Lares Augusti, decorated on all
four sides; on one side: apotheose of Caesar
or Agrippa; above to the right Caelus, to the
left quadriga of Sol (only the horses remain).
LIMC Helios/Sol 168 (with ref.); Matern
2002, 55, 216 Q54 (with refs.); Zanker 1969.

-2. Pl. 34.4
Munich, Glypt. 553
Unknown
Marble
AD 87
Altar, presumably for Sol and the Genius of
Domitian. Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays, of
which two lost), above a snake
Inscription: [SOLI AVGVS]TO ET /
IMP(eratoris) / [DOMITIANI] CAESARIS /
AVG(usti) GERMANICI SERVVS /
EVPORIANVS / ARAM D(on) D(edit)
D(edicavitque) III KALENDAS IVN(ias) /
[DOMITIANO] AVG(usti) GER(manico)
XIII CO(n)sule
Matern 2002, 171, 182 n. 998, 255 B74, fig.
78.

C2j to C2x. Varia
The remainder of section C2 of the catalogue is devoted to isolated cases: deities with whom Sol
is normally not associated, groups of deities not commonly depicted together in this manner, or
deities who are altogether rare in art. Being the anomaly, Sol is not part of a pattern of meaning,
but forms a foreign element in any pattern that may be present. In most cases the first step should
therefore be to establish whether there is a common pattern without Sol, which is varied or
changed by the presence of Sol in the specific instance listed in our catalogue. This requires
thorough knowledge and discussion of the iconography of each of the fifteen or so deities
involved, which is beyond the scope of this study. The present analysis of these images will
therefore be brief and preliminary.
In the majority of cases listed here, the image type [sol] is depicted in conjunction with its
common counterpart Luna, normally as cosmic framing pair, but the two are also fairly regularly depicted on par with the other deities present. Sol alone is also sometimes depicted as a smaller, more symbolic figure, but more often as a figure on par with the others. With one exception, the so-called Ara Casali (C2w.3), Sol is not performing any particular action. On the ara Casali his role in the discovery of the adultery of Mars and Venus is depicted. The reliefs in this section come from almost every part of the empire.

It is interesting that the conventionalized use of Sol, with or without Luna, as “cosmic symbol” extends to these exceptional cases. The fact that the deployment of Sol as smaller additional figure is possible in these instances is further evidence of the semantic nature of Roman art, for it shows the potential of the combined Sol-Luna image type to convey meanings outside one of its normal contexts. In other words it confirms that such components could be and were read as independent signs contributing meaning to the visual context in which they were deployed, irrespective of what that context was. Nonetheless, in almost half the cases Sol is depicted on par with the other deity or deities involved. In these cases the meaning of the image type [sol] appears to be less conventionalized and more direct: Sol as one of the deities depicted. This is not unexpected. The conventionalized image type [sol], i.e. the small, framing or marginal image, contributes to the definition of the main figure(s) or scene. Their basic nature does not change randomly from one depiction to the other. How it is defined depends on tradition, on the aspects one wishes to stress, and sometimes to a limited degree on the artist’s preference, but the random inclusion of irrelevant figures is not something one associates with Roman art. This means that the image type [sol] either is or is not part of the set of signs the artist can draw on in a given scene. While that set will almost inevitably consist of more image types than the artist can use in one particular image, each image type will be deployed regularly on a significant percentage of images of the same category. Sol and Luna are absent, for instance, from a majority of the African Saturnus reliefs, but are obviously part of the set of images that the artist could potentially deploy. Within the group of Saturnus reliefs as a whole there are obviously subdivisions; specific image types may be linked to a specific region or emphasize a particular aspect of Saturnus. But he is the same Saturnus whether or not Sol and Luna are depicted with him.

In the cases under discussion in this section, the image type [sol] was not part of the normal set from which the artist drew. That makes the use of the Sol-Luna convention in these cases striking and worth closer study. The number of depictions of Sol on par with others is less surprising. We have seen the (rare) examples of cult statues and imagery connected with the sun god. The number is modest, but significant enough to expect Sol to show up also in the company of fellow deities. That this is only rarely the case merely confirms what already emerged from our discussion of statues of Sol. Sol was not often depicted in his role as deity.

---

232 C2k.1, C2l.1, C2p.2, C2s.1, C2t.1, C2v.1, C2w.2(?), 4, 5, 10, 17-18.

233 C2o.1, C2u.1, C2w.11-16.

234 C2k.1, C2n.1, C2p.1, C2w.1, C2x.1(?).

235 C2j.1, C2m.1, C2q.1, C2r.1, C2w.5-9, C2x.2.
C3. Funerary reliefs
C3a. Sarcophagi with mythological scenes
C3a1 Phaethon myth
-1. Florence, Uffizi 181
   Rome
   Marble
   Ca. AD 170
   Sarcophagus relief depicting the Phaethon-myth. At the right-hand end, Sol, nude but for a chlamys, stands receiving Phaethon. In the centre the fall of Phaethon witnessed by Sol and many others.
   LIMC Phaethon I, 9 (with ref.); LIMC Helios/Sol 174 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 186, 278 K5

-2. Vatican, Mus. Chiaramonti 1965
   Unknown
   Marble
   AD 170-180
   Fragment of the lid of a sarcophagus; Phaethon in front of seated Sol, radiate (7 rays), half nude but for a garment draped over his knees and waist, whip in left hand. To the left, a standing female figure; to the right, a Wind-god in the guise of a winged putto.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 452 (with ref.); LIMC Phaethon I, 8 (with ref.); Amelung 1903, I, 394-5 nr. 130, pl. 42; Matern 2002, 186, 280 K15.

-3. Okayama, Kurashiki Ninagawa Mus.
   Unknown (produced in Rome)
   Marble
   Ca. AD 180
   Sarcophagus relief depicting the myth of Phaethon. Sol, seated, head lost, nude but for a chlamys, receives Phaethon; behind Sol, Luna. On the short sides: the Dioscuri.
   LIMC Phaethon I, 6 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 186, 279 K10.

-4. Liverpool, Merseyside County Mus.
   (formerly Ince Blundell Hall)
   Tivoli
   Parian marble
   AD 190-200
   Sarcophagus relief depicting the Phaethon myth. Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, is seated slightly left of centre and receives Phaethon (lost); to the right the four winds bring the four horses of the chariot.

-5. Florence, Museo dell'Opera del Duomo
   Rome
   Marble
   AD 190-200
   Sarcophagus relief depicting the Phaethon-myth. At the right-hand end, Sol, nude but for a chlamys, stands receiving Phaethon. In the centre the fall of Phaethon witnessed by Sol and many others.

-6. Pl. 35.1
   Copenhagen, Glypt. 847
   Ostia
   Marble
   Late 2nd c. AD
   Sarcophagus depicting the fall of Phaethon; left: seated Sol grants Phaethon, facing him, his wish; nearby the four Horae, the winds holding the horses of Helios, and Aurora. In the centre: Fall of Phaethon. Right: mourning Sol, approached by Hermes.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 175; ASR 3.3 417-8 nr. 336; Matern 2002, 186, 278-9 K7.

-7. Nepi, Cathedral
   Unknown
   Marble
   1st half 3rd c. AD
   Sarcophagus-relief depicting the fall of Phaethon, much damaged. At the right: seated Sol receives Phaethon; left of centre Sol (?) seen on the back, observing the fall of Phaethon. On the left-hand short side, Sol in quadriga; on the right-hand short side, Luna in biga.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 178 (with ref.), 347a; Matern 2002, 186, 279 K9.

-8. Pl. 37.2
   Verona, Mus. Maffeiano
   Unknown
   Marble
   AD 225-250
   right half of a sarcophagus-relief depicting
the fall of Phaethon; upper right-hand corner Sol, standing, radiate (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, receives Phaethon.

Pl. 36.1
St. Petersburg, Hermitage A985
Unknown
Marble
2nd quarter 3rd c. AD
Fragment of a sarcophagus depicting the fall of Phaethon. To the left, Sol, dressed only in chlamys.
Matern 2002, 186, 279 K12

-10. Benevento, Museo del Sannio
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 250
Fragment of a sarcophagus depicting the Phaethon-myth. Preserved are: seated Sol (head lost) receiving Phaethon (upper corner left); Sol (nude, chlamys, no rays) observing Phaethon's fall.
LIMC Phaethon I, 17 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 186, 277 K1

-11. Paris, Louvre MA 1017
Rome
Marble
Late 3rd c. AD
Sarcophagus relief depicting Phaethon-myth. In the upper left-hand corner, Sol (head restored), seated, nude but for a chlamys, cornucopia, receives Phaethon. In the centre, fall of Phaethon
LIMC Phaethon I, 16 (with ref.); ASR 418-20 nr. 337; Matern 2002, 186, 279 K11

-12. Pl. 37.1
Rome, Villa Borghese, Giardino del Lago (removed in 1994)
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 300
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the fall of Phaethon; in upper left-hand corner Sol, seated, head lost, nude but for a chlamys, torch in right hand, cornucopia in left hand, receives Phaethon. In the centre, Phaethon's fall, observed from the left by Sol. On the short sides: Sol in quadriga and Luna in biga.
LIMC Helios/Sol 179 (with ref.), 347b; LIMC Phaethon I, 15 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 186, 280 K16.

-13. Rome, Villa Borghese
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 300
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the fall of Phaethon; in upper left-hand corner Sol, seated, nude but for a chlamys, receives Phaethon. In the centre, Phaethon's fall, observed from the left by Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 179; LIMC Phaethon I, 18 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 186, 280 K17.

C3a2 Endymion

-1. Pl. 38
New York, MMA 47.100.4ab
Ostia
Marble
AD 190-210
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the myth of Endymion; on one short side Luna, on the other Sol, radiate (6 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in right hand, reins in left hand, stepping onto a quadriga, horses jumping forwards, Lucifer with torch flying above the horses, Oceanus below them.

-2. Rome, Galleria Doria
Unknown
Marble
1st half 3rd c. AD
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the myth of Endymion. Upper left-hand corner Sol, head lost, nude but for a chlamys in a quadriga; upper right-hand corner Luna in a biga.
LIMC Helios/Sol 344 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 189, 283 K34.

-3. Pl. 42.2
Rome, S. Paolo fuori le Mura
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 220-250
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the myth of Endymion. Upper left-hand corner Sol,
chlamys and chiton, all very heavily damaged, riding left (sic!). On the right half, Luna views Endymion and in the centre Venus (?) or Luna (repeated) rides off to the l., but there is no corresponding small Luna in the right corner.
LIMC Helios/Sol 165 (with ref.); ASR 12.2, 149-150 nr. 98; Matern 2002, 189, 283 K35. As Sichtermann puts it (ASR p. 150): “Konventionell ist an diesem [Sarkophag] also nur wenig”.

-4. Pl. 39.1
Cliveden
Rome
Marble
Ca. 225-250
Sarcophagus relief depicting the Endymion-myth; in the upper left-hand corner, Sol in quadriga, preceded by Lucifer; in the right-hand corner, Luna in biga with Hesperus. LIMC Helios/Sol 345; Robert 1900, 82-4, pl. 7d; ASR 12.2, 145-6 nr. 95; Matern 2002, 189, 282 K32.

-5. Pl 39.2-3
Woburn Abbey
Frascati
Marble
Ca. AD 250
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the myth of Endymion; along the upper border, just left of centre the tiny figure of Sol, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, globe in left hand, in a quadriga r.; near the upper right-hand corner Luna in a biga to the right. LIMC Helios/Sol 345; ASR 12.2, 143-5 nr. 94; Matern 2002, 189, 283 K36.

-6. Rome, Catacombs of Domitilla
Rome
Marble
Ca. AD 300
Damaged sarcophagus depicting the Endymion myth. In the upper r. corner, scant remains of Sol in quadriga (r. hand, chlamys, 1 horse). In upper l. corner: Luna in biga, preceded by Hesperus. Matern 2002, 189, 282-3 K33.

C3a3 Mars and Venus
-1. Grottaferrata, Abbey
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 160
Sarcophagus relief depicting the adultery of Venus and Mars; left: wedding of Vulcan and Venus; left of centre: Jupiter on throne, Apollo behind him, hearing of the adultery from Sol, radiate, chlamys, chiton, whip, and Vulcan; right of centre: Mars and Venus trapped in bed, Hypnos (?) and Mercury. LIMC Helios/Sol 186 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 188-9, 282 K29.

-2. Pl. 36.2
Amalfi, Chiostro del Paradiso
Unknown
Marble
Antonine

-3. Formerly Rome, Pal. Albani del Drago
Unknown
Marble
Antonine

C3a4 Prometheus
-1. Pl. 40.1
Paris, Louvre MA 339
Arles
Marble
Ca. AD 240
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the myth of Prometheus. In the upper left-hand corner in the background, bust of Sol, radiate, raised r. hand, between Minerva and Prometheus. To the right of center, next to Poseidon’s trident, bust of Luna with crescent behind her shoulder. LIMC Helios/Sol 164 (with ref.); ASR 3.3, 444-6 nr. 356.

-2. Rome, Mus. Cap. 329
Unknown
Marble
AD 220-240 (Messineo), early 4th c. (Sichtermann)
Sarcophagus-relief, child's sarcophagus, depicting the myth of Prometheus; near the upper left-hand corner, Sol, bare-headed, dressed in chlamys and long chiton, right hand raised, in quadriga, behind him Oceanus. Near the right-hand corner, Luna in biga.
LIMC Helios/Sol 346; Matern 2002, 189, 283 K39

-3. Pl. 40.2
Naples, Mus. Naz. 6705
Pozzuoli
Marble
Ca. AD 300
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the Prometheus myth. In the upper right-hand corner Sol in a quadriga, radiate nimbus, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, facing left; in left-hand corner Luna in biga facing right.

C3a5 Ariadne
Auletta
Marble
Towards the end of the 3rd c. AD.
Sarcophagus depicting Ariadne asleep, surrounded by harvesting erotes. In the upper left hand corner Sol in quadriga r. with Lucifer (all very poorly preserved) and in the upper r. hand corner an even less well preserved depiction of Luna in her biga. On the two short sides: seasons.
ASR 4.3, 403-4 nr. 229, pl. 247.2.

C3a6 Meleager
-1. Rome, Villa Albani
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 170
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the death of Meleager; right half: Meleager on his death-bed; at the foot of his bed his shield, with frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 4 (with ref.); ASR 12.6, 119-20 nr. 114, fig. 8.
The shield is a prominent feature of sarcophagi of this type. Normally it is decorated with a gorgoneion.

C3a7 Paris
-1. Rome, Villa Medici
Unknown
Marble
2nd half 2nd c. AD
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the judgement of Paris; Sol, whip, in quadriga, present at the return of the goddesses on the Olympus. Further the right: Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 166 (with ref.); Gundel 1992, 257-60 nr. 187; Matern 2002, 189, 284 K42.

C3a8 Protesilaos
-1. Pl. 41.1-3, 42.1
Naples, S. Chiara
S. Felice, near Teano
Marble
Ca. AD 160-170
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the Protesilaos myth; the scene is framed by Luna, standing, left, and Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, left hand and attribute broken off, standing at the right end of the relief.

C3a9 Rhea Silvia
-1. Rome, Pal. Mattei
Unknown
Marble
1st half 3rd c. AD
Sarcophagus-relief depicting the myth of Mars and Rhea Silvia; upper-left-hand corner: Sol in quadriga, radiate, chlamys and chiton, whip (?) largely restored, preceded by Lucifer and a wind-god
LIMC Helios/Sol 163; LIMC Ares/Mars 401 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 189, 284 K40.

C3b Non-mythological sarcophagi
C3b1 Sol, Luna, and the Capitoline Triad
-1. Mantua, Pal. Ducale
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 160-180
Lid of a sarcophagus; Capitoline triad and Fortuna between the Dioscuri and Sol (left) on quadriga, radiate (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in raised right hand, preceded
by Lucifer, Oceanus below the horses, and Luna (right) in biga preceded by Hesperus. LIMC Helios/Sol 350; LIMC Athena/Minerva 283 (with ref.); LIMC Dioskouroi/Castores 78 (with ref.); ASR 1.3, 202 nr. 33, pl. 51.1; Matern 2002, 74, 222 Q100.


-2. Rome, Villa Borghese 89
Unknown
Marble
Ca. AD 170-180
Lid of a sarcophagus, heavily restored. At the left side, Sol ascends on his quadriga, whip in his r. hand, reins in his l.; Oceanus reclines below the chariot. In the centre, the Capitoline triad, between the Diosuri. To the right, Luna descends in her biga, preceded by Vesper.
ASR 1.3, 221 nr. 95, pl. 51.2; Matern 2002, 75, 224 Q109.

-3. Pl. 43.1
St. Petersburg, Hermitage A433
Monticelli (Tivoli)
Marble
Ca. AD 180
Lid of a sarcophagus: On the right, Luna descends in her biga, preceded by Vesper, and on the left, Sol), nude but for a chlamys, radiate (four rays), whip in his r. hand, reins in the left, ascends in his quadriga, preceded by Lucifer and above Oceanus. They flank the three Parcae (left) and the Capitoline triad of Minerva, Jupiter and Juno (right). The main frieze depicts the married couple bringing sacrifice.
LIMC Helios/Sol 352 (with ref.); ASR 1.3, 224-5 nr. 113, pl. 51.6, 65.1; Matern 2002, 75, 223 Q105.

Unknown
Marble
AD 180-190
Fragment of the lid of a sarcophagus; at the left end Sol (head restored) in a quadriga, nude but for a chlamys, whip in right hand, reins in left hand; below the front hooves of the horses: Oceanus; to the right of him one of the Dioscuri with a horse, then Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, and Fortuna; to the right of Fortuna a trace of the hindquarters of a horse, no doubt belonging to the second of
the Dioscuri, while Luna in biga would have completed the scene.
LIMC Helios/Sol 350; Amelung 1908 677-9 nr. 426 pl. 78; ASR 1.3, 238 nr. 154, pl 51.4; Matern 2002, 75, 224 Q108.

Unknown
Marble
AD 180-190
Fragment of the lid of a sarcophagus; at the left end Sol, no rays, in a quadriga, nude but for a chlamys, whip in right hand, reins in left hand, preceded by Lucifer; below the front hooves of the horses: Oceanus or possibly Tellus, above whom one of the Dioscuri with a horse, and to the right of whom Caelus with his cloak billowing out over his head; to the right follow Minerva, Jupiter, Juno, and Fortuna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 350; LIMC Ouranos 7 (with ref.); Amelung 1908, 688-90 nr. 430; ASR 1.3, 238 nr. 155, pl. 51.5; Matern 2002, 75, 224 Q107

Unknown
Marble
2nd c. AD
Fragment of the lid of a sarcophagus; at the left end quadriga of Sol, preceded by Lucifer; below, Oceanus; to the right, Minerva.
Matern 2002, 75, 223 Q102 (with refs.).

C3b2 Sol and Luna as corner masks of sarcophagus lids

-1. Pl. 44.1
Paris, Louvre MA1335
St-Médard d'Eytrans
Marble
Ca. AD 225-250
Lid of an Endymion-sarcophagus; on the left-hand corner head/mask of Sol (13 rays), on the right-hand corner head of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 348 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 263 B129; Espérandieu II, 214-17 nr. 1240; ASR 12.2, 126-7 nr. 72.

-2. Pl. 44.2
Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Mus. GR 48.1850

-3. Vatican, Mus. Chiaramonti
Unknown
Marble
Late 3rd or 4th c. AD.
Lid of a sarcophagus; on left-hand corner, head of Sol, radiate (4 rays), on right-hand corner head of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 348 (with ref.); Himmelmann 1973, 31-34, pl. 36b (r. half, Luna) and 55a (l. half, Sol).

-4. Pl. 44.3
Avignon, Mus. Calvet
Avignon
Marble
Ca. AD 300
Two fragments of a sarcophagus-lid, later reused for an inscription. On the right-hand corner, head of Sol, curly hair, four rays; on the left-hand corner, head of Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 348; ASR 1.2, 144 nr. 7

-5. Vatican, Museo Pio Cristiano
Unknown
Marble
2nd quarter 4th c. AD
Fragment of the lid of a sarcophagus; left-hand corner, head of Sol, radiate (4 rays remaining of originally 9 or 11); to the right, two scenes with Christ and one other, framed by trees. Rest broken off.
Bovini & Brandenburg 1967, 102-3 nr. 165, pl. 35 (with refs).

-6. Rome, Palazzo Corsini
Rome, cemetery of S. Urbano
Marble
AD 310-320
Lid of sarcophagus, l. corner bust of Sol, long curly hair, radiate; r. corner Luna.
Wrede 2001, 127-8 nr. 21, pl. 19.1 (lid) and 19.2 (sarcophagus); Matern 2002, 259 B103.
C3b3 Sol and Luna on other non-mythological sarcophagi

-1. Velletri, Mus. Civ. Velletri Marble AD 140-150 Sarcophagus-relief with scenes from the underworld in two registers; above these: Caelus under an arch, between Sol, radiate (5 rays), chlamys, globe in l. hand, whip in r., and Luna (each in a tympanum), two tritons under arches, and two eagles in tympanums LIMC Helios/Sol 349 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 51 n. 376, 172, 260 B105.

-2. Rome, Mus. Naz. 124712 Rome, Via Aurelia Marble Ca. AD 180 Unfinished column sarcophagus with four arcades. In the two outer arcades: Dioscuri. In the two central arcades, the deceased couple, l. in dextrarum iunctia (husband l., wife r.) with Concordia and Hymenaeus; r. bringing sacrifice on a burning altar (wife l., husband r.) with two male figures in the background and a small cupid next to the wife. On the l. short side of the sarcophagus Sol in rising quadriga, on the r. short side Luna in rising biga, both executed very sketchily or unfinished. ASR 1.3, 218 nr. 87, pl 56.3, 58.5-6 (with refs.).

-3. Pisa, Camposanto A6 Int. Unknown Marble AD 190-200 Sarcophagus relief. Strigilated sarcophagus with, on the left corner, a woman and attendant sacrificing; on the right corner a man and a cupid; in the centre two pillars connected by an arch, framing Amor and Psyche; above the capital of the left-hand pillar Sol in quadriga r., moving upward, above the right-hand pillar Luna in biga descending r.. ASR 1.3, 207 nr. 51, pl 56.4 & 62.3 (with refs.).

-4. Pl. 44.4

C3b4 Sol (without Luna) on other non-mythological sarcophagi

-1. Pl. 45.1 Brignoles, Mus. La Gayolle Marble 2nd c. AD On the sarcophagus, from left to right: frontal bust of Sol in the upper left corner above the right arm of an angler. Sol, radiate nimbus (5 rays), wears a chlamys. Next to Sol an angler standing, followed by three sheep and an anchor, below a bush with a bird facing right towards a standing female orant. A sheep emerges from behind the orant heading right, in front of a tree. In the centre (damaged) a seated philosopher with a pupil or orant. To the right of the latter a shepherd bearing a sheep on his shoulders and at the far right a bearded figure variously interpreted as Hades, the personification of a mountain, some deity, or the like. Espérandieu I, p. 40-1 nr. 40; Wilpert 1929/36, I, 7, 131 pl. 1.3; Wallraff 2001, 159-60, fig. 15; Matern 2002, 178 n. 976, 258 B93. The sarcophagus was reused in the 6th c. AD (inscription).
-2. Pl. 44.5, 45.2
Vatican, Mus. Pio Cristiano 119
Vatican
Marble
290-300
Sarcophagus-relief depicting various scenes from Scripture, of which the main one is the story of Jonah. Above the sails of the ship from which Jonah is thrown: bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys.
Wilpert 1929-32 I, 17, 26, 32, 109, 140, pl. 9.3; Bovini & Brandenburg 1967, 30-32 nr. 35, pl. 11; Wallraff 2001, 160.

-5. Current location unknown
Troad
Marble
2nd c. AD
Two pairs of horsemen below a bust of Sol, radiate.
LIMC Helios 308 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 258-9 B95

C3c. stelai
-1. Current location unknown?
Eivili (Turkey)
Marble
Late Hellenistic?
Funerary relief. Head of Sol next to a man holding a lowered torch.
LIMC Helios 306 (with ref.). Pfuhl/Möbius 123 nr 339

-6. Bursa, Mus. 100
Bursa
Marble
2nd c. AD
Funerary relief. At the top, a quadriga r., above two busts. Below: bust of Helios between the Dioscuri.
LIMC Helios 309 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 258 B94.

Cotiaeum
Marble
Late Hellenistic?
Funerary relief: small bust of Sol, radiate (?) nimbus, above busts of deceased couple.
LIMC Helios 307 (with ref.).

-7. Pl. 45.3
Gaziantep, Mus. 1749
Nisip
Limestone
Mid 2nd c. AD
Stele. Bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (9 rays), chlamys.
Wagner 1976, 113 nr. 4; Matern 2002, 177 n. 972, 182 n. 991, 259 B99.
Wagner believes this to be a funerary stele because of its form, because it was found in the environs of an ancient necropolis, and because below the niche, between two garlands, there is a small head of Medusa. In his view, Sol is actually a portrait of a deified deceased man.

Unknown
Marble
1st c. BC (probably)
Greek funerary relief; upper left-hand corner star and bust of Luna; upper right-hand corner bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys, whip. Main field: horseman riding towards an altar; behind him a servant and two other figures.
Dütschke 1882, 264-5 nr. 671; LIMC Helios 305 (with ref.); LIMC Heros Equitans 358; Matern 2002, 169, 250 B43..

-8. Langres, Mus. 119
Langres, Citadel
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Upper part of a funerary stele; in the tympanum, bust of a man (the deceased?); on
the acroteria the busts of Sol (right), radiate (5 rays), chlamys (?), and Luna (left). Below the tympanum an inscription: D(iis) M(anibus) PVBILICI(i) SARASI / ET LIBERORVM / EIIVS (sic) P(ublicius) SACROVIRVS / M(onumentum) P(osuit)
LIMC Helios/Sol 359 (with ref.); Catalogue du Musée de Langres, Langres 1931, 68 nr. 119 (fig.); CIL XIII 5833; Matern 2002, 255 B72.

Asia Minor  
Marble  
3rd c. AD
In lower field busts of a man and a woman. In the upper field, triple Hecate between two goddesses (Demeter and Persephone?). Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays) rises up above the poloi (decorated with crescents) of triple Hecate.
LIMC Helios 310 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 259 B102.

-10. Hasanköy, Mus.
Akmonia  
Marble  
3rd c. AD
Fragment of an aedicula-shaped funerary relief. In the tympanum, bust of Men; above the left-hand acroterion, bust of Sol, radiate, above the right-hand one bust of Luna.
LIMC Helios 313 (with lit.); Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 259 B100.

Cotiaeum  
Marble  
3rd c. AD
Aedicula-shaped funerary relief; in the tympanum an eagle, below this Hecate triformis between Men and a youth with a double axe; above the heads of Hecate, bust of Sol (?), radiate nimbus, above a crescent. Below the register with Hecate: busts of deceased couple.
LIMC Helios 311 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 185 n. 1020, 259 B101.

-12. Uşak, Mus.
Cotiaeum  
Marble  
3rd c. AD?
Funerary stele. Triple Hecate between two men; above her head, very shallow crescent below a bust of Sol, radiate. Below: busts of man and woman (the deceased).
LIMC Helios 312 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 182 n. 991, 260 B104.

Sens  
Stone  
Undated
Fragment of a funerary relief with a beardless male bust on the left border of a deep niche, below which is a small radiate head of Sol.
Espérandieu IV, 42 nr. 2825 (with ref. But no picture).

-14. Side, Mus. 1631
Unknown  
Marble  
Undated
In the tympanon of a stele, bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (12 rays), draped.

C3d. funerary building or monument
Rome, Via Casilina, tomb of the Haterii  
Marble  
Ca. AD 100-125
Fragments of a relief depicting the rape of Proserpina. In the upper part, to the right of a woman capite velato, Sol (?) in quadriga; only the torso of Sol and the hindquarters of the horses are preserved but for Sinn & Freyberger (1996, 60) the identity of Sol is "zweifelsfrei".

-2. Pl. 46.1
Igel, in situ  
Sandstone  
2nd c. AD
Large funerary monument. In the N. tympanon, a frontal bust of Sol, radiate tent-like nimbus (11 rays), chlamys, in frontal quadriga (protomes of two horses to the left,
two to the right). In the S. tympanon: bust of Luna above the protomes of two bulls. LIMC Helios/Sol 220 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 215 Q51 (with refs.).

C3e. other
-1. Cadenet
   *In situ?*
   Local rock
   Undated
   Fragment of a relief cut into the face of a cliff, apparently in connection with a funerary monument; preserved are the busts of Sol and Luna. LIMC Helios/Sol 305 (with ref.). E6

-2. Sicca Veneria (El Khef), Tunisia
   Sicca Veneria
   Stone
   Undated
   Funerary altar (?). In a niche, two men (only the upper part preserved). Above (from left to right): bust of Luna (facing left), Lucifer (facing left), full-figure, with torch, an eight-pointed star, and bust of Sol (facing left), radiate (6 or 7 rays). LIMC Helios/Sol 360 (with ref.).

C3f. Funerary altar (not Sol)
-1. Pl. 45.4
   Paris, Louvre 1443
   Rome
   Marble
   Last quarter 1st c. AD
   Funerary altar of Julia Victorina, portrayed on one side with radiate crown and on the other with crescent moon. D(is) M(anibus) / Iulie Victorinae / quae vix(it) ann(os) X mens(es) V / C(aius) Iulius Saturninus et / Lucilia Procula parentes / filiae dulcissimae fecerunt. LIMC Helios/Sol 454 (with ref.).

C3. Funerary reliefs
Section C3 lists reliefs from a funerary context on which Sol occurs, i.e. sarcophagi, stelai, and other funerary monuments. Sol does not commonly figure on such reliefs, but is not a negligible figure either.
The majority of the sarcophagi on which Sol appears are decorated with mythological scenes, namely the myths of Phaethon (C3a1.1-13), Endymion (C3a2.1-7), the adultery of Mars
and Venus (C3a3.1-3), Prometheus (C3a4.1-3), Ariadne (C3a5.1), Meleager (C3a6.1), Paris (C3a7.1), Protesilaos (C3a8.1), and Rhea Silvia (C3a9.1). Of the other sarcophagi two groups are noteworthy: a group of Antonine sarcophagi with the Capitoline Triad, Sol, and Luna on the side of the lid (C3b1.1-7) and sarcophagi with masks of Sol and Luna as corner figures of the lid (C3b2.1-5). The remaining sarcophagi vary in type. Five of these depict Sol and Luna (C3b3.1-5) and range from the elaborate Velletri sarcophagus of the mid second century (C3b3.1) to a simple strigillated sarcophagus of the mid third century (C3b3.4). Two others depict only Sol, as (tiny) element of complex scenes (C3b4.1-2). The sarcophagi are predominantly from Rome and Italy; a small number come from France, and one from Turkey.238

The funerary stelai gathered under C3c are a mixed batch. On eleven of the stelai Sol but not Luna is depicted, usually as a minor figure, but once as the main figure. On the other three, Sol and Luna are depicted together. Most of the stelai are from Asia Minor, a few are from France. The remaining four monuments in section C3 are the tomb of the Haterii in Rome (relief of the Rape of Persephone), the large funerary monument of Igel near Trier, and a relief in a cliff face near Cadenet in France. The final monument, the funerary altar of Julia Victorina, does not belong in the catalogue, but sheds such interesting light on the Sol-Luna symbol that I have incorporated it anyway.

In many cases we are dealing here with typical depictions of the image type [sol], often together with Luna, and often as minor figure (alone as well as with Luna). Sol is not a common figure on sarcophagi and funerary stelai, and therefore the same issues arise as discussed above with regards to the reliefs C2j to C2x: Sol does not contribute to the construction of a pattern, but (usually) represents a variation or anomaly of the normal pattern in these cases. We would need to study those patterns or groups in which Sol is normally not represented to see how the insertion of Sol affects the iconographic schema. That is beyond the scope of this study.

C3a. Sarcophagi with mythological scenes
We are still left with a number of interesting sarcophagi and reliefs that do form self-contained groups and that are worth discussing. In the first place there are, of course, the sarcophagi depicting the myth of Phaethon, the only myth in which Sol is a major figure. As the father of the hapless Phaethon, Sol is depicted in various episodes of the myth. On all sarcophagi he is depicted receiving Phaethon and granting him his wish to drive the solar chariot. On some sarcophagi he is also depicted witnessing the fall of Phaethon or mourning the death of his son.

Strictly speaking most of the Phaethon sarcophagi do not belong in this catalogue because

---


237 C3a2.7, C3a4.1, C3b2.3, C3b4.

238 C3b3.5.

239 C3c.7. I am not convinced that this is a funerary plaque, and even less convinced that it depicts the deceased deified as Sol (Wagner 1976, 113). Matern (2002, 259 B99) rejects the suggestion that the deceased is portrayed, but accepts that the relief is a funerary plaque.

240 C3c.4, 8, 13.
Sol is normally not depicted in these scenes in accordance with one of the three basic image types [sol] that are the topic of this study. He is often not radiate, without whip or globe, and seated on a throne. The result is that Sol as protagonist of a Greek myth is depicted in a very different manner from the standard symbolic, cosmic and religious Sol of the basic image types. This difference does not denote “different” suns - we find a depiction of the Phaethon myth even in a mithraeum in Dieburg (Cat. C2c.8) - but does evoke a difference of substance. As the father of Phaethon in a mythical scene Sol is a matter of culture, not religion. He constructs meaning within the scene by invoking cultural knowledge - the paideia of the viewer - rather than through associations with cosmology, solar ritual and cult. This does not mean that mythological sarcophagus reliefs cannot have a religious component or meaning. But the sarcophagi themselves do not present the Phaethon myth as religion any more than Ovid gives a religious dimension to myths in his Metamorphoses. The art of the sarcophagi follows established patterns for depicting the myth in contexts that are neither funerary nor religious and thus belongs to the same realm as the literature of Ovid, which is that of culture. In the case of sarcophagi it is the funerary context that gives these scenes added meaning, and this can also be expressed visually. On one Phaethon sarcophagus, for instance, we find the standard image type [sol and luna] on the short sides as cosmic “frame” for the main scene.

This iconographic differentiation between the Sol of myth and the standard image types [sol] is further evidence of the extent to which the image types [sol] had evolved to indexical signs by the second century AD (if not earlier). An image type [sol] depicts a cosmic concept, but it was a soft-hearted divine father who succumbed to the pleas of his semi-divine son, not a cosmic force, and hence he was depicted differently. We find something of the same differentiation in the case of the three sarcophagi depicting the adultery of Mars and Venus, but here it is less marked. Sol is depicted along with other gods next to Jupiter as one of the gathering of gods, integrated in the main scene rather than differentiated from it through size or position as is normally the case with the standard image types [sol]. In effect, there were immediately recognizable separate iconographic categories for “cultural” rather than “religious” depictions of Sol.

Sol and Luna as framing figures on sarcophagi
On the other sarcophagi, mythological as well as non-mythological, we mainly find Sol and Luna as framing figures along the lines of their basic image type. Exceptions are the quite unconventional Endymion sarcophagus in the S. Paolo at Rome (C3a2.3), the Meleager sarcophagus (Cat. C3a6.1) with a shield decorated with a head of Sol, the sarcophagus of La Gayolle in the museum of Brignoles (C3b4.1), and the early Christian sarcophagus in the Vatican (C3b4.2). Where Sol and Luna are depicted as framing deities their symbolic function is as usual indicated by their marginal position and, usually, size. In a few cases the images are full-sized, but on the short sides of the sarcophagus, with Sol in a quadriga on the left side and Luna in her

---

241 Cf. C1f.2, C2c.8, D4.1-2, E4b.1-2, F1b.1, and LIMC s.v. Phaethon I.

242 C3a.7, 12.
biga on the right. Their marginality is indicated by their placement as well as in the execution of these figures, which is more sketchy than that of the figures on the main relief. Normally, however, Sol and Luna are depicted in the main relief, but as small and minor figures driving their quadriga and biga respectively. Sol usually occupies the upper left hand corner, Luna the upper right hand one. On the Endymion sarcophagi, this means that Luna is depicted in two ways: as the protagonist of the myth, and as framing figure with Sol in one of the standard image types. This is further evidence of the substantial difference between the mythical and the symbolic, iconographically conveyed by these sarcophagi. The framing Sol-Luna pair has an indexical, conventionalized meaning that differs fundamentally from the type of meaning conveyed by Luna stepping off her biga to view Endymion. This is not a double depiction of the mythical Luna, for when such double images do occur, to depict Luna’s departure as well as her arrival, the scale of both images of Luna is the same. Instead, we have Sol and Luna as symbolic pair contributing specific meaning to the image that does not conflict with the presence of Luna as protagonist of the main scene.

Closer analysis of Endymion sarcophagi is needed than I can offer here, in particular because the image type [sol-luna] is not a standard component of the iconography of Endymion sarcophagi. However, of the connotations of the Sol-Luna pair that we have previously discussed - cosmic/eternity, romaness, and liminality - the liminal aspect seems the most appropriate here. Endymion, asleep, is in the liminal state between life and death. Luna’s love for Endymion crosses the border between human and divine, and more generally there are the issues of love and loss, arrival and departure, and the like. There is a great deal of information packed into these sarcophagus reliefs, and they deserve close attention.

While the Sol-Luna pair is conventionalized on these sarcophagi, there are a few noteworthy exceptions. On the Endymion sarcophagus in the catacombs of Domitilla (C3a2.6), Sol is in the upper right hand corner and Luna is on the left. Here Sol is leaving the scene rather than entering it from the left as is normally the case, and the rise of Luna heralds the arrival of night - appropriate for what Luna has in mind. On the Prometheus sarcophagus in Naples (C3a4.3) Sol is also in the right hand corner, but heading left into the scene while Luna, in the left-hand corner, is heading to the right. Not only are Sol and Luna inverted, but they are also headed in opposite directions, a clear allusion to the chaos that preceded creation, which is the theme of the main scene. Luna is omitted as Sol’s counterpart on the Endymion sarcophagus from the S. Paolo in Rome (C3a2.3), perhaps indicating that there was a lingering sense that in the image type [sol and luna] the gods Sol and Luna were depicted, while Luna, of course, already takes centre stage in the main scene.

C3a1.7, 12, C3a2.1, C3b3.2.


Koortbojian 1995, chpt 4, n. 35.

The depiction of Sol and Luna on the short sides of some Phaethon sarcophagi is comparable; cf. C3a1.3, 7, 12.
C3b. Non-mythological sarcophagi

Of the non-mythological sarcophagi, the late-Antonine group of sarcophagus lids depicting the Capitoline triad flanked by Sol and Luna in their respective chariots form an interesting group. It is tempting to think that such an apparently large number of sarcophagi with the same basic scene, produced in such a short time-span (roughly AD 160-190), and only then, may indicate the commemoration of a specific event, presumably connected with the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and involving weddings, as these lids cover sarcophagi with wedding scenes. However, the variation in the composition of the main group of deities depicted on the front side of the lid suggests that it was at best intended to suggest the facade of the Capitoline temple, but not to copy it. The differences between the various depictions are too great. Sol and Luna are invariably in their chariots, and the triad is invariably in the middle, but in other aspects the depictions differ quite substantially. Sol and his chariot are preceded by a flying personification in five of the seven cases, but on the sarcophagus in the S. Lorenzo in Rome (C3b1.4) the figure is female while in the other four cases it is male. This may not mean very much, given that the triad on the S. Lorenzo sarcophagus lid also differs from the norm - neither of the two goddesses is Minerva - so that the whole scene is anomalous, and may have been recarved. But there are other variations as well. On five of the seven lids the Dioscuri also flank the central triad, but they are absent on the lids of St Petersburg and Palermo (C3b1.3,7). Fortuna is sometimes included, but because some of the lids are significantly restored or fragmentary it is not possible to say with certainty how often she was omitted. The inclusion, in one case, of the three Parcae (C3b1.3) constitutes a further variant.

The Sol-Luna pair is depicted in a more elaborate iconography on these sarcophagi than we have generally seen so far. Both are preceded by flying personifications, usually male. Sol’s companion is generally identified as Lucifer the light-bringer, while Luna is preceded by the personification of evening, Vesper or Hesperos. Below the horses of Sol’s ascending chariot, the reclining bearded figure is Oceanus, the ocean. There is no corresponding figure below Luna’s biga because it is descending, leaving no space, but on occasion she may be accompanied by Tellus. This enhancement of the image type [sol], alone or more often with Luna, is fairly common, and stresses its cosmic symbolism. Oceanus and Tellus (the latter by implication if not actual presence) symbolize the earth, Sol and Luna the heavens revolving around earth, and as a group they represent the cosmos as a whole. Depicted here together with the Dioscuri (representing the fixed stars?), Fortuna or the Parcae, and the Capitoline Triad they contribute to a group that articulates or evokes some of the fundamental aspects of the cosmos, with supreme divinity at the centre, with whom fate or fortune are associated, flanked next by the fixed stars, the Dioscuri, who stand between the divine and the visible cosmos, represented by the liminal image type [sol-and-luna] who occupy the transitional space between earth (Oceanus) and the...


248 C3b1.1,3,4,6,7.

249 Fortuna is not depicted on C3b1.2-4, and is absent from the fragmentary relief C3b1.7.

250 C4.7.
divine (triad). As usual we must stress that this is not “the” meaning of these scenes, but it is conceivably part of the range of associations such images could evoke. However, as with previous readings of, for instance, Mithraic scenes, this reading of these sarcophagus lids should be viewed as no more than a starting point for further exploration of these sarcophagi as a whole. I have not looked closely at the the other figures and their potential for symbolic or indexical meanings, nor have I extended my discussion to include other figures or scenes, either on the lids or on the sarcophagi proper.

Little need be said about the remaining sarcophagi. The sarcophagi of around AD 300 with masks of Sol and Luna as corner acroteria on the lids, conflate the meanings of the flanking Sol-Luna pair with that of theatre masks. This may enhance the contrasting dualism of the two - light and darkness, male and female - echoing the contrast between tragic and comic masks, for instance. Closer analysis of corner figures and masks on sarcophagi is needed.

The sarcophagus from La Gayolle has a bust of Sol at the left end of the main side, balanced by a seated male figure usually identified as Hades on the right. Between them, from left to right, are an angler, a female orant, a seated philosopher and his pupil (both damaged) and a man bearing a sheep on his shoulders. Sol and Hades (if the latter is correctly identified) are obvious opposites (bright sky and the dark underworld). The same is true for the angler and the sheepbearer, the latter symbolizing land and the former water. An anchor next to the angler confirms that we should associate him with the sea/water. The adult, female orant would then have the young male student as her counterpart, while the seated philosopher occupies the centre between these three pairs of “opposites”. Again this is only a first step in the analysis of the sarcophagus, but it does suggest a rhythm that is closely related to that of Sol-Luna/Lucifer-Hesperus/Oceanus-Tellus, discussed above. Whether or not this is a Christian sarcophagus is difficult to say. There is no clear evidence that it must be and opinions vary.

Certainly Christian is the Jonah sarcophagus (C3b4.2), with its tiny and somewhat incongruous bust of Sol above the sail of the ship from which Jonah is thrown overboard. There is no connection between this radiate bust and any common deployment of the image type [sol] that I am aware of, nor are there parallels for Jonah and Sol, except in the mausoleum M of the Vatican Neapolis (see chpt. X). This makes it difficult to evaluate the meaning of the bust of

---

251 C3b2.1-5.

252 On the sarcophagus cf. Koch 2000, 20, 22, 475. Wallraff (2001, 159-60) gives an excellent review of earlier scholarship concerning aspects of this sarcophagus’s iconography. His own analysis is also preliminary, and Wallraff stresses the necessity of closer study of the individual figures and symbols. He draws a parallel with the cosmic “Sol-Luna” imagery (p. 160 n. 73), but note that the imagery is much older than Wallraff suggests and can be traced back to the mid to late Republic. Cf. also chapter x.

253 Wallraff (2001, 159) considers the anchor a sign of the sarcophagus’s Christian character that would otherwise be difficult to explain, but I think it neatly emphasizes the angler’s connection with water.

254 Wallraff (2001, 160-1) adduces two parallels, neither one of which is convincing. The charioteer of an arcosolium painting in room 45-2 of the catacombs of SS. Marcellino e Pietro is definitely not Sol. The Jonah scene from cubiculum III of the catacombs of Domitilla is too poorly preserved to allow a good evaluation of the depiction of Sol.
Sol on this sarcophagus.

The funerary stelai do not reveal any coherent groups and as the inclusion of Sol on such stelai is quite rare. Therefore nothing further can be said here about the meanings that may be associated with his presence.

**Funerary altar of Julia Victorina**

Of the other monuments listed in C3 the altar of Julia Victorina is the most noteworthy (C3f.1). This funerary altar, discovered near the Lateran in Rome, is virtually unique and its meanings are not clear.\(^{255}\) It is decorated with two female busts, one on the front and one on the back. Both busts are presumably portraits of Julia Victorina. The bust on the front has short hair in loosely falling locks framing the face. Her forehead below the fringe of hair is smooth, the eyebrows thin but pronounced, her gaze direct. Her nose was (probably) straight but is damaged. She has a small, straight mouth with fairly thin lips and a pronounced chin. She has full cheeks, giving her face the roundish contours of childhood. Her ears are shapely and fairly large, and she is wearing small round earrings. An upturned crescent rests on the top of her head. The radiate bust on the back has a different hairstyle, consisting of nine carefully arranged round curls framing the face from ear tot ear. The short curls leave free a high, straight forehead. Below the thin eyebrows fairly deep-set eyes gaze straight ahead. The nose is straight and quite narrow, the mouth small with thin straight lips, the chin strong. The jawline is fairly straight and the cheeks flatter, giving the face a slightly more triangular shape than the counterpart on the front. The shapely ears are proportionately smaller and she is wearing the same earrings. Seven straight rays emerge from a fillet running over the top of the head from ear to ear. Set side by side, the differing hairstyles, the different shapes of the face, and the proportionate difference in the size of the ears make the radiate portrait on the back of the altar that of an adult woman who has lost the more child-like features of the portrait on the front.\(^{256}\) The fact that they are both wearing the same earrings confirms that the same person is meant. It is generally accepted that the portrait on the front depicts her as the ten-year-old girl she was at the time of her death. The portrait on the back, however, appears to depict her in the adulthood she never attained during her life. Cumont argued that it represents the maturity and immortality that she will attain during the sojourn of her soul in the sphere of the moon as it begins its ascent through the spheres.\(^{257}\)

From a visual point of view Cumont’s interpretation is somewhat problematic, for it does not forge any link to the visual meanings of Sol and Luna that were already well-established by the last quarter of the first century AD, to which this altar dates. The first question to ask, then, is whether this altar in any way echoes the image type [sol-luna]. Basically it does, of course, but

\(^{255}\) Comparable is the compital altar found in Trastevere and now in the Museo Nazionale inv. 58640, Candida 1979, nr. 44, CIL VI, 36851.

\(^{256}\) It should be noted however that the loss of the nose enhances the childish features of the latter; a straight, adult nose would have diminished the contrast with the portrait on the back.

\(^{257}\) Cumont 1942, 243-4. Nock and Beazley (1946, 143) have their doubts about this rather precise and detailed interpretation, but admit to having no alternative explanation for the unique imagery of this remarkable piece. Cf. D’Ambra 2006, 66-7; Kleiner 1987, 119-121, n 15; Wrede 1981b, 264-265, n 183.
only to a certain degree. The crescent on the one portrait and the rays on the other inevitably evoke Luna and Sol, but the two portrait busts are not placed in a flanking or subordinate position; they are not on the sides of the altar for instance, but on the front and the back, and they are clearly the main images. The two sides are each decorated with a laurel tree with birds. In short, the two busts borrow from the Sol-Luna imagery, but do not copy it. This is not Julia Victorina assimilated with Luna and Sol respectively, but two busts that stand to each other as Luna stands to Sol.

In normal social hierarchy the adult portrait on the back would be more important than the child on the front. This is reinforced by the attributes of Sol and Luna, for the light of Sol is more powerful, and in art he is generally granted the dominant role, rising in his four-horse chariot from the left into the scene while Luna sets in the other corner, descending out of the image in her biga of oxen or horses. In terms of Roman gender inequality as well, Sol, being male, has the dominant role in the image type [sol-luna]. And yet if we return to the portraits, the one on the front, despite its youth and association with Luna, is by virtue of its position the preeminent one. It is also the more “correct”, as it depicts Julia Victorina as the ten-year-old child she was when she died. It may be, of course, that this was not the front of the altar, but that seems highly unlikely. We don’t know how the altar was originally set up, but it is surely safe to assume that the inscription was on the side one approached first. The placement was important in other respects as well. How visible was the back at all? Is the deeper relief of this side of the altar meant to counteract reduced visibility because of placement or lack of light? Could one walk around the altar? One assumes that this was the case, and that the viewer thus went from the child that had died to the adult that never lived, back to the child that had died again.258 Circling around the altar thus involves the viewer in two major transitions, from childhood to adulthood and from life to death. The interwoven quote of the Sol-Luna iconography with its liminal connotations subtly reinforces this element of transition; the \textit{aeternitas} reference which is also part of the general meaning evoked by the image type [sol-luna] is likewise appropriate. But that does not yet explain why Julia Victorina is “Luna and Sol”, for the same effect could be achieved with small depiction of Sol and Luna on - say - the sides. There must be a reason why the Sol-Luna imagery is integrated into the two portraits, depicting the young ten-year-old as the moon in relation to her adult, solar self that was never attained. Are we to think of the ten-year-old as reflecting that adult potential in the same way as the moon “shines” by reflecting sunlight? That seems far-fetched, and further research is necessary.

As usual, this is only the beginning of a full analysis. The laurels (of Apollo as Helios?) on the sides, the ornamentation, comparable funerary altars, and other such elements are essential components of any comprehensive study which is hence beyond the scope of the present discussion. What I hope to have shown is that the basic connotations of the Sol-Luna imagery offer a good point of departure for the analysis of this funerary altar. From our perspective, however, the main interest of this altar is not in what it says, but in how it says it. The imagery constructs a significant part of its meaning by adopting elements of an image type, [sol-luna] which itself borrows two images ([sol] and [luna]) to construct meanings that, in semiotic terms, are only indexically related to the actual signifiers. The image type [sol-luna] itself does not

\footnote{258 On circumambulation in Roman funerary rites, cf. Davies 1997, 56-7.}
denote a meeting of Sol and Luna; in the case of the portraits of Julia Victorina the references to
moon goddess and sun god are even weaker. The crescent and the radiate crown enable an
elegant and at first glance straightforward funerary altar to construct, in typically visual fashion, a
complex of meaningful associations that enhance the impact of that altar. At no point, however,
can there be even a suggestion that Julia Victorina is somehow being identified with Luna and/or
Sol. The two deities have no role to play as deities in the imagery of this altar.

In visual terms, then, there is no need to somehow forge a direct link between Victorina
and the moon and sun, as Cumont attempts. What we see here is one of the clearest examples yet
in this study of symbolic signs in Roman art in the form of the upturned crescent and the crown
of rays deployed on this altar in a manner that has nothing to do with Luna and Sol anymore,
as they are the signifiers of abstract concepts for which those deities are all but irrelevant. The
capacity of Roman art to deploy these two symbols in this manner will prove to be an important
key to the understanding of the imperial radiate crown (see chapter six).

C4. Other reliefs or reliefs of unknown function.
-1. Pl. 46.2

Capua, Mus. Camp.
Capua
Terracotta
4th c. BC
Oscan "Iovila" with frontal face of Sol, long
wavy hair, completely surrounded by rays.
On the reverse sketch, incised, of a
sacrificial animal. Inscription, repeated on
each side: kluvatium / pumperias pustm[-.
LIMC Helios 41; Franchi de Bellis 1981, 87-
9 nr. 2 fig. 2.

-2. Pl. 46.3

Brindisi, Mus. Prov. 656
Apulia
Terracotta
1st c. BC (Gundel); late Hellenistic (LIMC
Semele); 3rd c. AD (LIMC Helios).
Roundel; circle with 11 signs of the zodiac
along the edge (libra missing). In the centre
a figure in a quadriga led by Hermes and
surrounded by a variety of figures and
symbols, including the busts of Sol (above
left) with a radiate nimbus and Luna (above
right).
LIMC Helios 299 (with ref.); LIMC Semele
23 (with ref.); LIMC Dioskouroi 237;

-3. Venice, Mus. Arch. 163

Rome
marble
AD 50-75
Three-sided candelabrum. On the base,
upper body of Sol, emerging from
vegetation. He wears a chiton and is radiate
(8 rays).
Matern 2002, 263 B132 (with ref.).

-4. Pl. 47.1

Tarragona, Mus. Naz. 45405
Tarragona, Roman Villa,
Marble
Last quarter 1st - 1st quarter 2nd c. AD (on
sculptural and stylistic grounds, cf. Koppel
1992, 141).
Fragmentarily preserved rectangular shield
of a statue. In the upper part, Sol ascends a
quadriga to the right. Sol, radiate, is nude but
for a chlamys, holds the reins in his left hand
and a whip (?) in his r. hand. A small,
winged nude figure flies above the horses
before him. Oceanus reclines below the
chariot. In the centre of the shield: head of
Medusa. In the lower part, Luna rides her
biga to the left. Tellus reclines below her.
Matern 2002, 75-6, 224-5 Q111, fig. 20
(with refs.); Koppel 1992.

-5. Rome, Mus. Torlonia 395

Rome, Villa dei Quintili
Marble
2nd c. AD
Charioteer riding left in a quadriga; stylized
waves below the horses.
Matern 2002, 65, 85, 218-9 Q70 (with refs.).
The identification of the charioteer as Sol
cannot be certain. His head, neck, part of his
upper body, and left arm with folds of his
toga are all modern restorations. As restored,
his clothing (toga, no chlamys) is incompatible with Sol, but it is not impossible that he originally was dressed in a chiton. This is certainly the impression one gets from the vertical folds of clothing behind the outer horse’s tail which - taken alone - would suggest a chiton. Furthermore the waves below the horses imply a deity, and Sol would be a logical candidate.

-6. Pl. 47.2
Avenches (Switzerland), Mus. Rom. SA/201 Aventicum (Avenches)
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Fragment of a relief, depicting the frontal head of Sol, very long curly hair, radiate (over 13 rays)
LIMC Helios/Sol 3 (with ref.); Bossert 1998, 84-5 nr. 38, pls. 30-31; Matern 2002, 263 B127

Lillebonne
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Stele; bust of Sol, chlamys, radiate nimbus (7 rays).
LIMC Helios/Sol 28 (with ref.); Walters 1974, 124-5 nr. 52, pl. 27; Poirel 1999; Matern 2002, 178 n. 976, 257 B85 (incorrect number of rays).
Discovered in 1864 in a Roman villa.
Suggestions, based on this relief, that the villa contained a Mithraeum are possible, but by no means certain. In the vicinity were a bust of a bearded figure (Poirel fig. 3) and a fragment of drapery, neither of which can be securely linked to a Mithraic context.

-8. Cologne, Römisch-germanisches Museum 442
Cologne, Neumarkt (SW corner)
Limestone
3rd quarter of the 2nd c. AD
Pilaster with reliefs on three sides in three registers; lower part of the bottom register lost. Lower register: Mars, Venus, Fortuna; central register: Victory, Vulcan, Sol, radiate nimbus (9? rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in right hand; upper register: Juno, Ceres, Minerva.
Mithraic reliefs, depicting Sol on a frontal quadriga; the upper part of the relief, including the head of Sol is lost. In front of the quadriga: a krater and a snake. Next to Sol, above the two right hand horses, a bust (head lost), unidentifiable.

LIMC Helios/Sol 306; Espérandieu III, 258-9 nr. 2273; CIMRM I, 942, fig. 233; Matern 2002, 214 Q41 (with incorrect current location).

-14. Pl. 48.1
Frankfurt a.M., Mus. für Vor- und Frühgeschichte X8382 (destroyed in WWII) Hedernheim
Sandstone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Bust of Sol (?) or more likely a local, Celtic solar god in view of the strange object in his right hand; radiate, 5 rays.
LIMC Helios/Sol 33; Huld-Zetsche 1994, 45, 164 fig. 79
Found in a well together with a similar relief of Luna (or perhaps a male, Celtic moon-god) and the remains of two Jupiter-pillars, one of which bears a dedication dated March 13th 240, thus giving a terminus post quem for the burial.

-15. Novae, depot
Novae, sector 9, square 3, nr. 155
Stone
2nd-3rd c. AD?
Fragment of a relief, showing part of a face (left eye) and one large ray (?) consisting of 6 lines; interpreted as the face of the Sun and connected with the cult of Mithras by the excavators.
LIMC Helios/Sol 6 (with ref.)

-16. Pl. 48.2
Private collection, on loan to MMA, New York (L.1993.85)
Unknown
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD; 1st c. AD (E. Moormann, pers. com.).
Body of a Kithara, decorated in relief. In the centre, frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), above the protomes of four horses. To the left, part of a Marsyas-scene, depicting the Scythian sharpening the blade for the flaying of Marsyas. Marsyas himself, to the right, is lost. The Kithara presumably formed part of a colossal marble statue of Apollo.
Unpublished.

-17. Épinal, Mus. dép.
Escles
Sandstone
3rd c. AD
Apex of the tympanum of a stele, frontal face of Sol, radiate (12 rays).
LIMC Helios/Sol 221 (with ref.);
Espérandieu VI, 146 nr. 4793; Matern 2002, 259 B98.

-18. Pl. 48.3
Brussels, Mus. Roy. B 206c
Virton
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Sol in quadriga (head of 4th horse missing) r., radiate nimbus (7 rays), nude but for chlamys, whip in r. hand, reins (?) in left. Face of Sol damaged. Right side of relief damaged.

-19. Pl. 48.4
Corbridge, Corbridge Roman Site Museum
Corbridge
Stone
3rd c. AD
Plaque with frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus.
LIMC Helios/Sol 32

-20 New York, Art Market
Unknown
Basalt
3rd c. AD
Bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), chlamys.
Matern 2002 263 B128

-21. Pl 48.5-6
Rome, Forum Romanum
In situ
Marble
November 20th, 303
Decennalia-base. Constantius Chlorus in the act of bringing sacrifice, in the presence of
various gods; at the right Roma "velificans" with a frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays) decorating her mantle. Gundel (1992, 305 nr. 363) suggests that Roma's billowing mantle may symbolize a "bildlose Zodiakos".


In the 16th c. there were still traces visible of a female bust next to Sol; cf. Wrede 1981, 122 n. 78.

-22. Pl. 49.1-2
Paris, Cab. Méd. 95 A 71961
Unknown
Marble
4th c. AD
Hexagonal plaque decorated in low relief.
To the left, Cybele is seated on her throne between two lions (lion on the left broken away completely). On the apex of the throne: decorative element consisting of a small frontal head of Sol, radiate. Behind Cybele a dancing girl with cymbals, nimbate, and next to her a dancing Corybant. To the right, Attis seated on a rock, supported by a Corybant.
LIMC Helios/Sol 224 (with refs.); DA I 2, 1689 fig. 2250.

-23. Xanten, Mus., lost (destroyed in WWII)
Xanten
Limestone
Undated
Stele; in tympanum frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays); below, an illegible inscription.
LIMC Helios/Sol 222; Espérandieu Recueil IX, 6591.

Unknown
Bronze
Undated
Bronze plaque; on the left-hand side two zones, the one above the other, with Helios-busts in one zone and Cybele-busts in the other. On the right-hand side four pairs of Cybele-busts.
LIMC Helios 317.

-25. Soueida, Mus.
'Äin Zeman

-26. Basalt
Undated
Rectangular cippus; on one side eagle and thunderbolt, on the other side bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys, above the bust of Luna (?).
LIMC Helios in per. or. 5 (with ref.).

-27. Basalt
Undated
Fragment of a relief consisting of the head of a beardless youth with short, stylized curls and the remnants of a headdress interpreted as being a radiate nimbus.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 37 (with ref.).

-28. Pl. 49, 3-5.
Burgos, Church of S. Maria en Quintanilla de las Viñas
In situ
6th c. AD?
Limestone
Two lintels supporting an arch. On one lintel, imago clipeata of Sol, radiate (nine rays), long-haired, clean shaven. Inscription S // OL. Two angels carry the clipeus. On the upper border, a dedicatory inscription: (h)OC EXIGVVM EXIGVA OFF(ert)
DO(mina) FLAMMOLA VOTUM D(eo)
(This small vow the unworthy (exigua) lady Flammola offers to God). On the other lintel, similar depiction of Luna with crescent; inscription LV // NA. Luna appears to have a short beard.
C4 Other reliefs and reliefs of unknown function

Only a few of the objects listed here require further discussion.

The iovila from Capua (C4.1) is a small votive plaque of the third century BC dedicated by the family of the Kluvatii on the occasion of a festival known as the pumperiae. The head of Sol with a full circle of rays is a good example of a Sol-type current in Italy until the late Republic, when it was gradually displaced by the radiate bust. The head of Sol on Roman unciae of the late third century BC is closely related to this type.259

The terracotta disc in the archaeological museum of Brindisi (C4.2) is almost certainly late Hellenistic, and not third century AD as Yalouris proposes in the LIMC.260 It is thus one of the earliest non-numismatic examples of the Sol-Luna imagery. The astrological context of this early example of the image type [sol-luna] is noteworthy.

On the well-known Decennalia base (C4.21) we again find Sol and, possibly, Luna. The base supported one of the five columns erected in 303 to commemorate the 20th year of Diocletian’s rule and the tenth year of the tetrarchy. Four columns bore statues of the tetrarchs while a fifth, larger column was surmounted by a statue of Jupiter. On one side of the surviving base a sacrifice is depicted attended by, among others, Roma seated at the far right. Her head is lost, but next to it was a bust of Sol in the fold of her billowing cloak; his face has been damaged, but the rays are still clearly visible. In the 16th century, when the base was discovered, Sol’s head was less damaged and there were still traces of a female bust next to it, suggesting Sol and Luna may have been depicted together and served here to stress the aeternitas of Roma.261

In section C4 we also find a number of images from the Near East of which the identity is problematic (C4.25-7). Local solar or sun-related deities in the Roman Empire generally had their own distinct iconographies, and this was certainly true in Asia Minor and Syria. Nonetheless, confusion is possible, particularly in Syria, where the use of the most distinct iconographic attribute of Sol, rays, extended well beyond local solar deities. Various non-solar deities are also depicted radiate, gods as well as goddesses. This increases the possibility of confusion, in particular when only a radiate bust is depicted without any further defining attributes, and the context is unknown. In their present state these busts fall within the definition of the basic image type [sol]. But in Syria, perhaps more than in other parts of the empire, context may have provided visual evidence that a different deity was meant, and that the adherence to the norms of the image type [sol] is a result of a lack of detail, not artistic choice. The issue is an iconographic one. I am not arguing that all cases of the image type [sol] automatically depict the same god. The interpretatio romana of local deities often resulted in a Roman form for a local god. But in the Near Eastern context of a range of potential radiate deities, the lack of additional defining attributes leaves these busts underdefined to a greater degree than they would have been in other

259 L.1.1; Cf. Schauenburg 1955.

260 Cf. LIMC Semele 23.

261 Wrede 1981, 122 n. 78.
parts of the Empire.  

The final entry in section C4 strictly speaking does not belong here. This pair of reliefs depicting Sol and Luna are examples of the early medieval art of Visigothic Spain, and their precise date is uncertain. I have included them as a good example of the post-Roman survival of the image type [sol-luna]. The iconography of the two reliefs betrays a good knowledge of Roman art, which clearly inspired the *imago clipeata* type, here with supporting angels rather than Roman Erotes, victories or the like. In addition, the reliefs are placed quite appropriately as support for the arch separating the chancel area from the transept. Taken together, this suggests a more than superficial understanding of, and admiration for Roman visual practices on the part of the Visigothic builders.

C5. Not or probably not Sol (selection).

1. Delos, Mus. A3915-2917  
Delos, Maison de Fourni  
marble  
Hellenistic  
Fragment of a relief, showing the head and shoulders of Apollo-Helios, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, quiver.  
LIMC Helios 139 (with ref.).

2. Delphi, Mus. 9449  
Delphi, Hermeion-terrace  
Marble  
Early Hellenistic  
Fragment of a relief; head of Apollo-Helios, radiate, laurel wreath, kithara; Hermes.  
LIMC Apollon 475 (with ref.).

3. Istanbul, Arch. Mus. 36552  
Troy  
Terracotta  
Late 2nd-1st c. BC  
Helios-Apollo in quadriga to left, chlamys, chiton, impossible to make out whether he was radiate or bare-headed (relief broken at top of head), with a kithara in his hands.  
LIMC Helios 383 (with ref.); Thompson Troy suppl III The terracotta figurines of the hellenistic period., Princeton PUP 1963, 143 nr. 297.  
Mirror Image of the famous metope of Troy.

4. Damascus, Nat. Mus. C7939  
Unknown, possibly environs of Homs  
Basalt  
AD 30/1  
Male bust (face hacked away), radiate nimbus and crescent, chlamys, armor; in upper right-hand corner a snake (corresponding left-hand corner missing). Below the bust: seven small male busts, the three at the left facing right, the four at the right facing left. Below these, inscription dedicating the relief Ἡλίος θεός μεγίστος.  
LIMC Helios 385 (with ref.); LIMC Helios in per. or. 60 (with lit.).  
The seven busts, as far as I can make out from the photograph in the LIMC, are all male, and have no specific attributes distinguishing the one from the other. The seven busts, as far as I can make out from the photograph in the LIMC, are all male, and have no specific attributes distinguishing the one from the other. The

---

262 Canonical images of Sol certainly existed in this region, at times prominently. On coins of Tripoli in Phoenicia, for example, a tetrastyle temple is depicted with in the central intercolumnial space the burning altar of Zeus Hagios; in the space to the left a statue of Sol, radiate, nude, right hand raised is depicted on a pedestal. In the corresponding space on the right, Luna. Cf. Matern 2002, 299 M185a-d (Julia Domna, Caracalla, Elagabal, Julia Soaemias); *CIL* 03, 14386d.

263 The church of S. Maria en Quintanilla de las Viñas may still have been under construction at the time of the Arab invasion in AD 711.


suggestion that they represent the planetary deities thus seems improbable.

-5. Palmyra, Mus.
Palmyra
Limestone
1st c. AD
Octagonal altar, three sides of which were originally decorated with standing deities, one of which is still preserved: standing deity, radiate (9?) rays, chlamys, armor, lance.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 44 (with ref.).

-6. Palmyra, Mus. 6534 (B 1734)
Sanctuary of Nabû
Limestone
1st c. AD
Fragment of a niche: bust of a deity, radiate nimbus (13 rays), chlamys, armor, between two eagles.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 17

-7. Palmyra, Mus. 6850
Palmyra, Temple of Ba'alshamin
Limestone
1st half 1st c. AD
Lintel: bust of a deity, radiate nimbus (27 rays), chlamys, armor, beside an eagle.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 1a (with ref.).

-8. Palmyra Mus. 7955 (2226 B)
Palmyra, temple of Nabû
Limestone
2nd c. AD
Fragment of a relief ("medallion"): bust of a deity, radiate nimbus (24 rays), chlamys, armor.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 35 (with ref.).

-9. Palmyra, Mus. 7971 (2232 B)
Palmyra, temple of Nabû
Marble
2nd c. AD
Stele: deity, radiate nimbus, chlamys, armor, lance.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 46 (with ref.).

-10. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. Äg. Mus. 10314
Fayum
Terracotta
2nd c. AD?
Bust of a beardless man, long curly hair, radiate nimbus (6 rays) with at the top a disc between two plumes and horns, chlamys, right hand raised, crocodile in left hand; to be identified as Souchos.
LIMC Souchos 25 (with ref.).
See also Cairo, Eg. Mus. CG 26902, LIMC Helios/Sol 24 (with ref.).

-11. Cairo, Eg. Mus. CG 27569 (JE 30001)
unknown
Limestone
3rd c. AD
Throning figure with staff, radiate nimbus, interpreted as "Caracalla-Sol", with soldiers standing around.
LIMC Helios/Sol 428

-12. New Haven, Yale Univ. Mus. 1929.369
Dura Europos
Limestone
AD 228/9
Standing Nemesis and a dedicant by an altar; between them a male bust (face hacked away), radiate nimbus, chlamys, armor.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 3 (with ref.).

-13. Damascus, Mus. Nat. 5216
Khirbet Wadi Suwân
Limestone
Undated
Allat (left) and dedicant (right), by an altar, flank a sun-god, radiate nimbus (15?) rays, right hand raised, torch in left hand, chlamys, richly decorated sleeved chiton with an elaborate belt.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 41a (with refs.).
The presence of Allat suggests that this is Shamash, but this is the only case in which Shamash is depicted unarmed.

Khirbet Wadi Suwân
Limestone
Undated
Standing god, radiate nimbus, dressed in chlamys and Roman armor, holding an upright spear in his right hand (legs, left hand, and face lost); to the left: Allat.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 42 (with ref.).

-15. Present location unknown
Mashara (Golan)
Stone
Undated
Radiate bust on a crescent accompanied by bearded god and Luna.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 24 (with ref.).

-16. Present location unknown
Palmyra
Stone
Undated
Fragment of a relief depicting a male deity, radiate, chlamys, armor.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 45 (with ref.).

-17. Antioch
Unknown
Stone
Undated
Altar of the Heliopolitan triad; among the figures represented: radiate god on a chariot drawn by two griffons.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 55 (with ref.).

-18 Châtillon-sur-Seine, Mus.
Essarois
Limestone
Undated
Fragment of a votive relief; in the pediment, frontal bust, radiate (4 of 7 rays surviving), winged, of Apollo Vindonnus, a Gallo-Roman deity with a temple at Essarois.
Inscription: [deo apollini Vind]ONNO ET FONTIBVS / [... p]RISCI (filius) VSLM
Espérandieu IV, 354-5 nr 3414.

-19. Lost
Galilea
Limestone
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol above a chariot drawn by two eagles.
LIMC Helios in. per. or. 38

-20. Ferzol, near Baalbek
In situ
Natural rock
Undated
Radiate horseman by a date-palm, accompanied by a nude Genius.
LIMC Helios in per. or. 50 (with ref.).
Not or probably not Sol
C5. Not or probably not Sol

The images collected here give an impression of Hellenistic and Roman image types that were akin to [sol], but with essential differences.

In the Hellenistic period in particular, Apollo may be depicted radiate as the sun god, but with attributes of Apollo as well, such as a quiver and bow or a kithara (C5.1-3). In the late Republic and Augustan era, this solar Apollo was common, but after that he recedes from art. Throughout most of the imperial period, the basic image types [sol] are used to depict the sun god. Apollo is still considered to be the sun, but no longer depicted in a manner that competed with Sol. Consequently the solar Apollo of Augustus came to be associated with the image types [sol] and with their preference for Sol, both Aurelian and Constantine can represent themselves as heirs of Augustus and his Actian Apollo.

Most of the other examples in C5 are of regional solar deities with particular attributes or other iconographic characteristics that differentiate them from the basic image types [sol]. The list is by no means exhaustive. In the Near East, the most obvious iconographic difference between local solar deities and Sol is the practice to depict the former in battle dress rather than nude or with a chiton (C5.4-9, 12, 14, 16). Such solar deities as Shamash, Yarhibol, or Malachbel are warrior gods and are hence depicted fully armed throughout the period of Roman rule. These depictions betray a significant degree of Roman influence. The armor that these gods wear, for instance, is of the standard Roman type and in the later Empire the gods may also echo Sol’s typical gesture of the raised right hand. This means that the differences in iconography of these gods, notably their armor, was purposeful and served to differentiate them from the standard image types [sol] of the Graeco-Roman art of imperial Rome. These images make quite clear that they do not depict Sol or Helios, but a different god. And yet these local deities were so closely related to Sol that they sometimes echo the Graeco-Roman type to a striking degree. These are not different sun gods in the (obviously impossible) sense of different suns. There is only one sun and these gods represent different manifestations or traditions of sun worship.

But that alone may be too simple an explanation for the differences (and similarities) in iconography between these deities and the image types [sol]. In the mingling of local and Roman elements we see a reflection of the process of positioning these local deities and the religious traditions they represent within the broader context of the Roman Empire. That process was neither straightforward nor easy, and the outcome was by no means always the same. In dealing with local religions, Roman practice ranged from the outright banning of cults, rites, or priesthods to the introduction of previously local cults into other parts of the Empire, not to mention the imposition, locally, of imperial cults. Local approaches to coping with the new, imperial situation ranged from the continuation of traditional cult practices unchanged, to the promotion of redefined local cults and the adoption of imperial ones. The politics of religion were complex and formed a major part of the process of empire-building, for religions and religious traditions loomed large in the socio-political discourse of imperial identities and power-


267 Cf. Matern 2002, 241, I58 and I59, bronze statuettes in the Louvre (BR 344) and a private collection
relations. Viewed from this perspective such local images as the Near Eastern sun gods in their Roman armor form interesting documents of a complex discourse. Studying such images in terms of identity, power, and empire would be worthwhile but again - it is the *Leitmotiv* of this chapter - is beyond the scope of this study.

The same is true with most of the other images in this section: the Egyptian Souchos can be almost indistinguishable from the standard image type Sol, but for his crocodile (C5.10). In other cases a sun god is depicted on horseback (C5.20) or on a chariot drawn by eagles (C5.19). There are other examples as well of such iconographic variations which clearly differentiate the depicted figure from the standard image types [sol], but also quote or recall aspects of the Graeco-Roman Sol. But this was not invariably the case with local solar deities. Elagabal, for instance, was normally “depicted” aniconically, as a conical rock.

**Conclusions**

At the conclusion of our review of reliefs on which the image-type [sol] occurs as bust, standing figure, or charioteer, we have now discussed about half the catalogue of images. Most of the major patterns of occurrence of the image type [sol] have, however, already been identified. The remainder of the catalogue will therefore require significantly less discussion.

We can conclude from the preceding discussions that the image types [sol] could depict a deity, the sun, and articulated the nature of that deity in cosmic terms. This is hardly surprising, given the nature of the sun and the evidence for his cult. More interesting is perhaps the fact that there was clearly a continuity of cult for the sun in the city of Rome and throughout the Empire from at least the mid-Republic to the fourth century AD. Most noteworthy, however, is the fact that only a small minority of the images discussed depicted the sun god. The vast majority of images in the catalogue deploy an image type [sol] as visual sign. Sol can be alone or form a pair with Luna, but either way in these cases he is not part of the main image, but supplemental to it. This is apparent from his marginal position, reduced size, and formulaic iconography. In these cases the image-type [sol] does not depict the presence of Sol in the scene, but endows the scene with qualities denoted by the image-type [sol]. This goes beyond depicting Sol as a symbol or metaphor for some concept, although *symbol* is a broad term that is difficult to define. Insofar as letters and words are symbols, the marginal image types [sol] or [sol and luna] are symbols too, but they are more clearly understood in semiotic terms as indexical signs. They bring to the image a complex of visual meanings that, as far as we have been able to establish, center on cosmos, *aeternitas*, *romanness*, and liminality. This definition of the image types [sol] and in particular [sol-luna] is still preliminary, but nonetheless marks a worthwhile result.

As indexical sign, the image types [sol] and [sol-luna] were fairly widespread throughout the Empire and Rome itself. There is some evidence that Sol and Luna were incorporated in this role even on the tympanon of Capitoline temple of Jupiter. The earliest examples of the image

---

For a good, recent case study of “the dynamic way in which the people of the provinces negotiated their way through the new imperial context” in religious terms, cf. Revell 2007. Her focus is on two sites in Britain and the Roman province of Baetica respectively. More (and better) work has been done on religion and Empire in the Western provinces than in the East, but cf. Price 1984, Woolf 1994 or Lozano’s (2007) interesting study on the differences between the *Divi Augusti* of Rome and the *Theoi Sebastoi* of the Near East. Cf. Also Sweetman’s (2007) more general discussion of Roman Knossos. For the Western provinces, cf. Webster 2001, and Woolf 2001.
type [sol-luna] in such a role are on Republican coins of the late second century BC but one need but think of Helios and Selene in the corners of the East pediment of the Parthenon to recognize that the Sol-Luna imagery had much older roots. When the various strands of indexical meanings arose is difficult to say, but the _aeternitas_ associations were well-established by the first century BC.²⁶⁰

A third role for Sol in Roman art is as the protagonist of myth. This is rare, for Sol plays no role of importance in any myth except that of Phaethon. These rare depictions of the Sol of myth are interesting nonetheless for the iconographic conventions used, or rather ignored. In Phaethon scenes Sol is cleanshaven, but no attempt is made to incorporate any of the iconographic characteristics of the standard image types [sol]. He can be recognized as the father of Phaethon through his position and role(s) in the scene, but viewed in isolation would not be identifiable as Sol. This shows that Roman art clearly distinguished between the image types [sol] as god or indexical sign on the one hand, and the mythical figure Sol. It does not really matter why this differentiation arose, but once established the effect was to separate the traditional Sol of myth from the cosmic Sol of cult and the concepts associated with or derived from the latter. That such a differentiation should arise and be maintained sheds an interesting light on the various aspects of the sun in Roman culture.

### D. Mosaics and opus sectile

#### D1. Sol and Zodiac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pl.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Image Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 50.1 | Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmus. 31.184-185 Münster-Sarmsheim | 3rd c. AD | Polychrome tessellae  
Sol, radiate nimbus (9 rays), nude but for chlamys, whip in r. hand, in quadriga with four rearing horses (two to the left, two to the right), within a zodiac circle (some signs missing). |
| 50.2 | Hammat-Tiberias, Synagogue | 4th-5th c. AD | Polychrome tessellae  
Bust of Sol, draped, radiate crown, right hand raised, globe in l. hand, in frontal quadriga within zodiac circle set in a square with the busts of the four seasons in the four corners. |
| 50.3 | Astypalaia, Maltezana, Tallaras Baths | 4th-5th c. AD? | Polychrome tessellae  
Bust of Sol, draped, radiate crown, right hand raised, globe in left hand within a zodiac circle set in a square with the busts of the four seasons in the four corners. |
| 50.4 | Husaijah (Ussfiyeh), Synagogue | 5th c. AD | Polychrome tessellae  
Synagogue floor, very poorly preserved, with two panels. The main (eastern) panel preserves traces of a zodiac circle, possibly around a depiction of Sol in frontal quadriga. |

²⁶⁰ See chpt. 7.
-5. Pl. 51.1-2
Sepphoris, synagogue
_in situ_
Polychrome tessellae
Early 5\textsuperscript{th} c. AD
Elaborate synagogue floor. Main panel: zodiac circle around a frontal chariot bearing a radiate disc (8 rays); crescent moon and star in field. In the corners the four seasons (busts), Weiss & Netzer 1996 (esp. 26-29); Weiss 2005, 55-161, 225-262.

-6. Pl. 50.3
Beth Alpha, Synagogue
_in situ_
Polychrome tessellae
6\textsuperscript{th} c. AD
Synagogue floor with three panels. Central panel depicts Sol, radiate (6 rays) in frontal quadriga (stars and crescent in field) within zodiac circle; busts of the seasons in the four corners.
LIMC Helios/Sol 292; Gundel 1992, 234-6 nr. 87

-7. Na’aran (Ain Douq), Synagogue
_in situ_
Polychrome tessellae
c. 6\textsuperscript{th} c. AD
Synagogue floor, poorly preserved (images apparently wilfully destroyed). The main preserves traces of 9 of the 12 zodiac signs in a circle around a depiction of Sol, radiate (about 11 rays) in frontal quadriga. In the four corners: busts of the seasons.
LIMC Helios/Sol 292; Gundel 1992, 236 nr. 88.

_D1b. Sol and Luna, Zodiac_

-1. Pl. 52.1
Sparta
_in situ_
Polychrome tessellae
Shortly after AD 325
Frontal busts of Luna (upturned crescent behind her shoulders) and Sol not (radiate) within zodiac circle; the four Winds in the corners.
Gundel 1992, 234 nr. 85; Panayotopoulou, 1998, 117 fig. 10.2; LIMC Helios 290.

-2. Beisan (Beth-Shan), Monastery, Church of Maria
_in situ_
Polychrome tessellae
Late 6\textsuperscript{th} c. AD
Frontal busts of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chiton and chlamys, torch, and Luna (upturned crescent on head and torch), within a circle of full-figure personifications of the 12 months.
LIMC Helios/Sol 401

_D2. Planetary deities_

-1. Pl. 52.2
Itálica, Casa del Planetario, _oecus._
in situ
Polychrome tessellae
2\textsuperscript{nd} half 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD
Planetary deities. The bust of Sol is radiate, 13 rays.
Matern 2002, 266 B154; Durán 1993, 73-5, 337 nr. 13 pl. 18.

-2. Itálica, private collection
Itálica
Polychrome tessellae
2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD
Four panels of a mosaic depicting busts of the planetary deities. Fully preserved are Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, whip, and Luna; Saturn (falx) is partially preserved as is a fourth bust, probably female and therefore Venus.
Blanco Freijero 1978b, 36-7 nr. 12; Matern 2002, 174 n. 957, 266 B155

-3. Pl. 52.3
Tunis, Bardo Mus. A 10
Bir Chana, _villa_, _oecus_.
Polychrome tessellae
2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD
In the centre, geometrical group of seven hexagonal panels with the planetary deities (Saturn in centre), around which various panels with with animals and the twelve signs of the zodiac are grouped. The mosaic as a whole is also hexagonal.
LIMC Helios/Sol 273; Gundel 1992, 144 fig. 62; 266 nr. 210; Matern 2002, 174 n. 957, 266 B158.
Boscéaz (Orbe, Switzerland), Roman villa.

In situ

Polychrome tessellae
AD 200-225

Octagonal panel with Sol, radiate (11 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in r. hand, reins in raised left hand, in quadriga r. The other octagons contain the planetary deities, of whom Venus occupies the central octagon in the room, as well as Narcissus, Ganymede, and groups of Nereids and Tritons
LIMC Helios/Sol 272; Dunbabin 1999, 79 fig. 82, pl. 11; Matern 2002, 66, 217 Q61.

Lost

Sainte-Colombe, Isère, Roman villa.

Polychrome Tessellae
Undated

Celestial globe surrounded by the seven planetary deities, only two of whom survived when the mosaic was uncovered. They are full-figure and difficult to identify from the drawings, but one may be Sol.
F. Artaud, Histoire de la Peinture en Mosaïque, 1835, p. 79, pl. XXII (non vidi); Blanchet & Lafaye 1909, 46 nr. 203; Blanchet 1913, 111; Duval 1953, 290; Lancha 1977, 179-182 pls 98-9.

D3. Sol and Seasons

-1. Pl. 53.1
Silin (near Leptis Magna), Roman villa
In situ

Polychrome tessellae
3rd - 4th c. AD?

Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip over shoulder in right hand, reins in left hand emerging in the sky with his quadriga r., preceded by a winged Lucifer (?) with a double aulos, above the main scene (Horae with Aion).
LIMC Helios/Sol 199; Gundel 1992, 302 nr. 351.

-2. El Jem, Mus.
El Jem/Thysdrus, House of Silenus
Polychrome tessellae
Late 3rd - early 4th c. AD.

Busts of Sol (nimbate, chlamys), Luna, and seasons around central panel with bearded Aion.
LIMC Helios/Sol 400; LIMC Aion 4.

D4. Phaethon-myth

-1. Pl. 53.2
Sens, Mus.
Sens
Polychrome tessellae
2nd c. AD

Mosaic, partially damaged, depicting the myth of Phaethon; Sol, nude, on horseback, whip in r. hand, tames the runaway horses of his quadriga. In the corners the four seasons.

-2. El Jem, Mus.
Bararus/Henchir Rougga
Polychrome tessellae
Late 2nd-early 3rd c. AD

Fall of Phaethon and other scenes of Phaethon myth, including Sol on throne.
LIMC Phaethon 1, 2bis

D5. Other mosaics with Sol

-1. Mérida, Casa del Mitreo
In situ

Polychrome tessellae
Mid 2nd c. AD

Large cosmological mosaic, partially destroyed, with a range of mainly cosmic personifications. Fairly high to the left: Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays), long chiton and chlamys, whip in right hand, on quadriga r., identified by inscription as OIRES. His counterpart Luna is depicted on the right side in her biga/
LIMC Helios/Sol 341; Quet 1981.

-2. Private Collection
Environ of Urfa
Polychrome tessellae
Late 2nd c. AD

Three fragments of a mosaic. Upper right hand corner: Sol, radiate nimbus (12 rays), chlamys. Damaged
LIMC Helios/Sol 451; Matern 2002, 174 n. 957, 266 B153

-3. Pl. 53.3-6, 54.1
Vatican Necropolis, Mausoleum M
In situ

Polychrome tessellae
1st half 3rd c. AD

In ceiling, Sol in frontal quadriga, all four
horses rearing to the left? (the two left-hand horses destroyed by a hole in the ceiling), radiate (7 rays), dressed in chlamys and chiton, right hand raised, globe in left hand. Not Christus-Helios, as generally assumed: cf. Hijmans 1997. For Christus/Helios, e.g. Huskinson 1974, 78-80; Perler 1953; Toynbee & Ward-Perkins 1956. See chapter eight.

-4. Pl. 54.2
Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom.258548
Rome, Mithraeum of S. Prisca, niche behind the Tauroctony scene. The background of the niche was painted blue and green, suggesting the sky.
Opus sectile, polychrome marbles.
Ca. AD 200-250
Head of Sol, tilted, three-quarters frontal, slightly opened lips (? Lips lost, but the surviving space suggests this), upward gaze, grooved, “pathos-filled” forehead, long curly hair.
La Regina 1998, 254-5 (with refs.).
A typical Sol of the Alexander-type, identifiable as Sol only because of the context.

-5. Pl. 54.3
Palermo, Mus. 2286
Palermo, Piazza della Vittoria, House A, room 2
polychrome tessellae
3rd c AD
Large mosaic with numerous scenes; frontal bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays).
Boeselager 1983, 175-183, fig. 123

-6. Pl. 55.1
Sparta, Mus. 11583
Sparta, from a building of unknown function.
polychrome tessellae
After AD 267
Bust of Sol, radiate, 12 rays.
Other panels of this large mosaic floor depicted Hemera (day), Nyx (night), hunting scenes, poets, and in the central panel the Muses.

-7. Tunis, Bardo Mus. A 109 ter
Uthina, provenance not further specified.
polychrome tessellae
3rd c AD
Bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (7 rays), chlamys.

-8. Pl. 54.4
Paphos, House of Aion
In situ
polychrome stone tessellae
mid 4th c AD
Mosaic floor with five panels. In the large, central panel, Victory of Kassiopeia over Nereids; in this scene, next to Aion, bust of Sol (partially destroyed) with nimbus (no rays?), chlamys, whip in left hand, right hand stretched downward to the left shoulder of Victory (winged, nimbate, palm branch in left hand, raising a wreath above Kassiopeia with her right hand). By the bust of Sol: HAI[...]. Daszewski (1985, 42-3) suggests that Luna may also have been depicted but has been completely destroyed.
Daszewski 1985 40-3.
D. Mosaics and Opus Sectile
The number of mosaics on which Sol is depicted is not large. The themes are primarily cosmological: Sol - alone or with Luna - and the zodiac (D1a.1-7, D1b.1-2), Sol and the planetary deities (D2.1-5), Sol and the seasons (D3.1-2), and other cosmological scenes such as the famous mosaic in Mérida (D5.1). A small number of mosaics depict myths (D4.1-2, D5.8), and the others simply the bust of Sol (D5.2, 4-7), with the exception of the so-called Christ-Helios of mausoleum M in the Vatican necropolis (D5.3), which I will discuss in detail in chapter eight. Most of these mosaics do not add anything new to themes already discussed above. The group of mosaics with zodiac rings is remarkable, however, and requires further discussion.

Sol in the Synagogue
In the late Roman and early Byzantine period a number of synagogues in Palestine were decorated with lavish mosaic floors in the main hall or nave of the synagogue, consisting of various panels of which the most prominent one contains a depiction of the image type [sol] in his frontal chariot, within a zodiac circle and the seasons in the four corners. Iconographically these central panels show little variation, but stylistically they differ immensely, with the classicizing mosaic of Hammath Tiberias on one end of the spectrum, and the naive style of the mosaics of Beth Alpha at the other end. In all cases there can be no doubt that these mosaics served as the floor of a synagogue; the contexts are unambiguous and the mosaics themselves have panels above and below the central one in which old testament scenes or Jewish religious objects such as the menorah and ark are depicted, as well as Hebrew inscriptions.

The following synagogues have mosaics of this type:
1. Hammath Tiberias. The synagogue at the ancient site near this thermal spa was discovered accidentally in 1947 and fully excavated in 1961-1963. The excavator, M. Dothan, recognized four main levels of occupation (with level I the most recent and level IV the oldest). The synagogue floor with Sol and the zodiac belongs to level IIA. This level represents the refurbishment of the synagogue of level IIB, which according to Dothan took place in the first quarter of the fourth century AD. He believes that the synagogue was destroyed about a century later by an earthquake in AD 419. Dothan’s chronology of the site has recently been challenged by Magness. She argues for a later date and proposes that the synagogue floor of stratum IIA with its mosaic of Sol and the zodiac was laid down just before AD 400 and remained in use until at least the third quarter of the fifth century AD. While this redating is certainly possible, it pushes the synagogue up to the latest possible date. In two dedicatory inscriptions incorporated in the mosaic, the dedicant Severus describes himself as the pupil (threptos) of the “most illustrious” Patriarchs. The Greek lamprotatos corresponds to the Latin clarissimus and is an adjective that indicates that the Patriarchs were of senatorial rank. Patriarchs were still viri

---

270 A map with the locations of these synagogues can be found in Magness 2005, 3 fig. 1.
271 Dothan 1983.
273 Dothan 1983, 55, 60.
clarissimi in AD 392, but had been downgraded to viri illustres by AD 397, with further downgrades following rapidly until the last Patriarch, Gamaliel VI, was executed in AD 425. While a disciple of the Patriarchs could of course still honour them with the title lamprotatos after it was officially removed, and conceivably even after the death of Gamaliel VI, this is not likely. The title was imperial, not Jewish, and to continue using it for the Patriarch after he had been officially downgraded would in effect be a dangerous rejection of imperial authority. Given that all the archaeological evidence is compatible with a date even many decades before the 390s, the terminus ante quem provided by the inscriptions is reasonable.

The image of Sol at Hammath Tiberias, though damaged by a wall that was later built over it, is easily recognizable and adheres in every respect to the long established standard image type. Sol has a radiate nimbus (7 rays), is dressed in a blue sleeved chiton and red chlamys, has raised his right hand in his characteristic gesture and holds a blue globe in his left hand. He is driving his quadriga, but the horses have been destroyed by the later wall running across the mosaic.274

2. Hussaifah. The synagogue lies below modern buildings and could only be partially excavated in 1930 by Avi-Yonah. Extensive mosaics covered the floor of the complex, but all were heavily damaged by the later building activities. The eastern panel of the central nave of the synagogue consisted of a zodiac circle, only part of which survives, around a central figure who is lost, but widely accepted to have been Sol. There is no direct evidence for the date of the synagogue, but it appears to be later than the one at Hammath Tiberias, giving it a fifth or perhaps even early sixth century date. It appears to have been destroyed around the middle of the sixth century AD.275

3. Sepphoris.276 This is the most recently excavated and, from the perspective of this study, most interesting synagogue in this group. The synagogue lies in the northern part of Sepphoris and was excavated in the early 1990s. It was built in the first half of the fifth century AD and destroyed in the early seventh century AD. The synagogue is 20.70 m. long and 8 m. wide and consists of a nave with only a single aisle along the North side. The entire synagogue is adorned with an elaborate mosaic floor with biblical scenes, Jewish symbols, and in a prominent, central position a panel with the circle of the zodiac, the four seasons in the corners, and within the zodiac the sun in a quadriga. In this case the sun is not depicted in the standard image type [sol], as in Hammath Tiberias, but as a long pole surmounted by a disc with eight broad rays. Next to the disc are a star and the lunar crescent.

4. Beth Alpha.277 The synagogue at Beth Alpha was excavated in 1929 by E. Sukenik. The complex as a whole is 20 m x 14 m, and the prayer hall 10 m. x 8 m. The mosaic floor of the synagogue has an inscription that dates it to the reign of Justin, generally assumed to be Justin 1

274 Dothan 1968.

275 Avi Yonah & Makhoul 1933.


277 Sukenik 1932.
It consists of three main panels, two smaller ones with a biblical scene (the Sacrifice of Isaac) and Jewish symbols respectively, and a larger one in the centre with a zodiac, the four seasons, and Sol on a frontal quadriga.

5. **Na’aran.** The synagogue at Na’aran was discovered towards the end of the first World War, and excavated in the early 1920s. Its prayer hall was almost 15 m. wide and well over 20 m. long (the exact length could not be established). The mosaic floor of the prayer hall, deliberately vandalized by iconoclasts, consisted of four panels. Upon entering one first came across a panel decorated with a geometric pattern of polygons and circles once containing depictions of animals, later destroyed. The next panel is slightly smaller, and depicts the zodiac ring, the four seasons, and Sol in his chariot, radiate and wearing a star-studded chlamys; and again all figurative images have been destroyed. The other two panels contain a biblical scene (Daniel in the lions’ den) and Jewish symbols respectively. The floor cannot be dated with precision, but belongs to the sixth century.

6. **Khirbet Susiya.** The prayer hall of this synagogue measured 15 m. x 9 m. It was built in the fifth century and survived until the eighth or even ninth century, during which time it was repeatedly refurbished. In its present state, the floor belongs to a late stage of the monument and only slight traces remain of what may have been a zodiac circle in an earlier phase of the floor.

7. **Yaphia.** This synagogue, like the one in Hussaifah, is beneath modern building and only a small part could be excavated when it was explored in 1951. The prayer hall was about 15 m. wide and almost 20 m. long. Its mosaic floor was heavily damaged but traces of twelve circles around a large central circle suggest we may be dealing with a variant of the zodiac circle here. Only one recognizable figure in one of the smaller circles survives and may be the sign of Taurus. The fragment of an inscription next to an adjacent circle cannot be reconciled with this interpretation, an suggest the twelve Tribes of Israel may have been depicted.

Not surprisingly, these synagogue mosaics have given rise to considerable discussion and controversy. The presence of figural art in late antique synagogues was itself unexpected, and largely unknown until the discovery of Na’aran, because it was deemed contrary to Rabbinic law. The presence of an apparently pagan image of the sun god within a zodiac circle was even more problematic. It is not my aim to review the various explanations proposed for the iconography of these floors. Much like the Visigothic relief from Spain, discussed above (C4.28), these mosaics are somewhat beyond our chronological limits, and the Jewish context also introduces a

---

278 Justin II seems an unlikely candidate because Jews and other non-Christians were under considerable pressure during his reign. Also, there may already have been a rise in Jewish iconoclasm as early as the second half of the 6th century AD.

279 Prigent (1990, 32-5) dates Jewish iconoclasm as early as the latter part of the 6th century AD. Fine (2005, 84-5) places it significantly later, in the 8th or 9th century AD, linking it to the influence of Islam.


wholly different set of iconographic, religious, and cultural elements. I do not, therefore, intend to reflect on the meaning of the image type \([ \text{sol} ]\) in this particular context, but propose to focus instead on what the occurrence of the image type in this context tells us about Roman art.

Sol in a frontal chariot within a zodiac circle has at least one mosaic parallel outside the region and, presumably, culture of these floor mosaics. In 1895, a mosaic was discovered in the reception hall of a Roman villa in Münster-Sarmsheim dating to the third century AD. One large panel of this mosaic depicted Sol in a frontal quadriga within a zodiac circle. The only substantial difference between this mosaic and the ones in the synagogues listed above is that it does not have seasons in the four corners, but vases flanked by fish. Other mosaics show the bust of Sol alone or Sol and Luna together within a zodiac circle (D1a.3, D1b.1-2). Sol and the zodiac form a logical combination, and occur together in the Roman world together as early as the second century BC (F1a.13; H9b.1-2). Though not especially common, the image of Sol within a zodiac circle remained an established image type throughout the late Republic and Imperial period.

When the first synagogue floor with zodiac circle, image type \([ \text{sol} ]\) and the four seasons was designed, presumably some time in the fourth century, there was nothing to differentiate that particular section or panel of the mosaic from mainstream Roman imperial art. What was adopted into the floor design was an astrological composition composed of a series of standard Roman image types. That the designers were aware of this cannot be doubted. Severus, who donated the oldest surviving mosaic floor, in the Hammath Tiberias synagogue, was closely associated with the Patriarchs which puts him in touch with the imperial elite, for the Patriarch was of senatorial rank and very close to the top of the imperial hierarchy in the region. To function successfully at this level, a thorough education in Graeco-Roman culture was a \textit{conditio sine qua non}. To be senatorial, one had to be well versed in senatorial culture.

The zodiac design of these floors, then, was not a Jewish invention, nor was it introduced into the synagogue by people who were not fully aware of its range of meanings within Roman imperial art. The question, as most scholars have framed it, is simple: “Why did some Palestinian Jewish congregations place the figure of the Graeco-Roman sun god in a central position in their synagogues?” Our review of the image type \([ \text{sol} ]\) so far suggests that stated in these terms the

282 C1f.7; C4.11; E3.4; G1e.3; H1fa.1; H1ha.1; H3aa.1; H4da.1; H6ch.1; H6h.1 (doubtful); H9b.1-2; HA9b.1; K1.14; K9.0, 12, 15, 24. Sol and the zodiac could also appear on coins, particularly of local civic mints. The following represent only a random selection: in the zodiac series issued in AD 145 in Alexandria, we find Sol with Leo (e.g. Geissen 1495, 1497, 1498; Dattari 2966), a circle of the zodiac and a circle of planetary deities around the bust of Saturn (note the order of the planetary deities! Geissen 1491, Dattari 2982), a zodiac circle around the jugate busts of Sol and Luna (Dattari 2984, cf. Journal of the Society of Ancient Numismatics 4 (1972-3), 46-7 for a related type). See also a bronze from Nicaea minted under M. Aurelius (AD 161-180) of Sol in his rising quadriga within part of a zodiac circle (Waddington et al. 138, pl. 70.5); a bronze medallion minted in Perinthus under Severus Alexander (AD 222-235) with on the reverse Zeus, enthroned, with Sol and Luna in a quadriga above, Tellus and Oceanus reclining below, all within a zodiac circle (BMC Thrace 157 nr 58); a bronze from Eirenopolis in Cilicia minted under Gordian III in 243 with facing busts of Sol and Luna within a zodiac circle (SNG Levante Suppl. 390).

283 The Hammath Tiberias synagogue gives us a \textit{terminus ante quem} of circa AD 395.

284 Magness 2005, 7.
question itself is at least in part the source of the “problem”. The anthropomorph image of sol is taken to mean that the sun god is depicted, but on the evidence discussed so far in this chapter it is quite clear that this is a misreading of the image. It is true that the genesis of the anthropomorph depiction of the sun was related to the ancient Greek concept of anthropomorph gods, but that takes us back more than a millennium. In Roman art, as we have seen, the image type [sol], though still anthropomorph, had long since evolved into a visual sign in the semiotic sense, not just for the sun in all its aspects, but for concepts at best indexically related to the sun. As such, this image type was the prime way to depict the sun irrespective of whether he was to be viewed as divine, cosmic, symbolic, or metaphorical. In fact, the anthropomorph image was the only image type for the sun available to Roman art.

In other words, from the perspective of Roman visual practice as it has emerged so far from our review of the image types [sol], there is nothing inherently surprising in finding that image type in a synagogue. The sun was not a matter of (pagan) belief. Nobody denied its or his existence. If, for whatever reason, one wanted to depict the sun, this was the way to do it. This does not mean that the roots of the image types [sol] in pagan religious anthropomorphism had been forgotten, but they had become (almost) irrelevant. The clearest evidence for this comes, paradoxically, from the mosaic in Sepphoris. That the figure of Sol was here replaced by a rayed disc on a pole is a unique and unprecedented change in iconography that indicates that the Jewish designers of such floors were not completely unconcerned by the pagan religious connotations of the anthropomorphism of the image type. But the disc and pole are still depicted as “charioteer” of a quadriga of horses. This shows two things: that the charioteer on the synagogue mosaics definitely was not intended to depict the Graeco-Roman sun god, for in that case the Sepphoris innovation would be inexplicable, and, secondly, that the iconographic prescripts which governed art in the Roman world were so widely known, so deeply rooted, and so immutable that even the late antique and early Byzantine Jewish mosaicists in these synagogues felt bound by them. It is remarkable that the mosaicists in Sepphoris retained the chariot and thus the link to the Graeco-Roman iconography of the image type [sol]. There is no “logical” link between the radiant orb of the sun in their mosaic and a chariot with horses, so that one had to be awkwardly created by placing the disc on a pole. This awkwardness may explain why the attempt at Sepphoris to divest the image of its lingering pagan religious roots was not copied elsewhere, but it does not explain why it was not attempted along different lines elsewhere. We can only conclude that the issue was not urgent.

The presence of the image type [sol] in these synagogues thus provides strong support for our contention that in Roman art such image types were signs in the semiotic sense. As we continue with our review of the images in this catalogue, it is becoming increasingly clear that the image type [sol] generally does not depict the sun god of Graeco-Roman myth, but the sun itself (i.e. the planet) as well as concepts and notions derived from or loosely associated with it. These meanings were socially agreed, and most were not a matter of religion. They were a matter of (scientific) knowledge and as such had no specifically pagan connotations. This does not mean that the images are intrinsically a-religious. Context plays a role. In the case of the synagogue.

285 The earliest surviving anthropomorph image of the Greek god Helios is possibly on an amphora from Thera dating to 670/60 BC (LIMC Helios 1), but it does not become common until the late archaic period.
mosaics, the zodiac circle and the busts of the seasons leave the viewer in no doubt as to the cosmic context of these particular Sol images. But that does not mean that one could place a statuette of Sol in a synagogue and achieve the same effect.

But from our perspective these mosaics are perhaps most important for the evidence they provide for the strength, durability and sheer geographic range of Roman image types such as [sol]. That Jewish mosaicists in Late Antiquity introduced the Graeco-Roman image type [sol] into their synagogues in Palestine is a remarkable testimony to the pervasive influence of Roman iconographic principles.

**E. Wall-paintings and stucco decoration**

**E1. Sol alone**

**E1a. Sol, standing full-figure**

-1. Pl. 55.2
Naples, Mus. Naz. 9819
Pompeii VI 7,20, atrium fresco
Ca. AD 69-79
Sol standing, radiate nimbus (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in his lowered right hand, large globe in his left hand. Fourth style.
The atrium also contained paintings of the seasons: PPM IV, 451
The inv. nr. 8819, found in many publications, is incorrect.

-2. Pompeii IX 7,19 - ala
Lost fresco
Fourth style
Described as tondo with bust of Sol with blue radiate nimbus, whip, and chlamys. Flanks a central panel (fish and shells) with a second tondo in which bust of Diana (2 javelins, foliate wreath).
LIMC Helios/Sol 302;

-3. Destroyed
Tivoli, Villa Adriana, Latin library fresco
2nd quarter 2nd c. AD
Bust of Helios, radiate (12 rays), chlamys. Matern 2002, 266 B152 (with ref.).

**E1b. bust/head of Sol**

-1. Delos, House 16
In situ Fresco
Ca. AD 69-79
Sol standing, radiate nimbus (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, whip in his lowered right hand, large globe in his left hand.
Gundel 1992, 294 nr. 310; Matern 2002, 90, 226 G9 (with refs)

-2. Destroyed in the early 18th c.
Rome, Vigna Moroni (one of 92 mausolea along the urban section of the Via Appia explored by Ficoroni between 1705 and 1710).
Fresco
2nd-3rd c. AD.
In the vault, Sol in a quadriga.
Ficoroni 1732, 35-9; Cumont 1923, 65-80.

**E2. Sol and Luna**

   Rome, Villa Farnesina
   Fresco
   Ca. 20 BC
   Sol and Luna depicted as statues on bases.
   Sol, frontal, moving r., is nimbate and wears a tunica, boots or high-laced sandals. He holds a whip in his r. hand and a sceptre in his l. hand (both difficult to make out).
   LIMC Helios/Sol 302; MusNazRom II, 1, 284-5 pl. 171.
   The iconography of this figure is not canonical for Sol at all, and his identity is therefore not certain. There can be no doubt, however, that his counterpart is Luna.

2. Pompeii IX 7,20
   destroyed fresco
   Mid 1st c. AD
   Two Lares flank Fortuna with cornucopia next to a burning altar. Two garlands above, and above the garlands the frontal busts of Luna (left) and Sol, radiate, whip.
   PPM IX p. 825-6; Trendelenburg 1871, 199-200; Matern 2002, 265 B149.

**E3. Sol and some or all planetary deities**

1. Pl. 54.5, 55.3
   Naples, Mus. Naz. 9519
   Pompeii, VI 17, Ins. Occ.
   Fresco
   Mid 1st c. AD
   Tondi with busts of the 7 planetary deities; Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys, whip. Found in April 1760 in a "yellow room" together with tondi with personifications of months, seasons, etc.
   Long 1992; LIMC Helios/Sol 270; Matern 2002, 168 n. 934, 265 B150;

2. Pl. 55.4
   Pompeii VII 4,48, Casa della caccia antica, cubiculum 14.
   In situ fresco
   AD 71-79 (Impressions of Vespasianic coins in the stucco give a terminus post quem of AD 71).
   On N.-wall, from right to left: tondo with bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays), chlamys, whip; panel with Venus, fishing; tondo with bust of Mercury. On W.-wall (now in Naples, inv. 9549) panel: Danae & golden rain. On S. wall (from right to left): tondo with bust of Luna; panel with Leda and the swan; tondo (only partially preserved) with bust of bearded male with staff (Saturn? But a staff is not a normal attribute for Saturn). Fourth style.
   Matern 2002, 168 n. 934, 266 B151; Allison & Sear 2002, 35-38, figs. 168, 176
   Note: the N. and S. walls have representations of Sol, Mercurius, Luna, and Saturn (?) in tondo, and Venus and Jupiter (Leda's swan) in panel - ergo: six of the seven planetary deities. Only Mars is missing. The 7th panel (W.-wall), depicting Danae, also refers to Jupiter.

3. Pl. 31.3
   Pompeii IX 7,1 - Officina Quactiliaria
   In situ fresco
   1st half 1st c. AD
   Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), along with busts of Luna, Mercurius, and Jupiter. There is no space for additional busts.
   PPM IX, 768-773.

4. Tivoli, Villa Adriana
   in situ or destroyed Stucco
   1st half 2nd c. AD
   stucco ceiling decoration
   Sol in quadriga in a central circle around which are grouped the planetary deities and the signs of the zodiac.

**E4. Sol in mythological scenes**

**E4a. Daedalus and Icarus**

1. Pompeii I 7,7 triclinium (b), East wall
   In situ Fresco
   Third style
Fall of Icarus. Sol in upper left-hand corner in quadriga to the right, long chiton (?) and chlamys. By the Boscotrecase painter. Very faded.
Von Blanckenhagen 1968, 110 nr. 5; LIMC Helios/Sol 182; PPM 1, 594-5 figs. 10-11; Matern 2002, 187-8, 281 K23.

-2. Pompeii I 10,7 oecus (9), West wall
In situ
Fresco
Suggested dates range from Claudian to Vespasianic
Fall of Icarus. Sol in upper left-hand corner. Very faded (February 1993)
Von Blanckenhagen 1968, 110, nr. 7; PPM II 420, fig. 29; Matern 2002, 187-8, 281 K 24.

-3. Lost
Pompeii V 2,10
Fresco
Early 1st c. AD (3rd style)
Fall of Icarus. Above: Sol, radiate, in radiate quadriga.

-4. Pompeii V 5,3
In situ
Fresco
Early 1st c. AD (third style).
Fall of Icarus. Sol in upper left-hand corner. By the Boscotrecase painter. Very faded.
Von Blanckenhagen 1968, 112-3 nr. 9; PPM III 1072, fig. 6; Matern 2002, 187-8, 281 K26.

E4b. Phaethon
-1. Rome, Mus. Naz. 1069
Rome, Villa Farnesina
Stucco
28 BC (Moormann)
Panel depicting Sol on throne (l.) facing Phaethon and old pedagogue.
LIMC Helios/Sol 172; LIMC Apollon/Apollo 418; LIMC Phaethon 1, 23; Matern 2002, 186, 279-80 K14; Moormann 2008.

E5. Mithras
-1. Capua, Mithraeum
In situ
Fresco
Mid 2nd c. AD (Clauss 1992, 51)
Tauroctony; Sol, radiate (11 rays), chlamys, whip, and Luna in chariots in the upper corners.
LIMC Helios/Sol 340 (with ref.)

-2. Rome, Mithraeum Barberini
in situ
Fresco
2nd-3rd c. AD (Merkelbach); 2nd c AD (Gundel)
Tauroctony; Sol, radiate, in upper left-hand corner above zodiac; to either side various Mithraic scenes; on the right, scenes with Sol/Heliodromus: banquet, Mithras and Sol on quadriga, Mithras and Sol to either side of burning altar, crowning of Sol.
LIMC Helios/Sol 242, 245a, 253a, 271a, 340a; Gundel 1992, 262 nr. 194.

-3. Rome, Mithraeum of S. Prisca
in situ
Fresco
Ca. AD 200
Sol and Mithras at banquet. Sol has long blond curly hair, a radiate nimbus (probably more than seven rays), wears a chiton (?) and chlamys, holds a globe in his left hand, and has raised his right hand. Mithras is nimbate, without rays.
LIMC Helios/Sol 248.

Dura Europos, Mus.
3rd c. AD
Two tauroctonies, both with Sol (in the larger one, only his rays are preserved); various Mithraic scenes, including the crowning of Sol by Mithras, and Mithras and Sol dining.
LIMC Helios/Sol 243; Merkelbach 1984, 274-5 fig. 15; CIMRM I, 34-42.

-5. Lost
Rome
fresco
Undated
Tauroctony; Sol and Luna. The iconography
of Mithras, if correctly rendered, is exceptional as he does not wear a pileus (Turcan 2001, n. 37).
LIMC Helios/Sol 340; CIMRM I, 337 fig. 94.

-6. Marino, Mithraeum
   In situ
   fresco
   2nd-3rd c. AD
   Tauroctony. In the upper left-hand corner, bust of Sol with a radiate nimbus, one ray extending to Mithras. In the upper right-hand corner bust of Luna, nimbate. Below Sol and Luna are two rows of four minor scenes in black frames. Vermaseren 1982.

E6. Sol in biblical scenes
-1. Pl. 56.1-2
   Rome, Catacomb of Via Latina, cubiculum B, right-hand arcosolium.
   in situ
   Fresco
   1st half 4th c. AD
   Joseph's dream: below, two figures each lying on a bed; four trees (?) and some greenery by the left-hand bed, nine yellow sheaves of corn (three upright and six lying) above the right-hand bed; in the upper left-hand corner busts of Sol, frontal, radiate, and Luna (also frontal, crescent). Ferrua 1991, 78, fig. 51.

E7. Various scenes with Sol
-1. Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica
   Via Appia
   Stucco relief
   1st c. BC
   Fragment of a tondo with various combat-scenes grouped around a central clipeus with a frontal head of Sol, radiate (about 30 rays). LIMC Helios/Sol 6 (with refs.); Matern 2002, 252 B55; Richter 1958, 374-5, pls. 94.34, 95.35-7.

-2. Pompeii IX 5.2 - House of Achilles
   in situ (very faded, February 1993)
   Fourth style
   Upper part of a panel; Sol, radiate (6? rays) standing next to another standing figure. The rest of the panel is lost.

Schefold, WP 252; PPM

E8. Not or probably not Sol
-1. Naples, Mus. Naz. sala 88 (no inv, nr.)
   Pompeii V 4.13
   1st c. AD
   Scene depicting origin-myth of Rome. Above: Mars descending from the sky towards Rhea Silvia. Below: she-wolf, Romulus and Remus, observed by Mercurius and a woman, as well as other scenes connected with the story. In upper left-hand corner Luna in biga (often misidentified as Sol). LIMC Helios/Sol 162 (refers to Luna as Sol, in quadriga rather than biga); LIMC Ares/Mars 391 (with refs.); Matern 2002, 189, 284 K41 (professes uncertainty as to whether Sol or Luna is depicted).

-2. Lost
   Rome, Theatre of Pompey
   Sail-cloth, painted
   AD 66
   Velarium, used in the theatre at the occasion of Tiridates' visit to Rome. Nero driving a chariot and surrounded by golden stars. Cass. Dio 63, 6. 2; LIMC Helios/Sol 426 (with refs.); Bergmann 1998, 181.
   Often interpreted as Nero depicted as Sol and driving a quadriga among the stars, but the brief mention in Cassius Dio lacks detail (e.g. number of horses, dress of Nero, whether he is radiate) so that the interpretation lacks evidence.

   Pompeii IX 6.4-5 room d
   Fresco
   Early 1st c. AD (3rd style)
   Fall of Icarus. Sol not depicted. Von Blanckenhagen 1968, 109 nr. 3. LIMC Helios/Sol 183 (following Schefold 1957, 72q) confuses this painting with E4a.3.

-4. Lost
   Rome, Domus Aurea, Room 33
   Fresco
   AD 64-68
   In the centre a male figure with radiate nimbus, nude but for cloak draped over left
shoulder and right leg, seated on a throne on a dais below a canopy. To either side four standing women (Horae?); before the dais stand a male figure, nude but for a chlamys (left) facing a woman dressed in a chiton (right).
This mythical scene, now lost, formed the centrepiece of the ceiling of decoration of room 30. It is known to us only through imperfect, 18th century copies. The suggestion that the central figure is Sol, and the youth before him is Phaethon, is rejected by Moormann (1998, 700). He proposes to identify the central figure as Dionysus, but if the scene is a Sternenstreit, he could be Apollo (cf. Hijmans 1994).

E. Wall-Paintings and Stucco Decorations
The images gathered in this section offer few surprises. One group of images is new, namely the Fall of Icarus (E4a.1-5), while the rest all follow patterns we have already encountered and discussed. In the Fall of Icarus the image type [sol] is not so much the sun god as simply the hot celestial body that melted the wax of Icarus’ wings when he came too close. There is no intrinsic reason why he should be depicted in anthropomorph guise rather than as a rayed disc, for instance. It is simply a matter of Roman iconographic practice.

Of the other images, the fresco of Sol (?) and Luna from the Farnesina deserves mention because of its date (28 BC) and iconography. Tunica, lance, boots and nimbus are all elements that are not in line with the iconography of the standard image type [sol], but the whip is closely associated with Sol and there can be no doubt that his counterpart is Luna. Bearing in mind that if this is Sol it is the oldest surviving example of Sol as standing figure without his chariot, I tend to think this may be an image that antedates the coalescing of clear iconographic norms for the depiction of the image type [sol] as standing figure.286

The fresco in the ala of Pompeii IX 7,19 (E1b.2) is a good example of how closely Sol and Apollo were identified in the first century AD. The radiate nimbus, whip, and chlamys clearly identify the male bust as Sol, but his counterpart is Diana the huntress with two javelins. Thus this image conflates the Apollo-Diana and Sol-Luna imagery visually, much as Horace does in his Carmen Saeculare (cf. chapter seven). Nearby in Pompeii we find the canonical Sol-Luna imagery (E2.2). In general, the iconography in Pompeii adheres to the iconographic norms set out in

286 The Colossus of Rhodes was presumably a standing figure, but we know nothing of its iconography. On certain Bactrian coins of the 2nd century BC the sun god is depicted as a standing figure, cf. Matern 2002, 86-7.
The groups of planetary deities are somewhat surprising. We have already mentioned the
tondi from the Insula Occidentalis. These follow the normal pattern for the planets as markers
of the days of the week. In the house of the Caccia Antica, however, only six planets are depicted
(E3.2), of which four as busts in tondi, while Venus and Jupiter are represented by more
elaborate panels. Mars appears to be absent. Venus and Jupiter are the two most beneficial
planets, which may explain why they receive more elaborate treatment, and Mars is the most
malefic, which may explain why he is omitted, but the order of the images is also not
“planetary” and a convincing interpretation of this cycle is difficult to give. Whether the four
busts at the Officina Quactiliaria represent Sol, Luna, Jupiter and Mercury as planets is not
certain (E3.3).

The depiction of Sol and Luna in the Via Latina catacombs (E6.1) in the scene of
Joseph’s dream (Gen. 37, 9) is appropriate. That the sun and the moon are depicted
anthropomorph along the established lines of Graeco-Roman iconography is not surprising. As in
the case of the synagogue floors discussed in the previous section, this image is evidence that the
image types [sol] were signs in the semiotic sense, not icons of the Graeco-Roman sun god.

The other images in this section do not need further discussion here as they cover themes
already discussed in previous sections.

F. Decorated plates and vessels.
F1. Terracotta
F1a. Calenian ware

1. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. 793
   Unknown, produced in Cales
   Terracotta
   2nd half 3rd - early 2nd c. BC
   Head of Sol within a medallion
   LIMC Helios/Sol 8
   For the date of Calenian ware, cf.
   Pagenstecher 1909, 165-6.

2. Pl. 56.3
   Heidelberg, Univ. R27
   Unknown, produced in Cales
   Terracotta
   2nd half 3rd c. BC - early 2nd c. BC
   Around the central omphalos identical scene
   repeated five times, of a head (of Sol?)
   framed by two horses' protomes, one
   jumping to the left, the other to the right.

3. Göttingen, Univ. Slg. 90
   Unknown, produced in Cales
   Terracotta
   2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
   Frontal head of Sol, radiate, above the
   protomes of two horses, one jumping to the
   left, the other to the right.

4. Karlsruhe, Kat. (Winnefeld) 705
   Unknown, produced in Cales
   Terracotta
   3rd-2nd c. BC
   Frontal head of Sol (?), radiate (?) framed by
   the protomes of two horses, one jumping

---

287 See in particular E1a.1-2.

288 E3.1.

289 “Then he dreamed another dream, and told it to his brothers, and said, “Behold, I have dreamed another
dream; and behold, the sun, the moon, and eleven stars were bowing down to me.””
left, the other right.
Pagenstecher 1909, 22 nr. 1b; Matern 2002, 55, 215 Q552

-5. Paris, Louvre 277
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Frontal head of Sol (?), radiate (?) framed by the protomes of two horses, one jumping left, the other right.
Pagenstecher 1909, 22 nr. 1c.

-6. Paris, Louvre (De Witte 1350)
Vulci
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Group, repeated 5 times around the omphalos, consisting of head of Sol between 2 horses' protomes and two heads of Dioscuri.
LIMC helios/Sol 266

Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Group, repeated 5 times around the omphalos, consisting of frontal head of Sol, radiate (6 rays) between 2 horses' protomes and two heads of Dioscuri.
LIMC Helios/Sol 131

-8. London, British Museum
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Bust of Sol, radiate, above the protomes of two horses, one jumping l., one r.
LIMC Helios/Sol 130; cf. Pagenstecher 1909, 22.

Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Group consisting of two heads of Dioscuri flanking bust of Sol between protomes of two horses, repeated six times around the omphalos of a patera.
LIMC Helios/Sol 266.

-10. Cracow, Mus. Czartoryski
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Group consisting inter alia of bust of Sol between protomes of two horses, repeated four times around the omphalos of a patera.
LIMC Helios/Sol 131.

-11. Pl. 56.4-5
British Museum GR 1928.1-17.71
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate, five rays, above the protomes of two horses, one to either side, repeated six times around the omphalos of a patera, and alternating with back to back busts of the Dioscuri wearing Persian caps.
Inscribed: LUCIUS CANOLEIOS L.F. FECIT CALENOS.
Pagenstecher 1909, 76 nr. 115, quoting a British catalogue of 1904.

-12. Unknown
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Frontal head of Sol, radiate, above the protomes of two horses, one jumping l., the other r.
Pagenstecher 1909, 22 nr. 1d

-13. Private Collection
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays), chlamys, within zodiac circle, on upturned crescent with two stars.

-14. Berlin
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Bust of Apollo-Sol, radiate (12 rays), chiton,
chlamys, lyre.
Pagenstecher 1909, 22 nr. 2a

-15. Göttingen, Univ. Slg. 87
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Bust of Apollo-Sol, radiate (12 rays), chiton, chlamys, lyre.
Pagenstecher 1909, 23 nr. 2b.

-16. London, BM IV G134
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Bust of Apollo-Sol, radiate (12 rays), chiton, chlamys, lyre.
Pagenstecher 1909, 23 nr. 2c

-17. St. Petersburg
Unknown, produced in Cales
Terracotta
2nd half 3rd c. - early 2nd c. BC
Bust of Apollo-Sol, radiate (12 rays), chiton, chlamys, lyre.
Pagenstecher 1909, 23 nr. 2d

F1b. Other wares

-1. Pl. 56.6
Boston, MFA 98.828
Unknown (produced in Italy)
Terracotta
Ca. 20 BC - AD 10
Mould for Aretine-ware bowl, depicting Phaethon-myth. Sol (?), nude, not radiate, on horseback catching the reins of the runaway horses.
LIMC Helios/Sol 181; Matern 2002, 186, 278 K3; Hartwig 1899.
On the identification of the horseback rider as Sol, cf. Hartwig 1899 (with an accurate drawing of the mould, pl. IV). Problematic is the presence of six horses: two making off to the right, their loose reins caught by the figure identified as Sol; one horse next to the one ridden by Sol; one horse jumping away to the left with the shafts of the carriage; and finally the hind legs of a horse going to the left, visible behind Sol’s horse (which is headed to the right); these legs must belong to a sixth horse because they are too far removed from the other horse heading left, but the missing sherd here has left a gap in the image that is too large to allow a clear reconstruction of this part of the image.
Given that Sol’s solar chariot was invariably a quadriga, the presence of two additional horses must be explained. Hartwig (1899, 487) suggests that Sol took along an extra horse (“Beipferd”). Another possibility is that not Sol but the Dioscuri were depicted, with the second Dioscure lost in the gap of the mould (although it is not immediately clear to me how we should then reconstruct the missing part. A third proposal, that the chariot was drawn by six horses and the rider is Phaethon in a desperate final attempt to corral the runaway horses before he is brought down, strikes me as very unlikely (cf. Hartwig 1899, 482-3).

-2. Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum 58289
Cologne
Terracotta
2nd c. AD
Kantharos decorated with Mithraic figures, including Sol, standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (5 rays), globe in l. hand, right hand above a burning altar; Sol stands between Cautes and Cautopates.
LIMC Helios/Sol 450 (with refs.)

-3. Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum 58270
Cologne
Terracotta
2nd c. AD
Kantharos decorated with Mithraic figures, including Sol, standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (5 rays), globe in l. hand, right hand above a burning altar; Sol stands between Cautes and Cautopates.
LIMC Helios/Sol 457 (with refs.)

-4. Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum 58273
Cologne
Terracotta
2nd c. AD
Kantharos decorated with Mithraic figures, including Sol, standing, nude but for a chlamys, radiate (5 rays), globe in l. hand, right hand above a burning altar; Sol stands
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between Cautes and Cautopates.
LIMC Helios/Sol 457 (with refs.)

-5. Pl. 56.7
Heidelberg, Arch. Inst. Inv. 64/1
Asia Minor
Terracotta
2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD?
Fragment of a bowl; frontal head of Sol, radiate between a bull (?) and a lion .
LIMC Helios/Sol 7; Matern 2002, 265
B145; LIMC Helios 155 (incorrect inv. nr.).

-6. Craiova, Muzeul Oltenei
Locusteni
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Vase-applique; Sol, nude, radiate (?), right hand raised, reins in left hand, on quadriga left.
LIMC Helios/Sol 151

-7. Trier, Rheinisches Landesmuseum 33.513
Trier?
Terracotta
3\textsuperscript{rd} c. AD
Vase with two large vertical handles, decorated on the shoulder with relief busts of the seven planetary deities.
LIMC Planetae 32

-8. Pl. 57.1-2
Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum 51199
Cologne, corner of Luxemburger and Hochstadenstrasse
Terracotta
4\textsuperscript{th} c. AD
Squat white-ground amphora; on shoulder incised frontal busts of Saturn, Sol, and Luna; Sol is radiate (8 rays) and holds a whip.
La Baume 1964, 83-4 fig. 67.

-9. Pl. 57.3
Trier, Rheinische Landesmuseum 05.228
Trier (necropolis of S. Mathias)
Terracotta (Terra Sigillata)
Undated
Sol and Mithras at banquet with 2 servants, lion, krater with snake, cock and raven.
LIMC Helios/Sol 253; CIMRM I, 988;

-10. Rheinzabern, Terra Sigillata Mus.
Unknown
Terracotta (Terra Sigillata)
Undated
Radiate head of Sol (?? rays)
LIMC Helios/Sol 14

Environ of Lyon
Terracotta
Undated
Fragment of pottery decorated in relief.
Visible are the wheel and most of the horses of a chariot jumping up to the r. over stylized clouds, with Tellus below.
Wuilleumier 1952, 151 nr. 284 pl. 7;
Bergmann 1998, 248 fig. 4.

F2. Stone

-1. Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Mus. Kl 626
Probably acquired in Tunisia by the former owner
Marble
3\textsuperscript{rd} c. AD
Votive patera, decorated in relief with Saturn on a throne within an aedicula, between two sphinxes. Outside the aedicula, to either side, Sol (1.), standing, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, globe in r. hand, and Luna r.).
LIMC Saturnus 75

F3. Bronze

-1. Naples, Mus. Naz. 75091
Unknown
Bronze
1st-2nd c. AD
Eight-sided vat, with on seven sides the planetary deities. Sol is standing, wears a chiton and chlamys, and holds a whip.
LIMC Planetae 12

-2. Pl. 57.4-5
Augst, Römermuseum 21.78
Augst, near temple bronze
mid 3rd c. AD
Cult vessel (incense burner?) depicting the planetary deities (standing figures); Sol is radiate (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, holds a whip in his right hand and a globe (or patera?) in his left hand above a burning altar.
LIMC Helios/Sol 276; Matern 2002, 92, 228 G20; Staehelin 1948, 568, fig. 175; Duval 1953, 290.

-3. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. 15/69
Syria or Palestine?
Bronze
Late 6th c. AD
Flanking the crucifixion: busts of Sol and Luna.
Weitzmann 1979, 626 nr. 563

-4. Lyons, Mus. de la civilisation Gallo-Romaine BR 207
Gap
Bronze, silver-plated
Hexagonal vase with swing-handle. The shoulder consists of a flat hexagonal plaque with a large hole in the centre, around which six of the seven planetary deities are arranged (Saturn to Jupiter).
Duval 1953, 289; Boucher & Tassinari 1976, 148-151 nr. 192.
Hybrid (probably modern) assembly of various ancient elements of varying date.

F4. Silver
-1. St. Petersburg, Hermitage II 1838.25
Kertsch
Silver
3rd c. BC
Cup, with on the inside a depiction of Helios on 3/4 quadriga, radiate (9 rays), long-sleeved chiton and chlamys, whip in raised right hand.
Gorbunova & Saverkina 1975, nr. 99.
Matern 2002, 61, 67, 80 n. 487, 213 Q35

-2. Pl. 58.1-2
Paris, Louvre Bj 1969
Boscoreale
Gilded silver
Late 1st c. BC to 1st half 1st c. AD
Patera, with in the emblema the bust of a woman with elephant headdress (probably personification of Africa); her cornucopia is decorated in the upper register with a bust of Sol, draped, radiate (9 rays); in middle register eagle; in lower register caps of Dioscuri crowned by stars.

F5. Glass
-1. Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum 1002
Cologne-Braunsfeld
Glass
AD 320-340
Profile bust of Sol, left, radiate (12 rays), chlamys, whip, in central medallion surrounded by circus-scene with four racing chariots.
LIMC Helios/Sol 198 (with refs.); Matern 2002, 265 B146.
F. Plates and Vessels

Iconographically, this section of the catalogue offers little that is new. What makes it noteworthy is the early date of many of the objects listed here.

The black gloss relief wares from Cales (F1a) represent the oldest objects in this section, and among the oldest in the catalogue as a whole. Cales was a Campanian town on the site of Calvi Risorta, just to the North of Capua, on the Via Latina. After conquering it in 335 BC, the Romans made it an important centre for the Roman administration of Campania. It was settled almost immediately by Roman and Latin colonists, was the seat of the quaestor for Southern Italy, and rapidly developed into a major Roman city. It also became an important centre for the production of relief-decorated black-gloss ware imitating silver vessels. Calenian relief ware was produced and exported on a significant scale by the middle of the third century BC and continued to be produced until about 180 BC.

On Calenian vessels, in particular omphalos bowls, busts of Sol were depicted repeatedly, though not with particular frequency. The frontal bust of Sol is normally accompanied by two horses or two pairs of horses jumping up to either side. This image conflates two of the standard image types [sol] (radiate bust and charioteer respectively), and remained a common way to support the identity of the radiate bust until Late Antiquity. Normally four horses are depicted, but sometimes the image is so sketchy that only two horses are shown, without meaning that in these cases Sol was driving a biga. On occasion Sol is depicted without horses. The bust of Sol above a crescent with stars within a zodiac circle is noteworthy as a particularly early example of this type of astrological imagery in the Roman world. The presence of the Dioscuri as an integral part of a number of designs is also noteworthy, as the Dioscuri are often found in the company of Sol. We should note, lastly, that Apollo with the rays of the sun, but identified as Apollo by his lyre, also occurs.

Of the images of Sol on Calenian ware, most fit what was to become standard in the Roman world. Only the radiate Apollo with a lyre would disappear in the course of the first century AD. Calenian pottery thus gives us quite early examples of Roman images of Sol. These

---

290 Cornell 1995, 352.

291 The dating is based on Pagenstecher (1909, 165-6), still the most comprehensive study of Calenian ware. His dates may be too late (cf. Jentel 1976, 31-3), but in view of the Latin potters' inscriptions the production cannot have begun before the late 4th c. BC.

292 F1a.2(?)-12.

293 Cf. e.g. C2c.13, 68 (2 horses), C2g.4, C2n.1, C3d.2, C4.16, J1.2, 4, L1.5.

294 F1a.1, 13.

295 F1a.13.

296 F1a.6-7, 9, 11. Cf. C2d.4,6-7,11, C2e.1, C2h.65, 71, 82-4, 96, C2n.1, C2w.4, 11, C3a1.3, C3b1.1, 4-6, C3b3.2, C3c.6, F1b.1(?) F4.2, H4f.1, H10g.1, J1.6, J3.3.

297 F1a.14-17.
are by no means Roman inventions, of course. The Greek centres to the South as well as the
Etruscans to the North had longstanding traditions of depicting their sun god, Helios and Usil
respectively. Roman art inherited Sol from both traditions, but tracing that process is as
difficult and, frankly, meaningless as tracing the beginnings of “Roman” art in general. In the
case of Calenian ware, I have taken the nature of the town - Roman administrative centre where
Latin was spoken by a population descended in significant numbers from Roman and Latin
colonists - to be “Roman” enough to designate its products as “Roman”. What that tells us is that
by the third century BC, stock image types of Sol were incorporated in Roman art as a matter of
course. This is in line with the numismatic evidence of Roman Republican coinage and as such
need not surprise us. It is also in line with the Romans’ own assessment of Sol as one of the
traditional deities of the Roman pantheon. For the purpose of this study of the Roman image
types [sol] that is all we need to establish.

Of the other pottery vessels, a substantial number is Mithraic in origin, but generally
speaking Sol was not a frequent figure on these vessels, or indeed on vessels of any kind. On
three of the four bronze vessels he is one of the planetary gods. On the fourth, a sixth century
censer, we have another example of the continuity of the Sol-Luna imagery into Christian
contexts. In this case they are depicted to either side of the crucifixion of Christ - not uncommen
in (early) medieval art.

The silver cup from Kertsch (F4.1) does not really belong in this catalogue, but is a
beautiful example of the fully established image type of Sol as charioteer in Hellenistic art, and
as such can serve to support our contention, outlined above, that “Roman” art such as that in
Cales produced images of Sol along typological lines that by this time were already well-
established.

We close our discussion of this section with a brief glance at a silver plate from
Boscoreale now in the Louvre (F4.2). It is decorated with the high relief bust of a woman
wearing an elephant headdress. To the right is a cornucopia topped by a lunula, and decorated
with a radiate bust of Sol, an eagle, and two star-topped caps of the Dioscuri. Numerous other
symbolic images and animals are crowded around the bust as well. The presence of the lunula,
the bust of Sol and the caps of the Dioscuri as decorative elements on the cornucopia by the main
figure - possibly the personification of Africa - is clearly symbolic in nature and reinforces the
evidence for a highly symbolic use of the image type [sol] already at this early date. For the plate
must date to before AD 79, when the villa in which it was found was buried by the eruption of
the Vesuvius, and may well be considerably older. Roller suggests the personification of Africa
may actually be Cleopatra Selene (40 BC - 5 BC?), daughter of Marc Anthony and wife of Juba

298 Cf. LIMC Helios and LIMC Helios/Usil.
299 See chpt. 2.
300 F3.1,2,4, cf F4.4.
301 Déonna 1948.
Thus what emerges from this section in particular is further evidence for the use of the image types [sol] as standard, easily recognized images as early as the mid Republic. Even the cosmic imagery (zodiac) can be dated to the mid to late Republic, while other symbolic uses of the standard image types [sol] can also be attested by the late Republic or early imperial era, as illustrated by the silver plate from Boscoreale. What symbolic force and meanings these early instances of the image types [sol] had is a separate issue, and I am not suggesting that the later meanings were already all established by this time. But that Sol is at best symbolic on these early vessels seems to me clear, and that in itself is already quite interesting.

---

**G. Lamps**

**G1. Terracotta lamp; decoration on body**

**G1a. Head/bust of Sol**

1. Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 859
   - Terracotta
   - Ca. AD 50
   - Frontal bust of Sol, 8 rays (hole where ninth ray would be).
   - LIMC Helios/Sol 45; Matern 2002, 181, 267 B170b

2. Pl. 58.3
   - London, British Mus. 1856.12-26.441
   - Pozzuoli
   - Terracotta
   - Ca. AD 40-80
   - Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (8 rays)
   - LIMC Helios/Sol 44; Bailey 1975, Q1009; Matern 2002, 181, 268 B173a

3. Altino (?)
   - Altino, deposit of lamps midway between ustrinum and mausoleum
   - Terracotta
   - 1st half 1st c. AD
   - Frontal bust of Sol
   - Marcello 1956, 100-103 nr. 9, pl. VIII; Ianovitz 1972, 60

   - Verona
   - Terracotta
   - 1st c. AD
   - Bust of Sol, radiate, left.
   - LIMC Helios/Sol 77 (with ref.); Ianovitz 1972, 80 (with refs.).

5. Bordeaux, Mus. d'Aquitaine 60.8.559
   - Bordeaux, Terre Nègre Cemetery (discovered in 1863)
   - Terracotta
   - 1st c. AD
   - Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)

6. Mérida, Arch. Mus. 272p
   - Mérida
   - Terracotta
   - Early 1st c. AD
   - Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays) on thin upturned crescent.

7-10. Mérida, Arch. Mus. 59p
   - Mérida, theatre
   - Terracotta
   - Early 1st c. AD
   - 3/4 bust of Sol, radiate, whip.
   - LIMC Helios/Sol 57; Gil Farrés 1948, 103-4 nr. 4; Matern 2002, 181, 272 B212.
   - Gil Farrés (1948, 104 n. 1) mentions a second, similar lamp in the same collection as well as two from Villafranca de los Barros and one from Troia. All lamps are described as "Mithraic" (despite the early date for the Merida lamp) and depicting bust of Sol, radiate, whip in right hand.

11. Oszöny, Mus.
    - Brigetio
    - Terracotta
    - Early 1st c. AD
    - Bust of Sol, radiate nimbus, chlamys

---

302 Roller 2003, 141-2. Della Corte (1951, 35-7) interprets it as a portrait of Cleopatra VII, her mother.
-12. Prague, Inst. of Class. Arch. 574/57
M Teplice
Terracotta
AD 30-60
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).
Marsa 1972, 115 nr. 117 pl. IV

-13. Corinth, Mus. 740
Corinth
Terracotta
1st c. AD
Frontal head of Sol, radiate
Broneer 1930, 180 nr. 489; Matern 2002, 181, 270-1 B196a

-14. Pl. 58.4
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 72.224
Cyprus
Terracotta
1st c. AD
10 rays
Unpublished.

-15. Copenhagen Nat. Mus. ABc 425
Mysia?
Terracotta
2nd half 1st c. AD
Bust of Sol facing left, chlamys, 7 rays.
LIMC Helios/Sol 76; Matern 2002, 181, 272 B211

-16. Carthage, Mus. 46.46
Carthage
Terracotta
Last quarter 1st c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays).

-17. Carthage, Mus. 46.249
Carthage
Terracotta
Last quarter 1st c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).

-18. Carthage, Mus. 46.402
Carthage
Terracotta
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays).

-19. Sabratha, Mus. 111
Sabratha, Byzantine Gate road
Terracotta
1st c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 55; Joly 1974, 106 nr. 76, pl. 7; Matern 2002, 181, 268 B177

-20. Sabratha, Mus. 342
Sabratha, excavations near theatre
Terracotta
1st c. AD?
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys.
Joly 1974, nr. 77.

-21. Unknown
Thamusida
Terracotta
1st c. AD
Bust of Sol, radiate (10? rays) above crescent.
Matern 2002, 272 B206 (with ref.)

Unknown
Terracotta
1st c. AD
Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)

-23. Pl. 59.1
Boston Museum of Fine Arts 01.8371
Unknown
Terracotta
Late 1st c. AD
Bust of Sol, radiate, 12 rays
Unpublished

-24. Budapest, Mus. 51.845
Unknown
Terracotta
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
1st c. AD.
Matern 2002, 181, 267 B162

-25. Pl. 59.2
Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 5301
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd half 1st c. AD
Frontal face surrounded by a radiate nimbus (Sonnengesicht).
LIMC Helios/Sol 45 (Letta also lists Copenhagen Nat. Mus. 1245 as a lamp with a bust of Sol, but this lamp actually has a rather nice frontal face of a bearded satyr);
LIMC Helios 9 (with incorrect inv. nr.).

-26. Hannover, Kestner Mus. 952
Unknown
Terracotta
AD 30-100
Bust of Sol between two dolphins.
Matern 2002, 167 B166b (with ref.).

-27. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum
Unknown
Terracotta
AD 25-50
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (8 rays).

-28. London, British Mus. 1814.7 - 4.105
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd half 1st c. AD
Miniature mouldmade lamp; frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays) above globe.
LIMC Helios/Sol 47; Bailey 1975, Q1096; Matern 2002, 181, 272 B207

-29. Pl. 59.3
Prague, Nat. Mus. Inv. 2533
Unknown
Terracotta
AD 50-75
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
Haken 1958, 58 nr. 53.

Unknown
Terracotta
AD 25-50
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), on upturned crescent with a star on each point.
LIMC Helios/Sol 58; Matern 2002, 181, 271 B200a

Unknown
Terracotta
2nd half 1st c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).

-32. Warsaw, Arch. Mus. 147887
Unknown
Terracotta
1st c. AD?
Only the 7 rays of Sol survive.
Matern 2002, 268 B179a (with ref.).

-33. Warsaw, Arch. Mus. 147057
Unknown
Terracotta
1st c. AD?
Bust of Sol over crescent, 9 rays.
Matern 2002, 268-9 B179b (with ref.).

-34. Pl. 59.4
Bordeaux, Mus. d'Aquitaine 60.8.266
Rome, Baths of Diocletian
Terracotta
Last quarte 1st c. - 1st half 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).
LIMC Helios/Sol 46

Camarina
Terracotta
1st-2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol.

-36. Florence, Arch. Mus. 1237 (case 22)
Found locally
Terracotta
1st-2nd c. AD
Bust of Sol

-37. Florence, Arch. Mus. 2500 (case 6)
S. Alessandro
Terracotta
1st-2nd c. AD
Bust of Sol

-38. Hannover, Kestner Mus. 1010
Unknown
Terracotta
AD 90-140
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).
Matern 2002, 267 B166c

-39. Ripon College, Clark Collection EC.53.86
Unknown
Terracotta
1st - 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)

-40. Jerusalem, Hebrew Univ. 6058
Unknown (acquired in Beirut)
Terracotta
1st - 3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays),
chlamys, on thin upturned crescent.

-41. Jerusalem, Hebrew Univ. 6057
Unknown (acquired in Beirut)
Terracotta
1st - 3rd c. AD
Frontal face of Sol (?), surrounded by petal-like rays (9).
Rosenthal & Sivan 1978, 88 nr. 357

-42. Jerusalem, Hebrew Univ. 6064
Unknown (acquired in Beirut)
Terracotta
1st - 3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (10+ rays),
chlamys, on thin upturned crescent.
Rosenthal & Sivan 1978, 86 nr. 348

Unknown
Terracotta
AD 90-140
Bust of Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 46

-44. Montreal, McGill Univ. 6292
Unknown
Terracotta
Late 1st - early 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).
Zoitopoúlou & Fossey 1992, 99 nr. 32.

-45. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 3870
Unknown
Terracotta
Late 1st - early 2nd c. AD

-46. Lodi, Mus. Civ. 243
Lodivecchio
Terracotta
Early 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).

-47. Mozia (Sicily), Whitaker Mus.
Found locally
Terracotta
2nd c. AD
Bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays), above upturned crescent.
LIMC Helios/Sol 57; Matern 270 B187.

-48. Pl. 59.5
London, British Museum 1898.11 - 22.1
Reputedly found in a tomb near Cherchel,
produced in Central Italy
Terracotta
1st half 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
LIMC Helios/Sol 46; Bailey 1975, Q1281; Matern 2002, 181, 268 B173b
Bailey notes that "the objects supposedly found with the lamp range in date from the fourth century BC to the second century AD".

-49. Pl. 59.6
Bordeaux, Mus. d'Aquitaine 60.8.555
Bordeaux, Terre Nègre Cemetery,
discovered in 1863
Terracotta
1st half 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays). On base,
inscription OPPI(us) RES(titutus) C
A. Ziéglé, pers. comm.; CIL XIII 10001, 235A

-50. Pl. 59.7
London, British Museum 1867.11 - 22.236
Ephesus (produced locally)
Terracotta
1st quarter 2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays)
Bailey 1975, Q3067; Matern 2002, 181, 268
51. Freiburg, art market
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, draped, 7 rays, over crescent. Inscr. C MAR EV
Matern 2002, 181, 267 B165; Galerie C. Puhze, *Kunst der Antike* Katalog 8, 26 nr. 271. Matern (2002, 270) lists the same lamp under B191 referring to the same catalogue and page, but nr. 171. This number (on a different page) is a depiction of a fish.

52. Freiburg, Art Market
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd c. AD
Profile bust of Sol.
Matern 2002, 270 B210

53. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. TC 8217/106
Rome
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
3/4 bust of Sol with long, "radiate" hair.
LIMC Helios/Sol 51; Heres 1972, 72 nr. 441; Matern 2002, 181, 272 B209.

54. Mozia, Whitaker Mus. MC 6227
Mozia
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, 5 rays.

55. Pl. 59.8
London, British Museum 1905.5 - 20.154
Herpes, Charente, reputedly from a Merovingian (!) cemetery.
Terracotta
Ca. AD 150-250
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), whip
Bailey 1975 vol. III, 175, Q1669; Matern 2002, 181, 268 B173c
Found together with a lamp of Luna (Q1668).

56. Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum 1805
Environ of Cologne

57. Caracal, Mus. 5793
Romula
Terracotta
2nd - 3rd c.
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys.
LIMC Helios/Sol 52; Matern 2002, 181, 270 B188

58. Jerusalem (?)
Nabratein, Field 4, Roman house
Terracotta
Late 2nd-early 3rd c. AD (stratified date)
Sol with globe in r. hand.

59. Unknown
Jerusalem
Terracotta
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Bust of Sol above crescent.
Matern 2002, 272 B204a (with ref.)

60. Unknown
Jerusalem
Terracotta
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Bust of Sol above crescent.
Matern 2002, 272 B204b (with ref.)

61. Unknown
Sebaste (Samaria)
Terracotta
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Bust of Sol above crescent.
Matern 2002, 272 B205 (with ref.)

62. Unknown
Banasa
Terracotta
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, above globe.

63. Catania, Mus. Civ. MC 6227
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays), chlamys.
LIMC Helios 53

Rome, Museo Naz. Rom.
Unknown
Terracotta
Late 2nd - early 3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays), long-sleeved tunica and chlamys, overly large raised right hand, globe in left hand in front of breast, whip behind left shoulder.
LIMC Helios/Sol 50; Matern 2002, 181, 268 B176b

Portland, the Portland Art Museum 26.147
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys.

Art Market
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys.
Ancient and Oriental Antiquities (www.Antiquities.co.uk), autumn 2007

Delphi, Mus.
Delphi
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol above crescent
LIMC Helios 159; Matern 2002, 270 B190.

Unknown
Dura Europos
Terracotta
Mid 3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys. Damaged.
Dura IV, 111.

Private collection
North Africa

Carthage, Mus. 46.556
Carthage
Terracotta
Late 3rd - early 4th c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays), chlamys, raised right hand, whip behind left shoulder.
Deneuve 1969, nr. 1131; LIMC Helios/Sol 54.

Athens, Agora mus.
Agora
Terracotta
2nd half 5th - early 6th c. AD
Frontal head of Sol, radiate (9? rays).
LIMC Helios 160a; Matern 2002, 181, 266-7 B160a

Athens, Agora mus.
Agora
Terracotta
2nd half 5th - early 6th c. AD
Frontal head of Sol, radiate (9? rays).
Perlzweig 1961, 172 nr. 2367; Matern 2002, 181, 266-7 B160b

Corinth, Mus. 540-560
Corinth
Terracotta
5th-6th c. AD (Broneer); Roman Imperial (Matern).
Frontal head of Sol, radiate (10-12 rays)
LIMC Helios 160b; Broneer 1930, 251-3 nr. 1148-1168; Matern 2002, 181, 270-1 B196b-v.

Delphi, Mus.
Delphi
Terracotta
5th-6th c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate.
LIMC Helios 160c (with ref.)

Volos, Mus. (?)
Phthiotic Thebes
Terracotta
5th-6th c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate.
ADelt 38 (1983), 2.1 p. 225 & pl. 94

-97-107 Athens, Agora mus. L3384 (= Perlzweig 2372), L3480 (= Perlzweig 2374)
Agora Terracotta
6th c. AD
Frontal head of Sol, radiate (ca. 9 rays).

-108. Athens, Nat. Mus. 2535
Phyle, Parnitha, Cave of Pan
Terracotta
6th c. AD
Frontal head of Sol, radiate (7 multiple rays)

-109. Athens, Nat. Mus. 2536
Phyle, Parnitha, Cave of Pan
Terracotta
6th c. AD
Frontal head of Sol, radiate

-110. Tunis, Bardo CMA 1424
Carthage
Terracotta
Late antique
Frontal bust of Sol, chlamys.
Matern 2002, 268 B178 (with ref.).

-111 -119 Ostia, Mus. 2485, 2676, 2741-3, 4410, 4460, 4712
Ostia
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol
Floriani Squarciapino 1962, 69 n. 1

-120. Ostia, Mus. 2777
Ostia
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol on upturned crescent with two stars.
Floriani Squarciapino 1962, 69 n. 1

-121. Porto, Univ.
Gulpilhares
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol, chlamys, chiton, radiate (?), both arms raised.
Matern 2002, 181, 268 B175

-122. Private collection
Romula
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays). Worn.
LIMC Helios/Sol 52; Matern 2002, 181, 270 B189.

-123. Adana, Mus. (?)
Tarsus
Terracotta
Undated
A total of eight lamps, mostly fragments, from the same mould. Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays).

-124. Unknown
Dora (Phoenicia_
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol above crescent.
Matern 2002, 272 B203 (with ref.)

-125. Unknown
Eleutheropolis (Beit Guvrin)
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol above crescent.
Matern 2002, 272 B202 (with ref.)

-126. Ann Arbor, Univ. of Michigan, Kelsey Museum 22313
Karanis, Egypt
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol
Shier 1978, 39 nr. 365.

-127. Constantine, Mus.
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (12 rays),
chlamys, on upturned crescent with a star on
each point.
Doublet & Gauckler 1892, 105 nr. 2, pl. XI

-128. Pl. 59.9
Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. ABc 855
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, 5 rays.
LIMC Helios/Sol 45.

-129. Damascus, Mus. 5240
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol, radiate
Abdul-Hak & Abdul-Hak 1951, 95 nr. 37.

-130. Pl. 60.1
Heidelberg, Univ. La 170
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (8 rays), on
upturned crescent with a star on each point.
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

-131. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 708
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

-132. Leyden, RMO RD II 213
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays).
Matern 2002, 268 B172

-133. Munich, Antikenslg. 1145 WAF
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

-134. Munich, Antikenslg. 1330 WAF

Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

-135. Munich, Antikenslg. 1363 WAF
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
= G1g.16
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

-136. Munich, Antikenslg. 8578 (neue Inv.)
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 48.

-138. Sao Paolo, Univ. 64/9.2
Unknown
Terracotta
Unknown
Bust of Sol
LIMC Helios/Sol 55

-139. Seville, Palacio Lebrija
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays) over crescent.

-140. Seville, Palacio Lebrija
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays) over crescent.

-141. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. 6764
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated

-142. Art market
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays).
Kricheldorf Auktion XII (1962), 19 nr. 126.

-143. Art market
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays).
Kricheldorf Auktion XII (1962), 19 nr 127.

G1b. Sol in quadriga
-1. Brugg, Vindinossa Mus. B859
Vindinossa
Terracotta
1st c. AD
Man, nude, reins in both hands, on biga l.
The man is perhaps radiate (difficult to make out on photograph).
LIMC Helios/Sol 152.

-2. Pl. 60.2
London, British Museum 1870.7-9.45
Reportedly purchased in Alexandria
Terracotta
AD 150-250
Sol, standing in frontal chariot, two horse rearing up to the left, two to he right. Sol has a radiate nimbus (12? rays), is nude but for a chlamys, and has raised both hands.
Bailey 1975, Q2076; Matern 2002, 53, 214 Q44

-3. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1904 (Fr. VII 586)
Unknown, possibly Egypt
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Sol, standing in frontal chariot, two horses rearing up to the left, two to he right. Sol has a radiate nimbus (11? rays), is nude but for a chlamys, and has raised both hands. He is described as holding a whip in each hand, but I cannot make this out on the photograph.
Matern 2002, 53, 214 Q45

G1c. Sol and Luna
-1. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. TC 6002
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd half 1st - 1st half 2nd c. AD.
Frontal busts of Sol, radiate, on the left, and Luna, torch, on the right.
NOTE: the disc and the lamp do not belong together.

-2. Pl. 60.3
Terracotta
2nd half 2nd c. AD
Frontal busts of Sol (left), radiate (6 rays), chlamys and long-sleeved chiton, globe in right hand, and Luna (right), with torch but no crescent, next to each other.
LIMC Helios/Sol 314; Bailey 1975, Q1704; Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B224.2

-3. Patras, Mus. 1473
Patras, Od. Kanari 54 & Od. Korinthou
Terracotta
2nd c. AD (?)
Within a zodiac circle profile busts of Sol (radiate) and Luna next to each other.
LIMC Helios 325 (with ref.); Petropoulos 1978, 306-7 nr. 4; Gundel 1992, 238 nr. 100.1; Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B222.

-4. Pl. 60.4
London, British Mus. 1814.7-4.50
Produced in Central Italy
Terracotta
Ca. AD 175-225
Very worn. Busts of Sol, radiate (4 or 5 rays) and Luna facing each other.
LIMC Helios/Sol 313; Bailey 1975, Q1354; Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B220

-5. Pl. 60.5
London, British Museum 1756.1-1.5.89
Produced in Central Italy
Terracotta
Ca AD 175-225
Sol standing, radiate nimbus (7 rays), nude but for a chlamys, globe in right hand, whip
in left hand, facing Luna (torch, crescent). 
NOTE: the base is inscribed with SAECVL - reference to the ludi saeculares of AD 206?

Reported to be from Rome
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Facing busts of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, sleeved chiton, globe in his right hand, and Luna
LIMC Helios/Sol 314; Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B224.4

-7. Ptuj, Mus. G.B.10/I.Z.2796*
Ptuj
Terracotta
2nd - 3rd c. AD
Frontal busts of Sol and Luna
Matern 2002, 273 B223

-8. London, British Museum
Egyptr
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Profile busts of Sol and Luna, facing each other
Matern 2002, 273 B221; Bailey 1975, Q2052bis

-9. Jerusalem, Mus. of Prehistory 6202
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd-3rd c. AD
Busts of Sol and Luna, kissing

-10. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. TC 891
Unknown
Terracotta
Early 3rd c. AD
Profile busts of Sol (right) and Luna (left) facing each other. Sol is radiate (four rays), Luna has an upturned crescent moon above her forehead; between their foreheads a star, below Sol a globe, below Luna a torch.
LIMC Helios/Sol 313 (with refs); Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B215, fig. 94.

-11. Athens, Benaki Mus. 12204
Alexandria
Terracotta
4th c. AD
Busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right) facing each other.
Matern 2002, 181-2, 272-3

-12. Athens, Benaki Mus. 12205
Alexandria
Terracotta
4th c. AD
Busts of Sol and Luna facing each other.
Matern 2002, 181-2, 272-3

-13. Ostia, Mus. 2299
Ostia
Terracotta
Undated
Busts of Sol and Luna.
Floriani Squarciapino 1962, 69 n. 1.

-14. Ostia, Mus. 2415
Ostia
Terracotta
Undated
Busts of Sol and Luna.
Floriani Squarciapino 1962, 69 n. 1

-15. Unknown
Syracuse
Terracotta
Undated
Busts of Sol and Luna.
Matern 2002, 273-4 B224.6

-16. Carthage, Mus. 650
Carthage
Terracotta
Undated
Busts of Sol, radiate, chlamys, and Luna facing each other.

-17. Sabratha, Mus. 862
Sabratha, Regio IV
Terracotta
Undated
Frontal busts of Sol, left, radiate (? rays), long-sleeved chiton and chlamys, globe in front of him in r. hand, and Luna, right, upturned crescent behind shoulders, torch.
- 18. Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum B 691
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Busts of Sol and Luna
   LIMC Helios/Sol 314

- 19. Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum O 36629
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Frontal busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right);
   Sol is radiate (5 rays), wears a chlamys and -
   possibly - a long sleeved chiton, and holds a
   globe in his left hand before his breast.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 314; Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B224.3

- 20. Munich, Antikenslg. 1248 WAF
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Profile busts of Sol and Luna.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 314

G1d. Sol, Luna and Capitoline Triad
   Rome
   Terracotta
   2nd-3rd c. AD.
   Above: Capitoline triad, seated, between two
   Tritons (?) blowing their horns. Below, left,
   Sol, radiate, nude but for chlamys, right
   hand raised, in quadriga ascending to the
   right, and right, Luna in biga, descending to
   the right.
   LIMC Helios/Sol 392 (with refs.); Matern 2002, 70, 219 Q74.

- 2. Berlin, Staatl. Mus. TC 871
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   2nd-early 3rd c. AD (Type Loeschke 7b)
   Above: Capitoline triad, seated, between two
   Tritons (?) blowing their horns. Below, left,
   Sol, radiate, nude but for chlamys, right
   hand raised, in quadriga ascending to the
   right, and right, Luna in biga, descending to
   the right.
   Heres 1972, 72 nr. 440; Matern 2002, 70, n.
   444, 219 Q73.

G1e. Sol and Sarapis
- 1. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 8545
   Alexandria
   Terracotta
   3rd c. AD
   Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed
   by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
   Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 319 nr. 4.
   From the same mould: Alexandria, Mus.
   8969 and 5040; Tübingen, Arch. Inst.
   H.S./112039.

- 2. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 8546
   Alexandria, Serapeum, subterranean
   passageways
   Terracotta
   3rd c. AD
   Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed
   by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
   Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 318 nr. 1.
   From the same mould: Cairo, Eg. Mus.
   26424 (disc only).

- 3. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 8969
   Alexandria
   Terracotta
   3rd c. AD
   Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed
   by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
   Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 319 nr. 3.
   From the same mould: Alexandria, Mus.
   8545 and 5040; Tübingen, Arch. Inst.
   H.S./112039.

- 4. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 16333
   Alexandria
   Terracotta
   3rd c. AD
   Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed
   by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
   Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 319 nr. 5.
   From the same mould: London, BM EA
   49647; Münster, Arch. Mus. d. Univ. inv.
   458.
-5. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 29062
Alexandria
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 319 nr. 6.

-6. Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 29073
Alexandria
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 319 nr. 7.

-7. Pl. 61.1
Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 31801
Alexandria
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Unpublished. Description based on photographs kindly provided by Dr. Merwatta Seif el-Din

-8. Pl. 61.2
Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 31802
Alexandria
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Unpublished. Description based on photographs kindly provided by Dr. Merwatta Seif el-Din

-9. Pl. 61.3
Alexandria, Graeco-Roman Museum 31810
Alexandria
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Unpublished. Description based on photographs kindly provided by Dr. Merwatta Seif el-Din

-10. Athens, Benaki Mus. inv. 11887
Egypt
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 320 nr. 9

-11. Athens, Benaki Mus. inv. 21028
Egypt
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 320 nr. 14

-12. Cairo, Eg. Mus. 2642
Alexandria?
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 320 nr. 15

-13. Hannover, Kestner Mus. 1932.252
Egypt
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B217

-14. London, British Museum 1964.6-1722
Unknown
Terracotta
3rd c. AD
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B217

-15. London, British Museum 1877.11-12.2
Alexandria
Terracotta
AD 150-250
Frontal bust of Sarapis, embraced and kissed by Sol (profile bust) to the left of him.
Tran Tam Tinh 1984, 319 nr. 8; Bailey, 250, Q2049EA
From the same mould as Alexandria, Mus. 16333 = G1e.4 and Münster, Arch. Mus. Univ. 458 = G1e.16
G1f. Planetary deities

-1. Unknown
   Rome

   Terracotta
   Undated
   Busts of the seven planetary deities
   LIMC Saturnus 42

G1g. Other

-1. Hannover, Kestner Mus. 950
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   AD 40-100
   Twelve busts of deities: Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Luna, Mercurius, Mars, Sol, Neptune, Ceres, Vesta, Venus, Vulcan. Matern 2002, 458, Q127bis (with ref.).

-2. Pl. 61.5
   London, British Museum 1980.10-8.3
   Produced in Campania
   Terracotta
   2nd half 1st c. AD
   Above an upturned crescent, scene consisting of profile head, r., of Sol, radiate (6 rays), crowned from behind with a wreath by a small winged Victory in long chiton. Bailey 1975, 458, Q127bis.

-3. Pl. 61.6
   London British Mus. 1756.1-1.1093
   Produced in Central Italy
   Terracotta
   Ca. AD 175-225
   Rather worn, details difficult to discern. Shepherd clad in short tunic, carrying a sheep on his shoulder. In front of him: crescent. Behind him, bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays). Bailey identifies the indeterminate blobs by his feet as "several indeterminate animals, presumably part of his flock". LIMC Helios/Sol 391; Bailey 357-8, Q1370, pl 80, figs 48, 109. NOTE: the base is inscribed with SAECVL - reference to the ludi saeculares of AD 206? A similar lamp, also inscribed SAECVL, is described by De Rossi 1870 (cf. Finney 1994, 132-5, figs. 5.4-6). This lamp is now in Berlin.

G2. Terracotta lamp, handle

G2a. Head/bust of Sol

-1. Berlin Antikenslg. TC 8760
   Art market Italy, acquired in 1904; reputedly found in Boscotrecase.
Terracotta
Mid 1st c. AD (Claudian)
Handle, triangular, caduceus behind a cock walking to right; lower left-hand corner frontal bust of Sol, 12 rays; lower left hand corner frontal bust of Luna with crescent moon above her forehead. On lamp bust facing left of Sol (?) on upturned crescent with a star on each point and a hand above his forehead. (Heres, followed by Matern, describes the bust as Luna).
Heres 1972, 13 nr. 5; Matern 2002, 181-2, 273 B216.

-6. Athens, Benaki Mus. 22239
Alexandria
Terracotta
1st c. AD?
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (13 rays) in front of crescent.
LIMC Helios 159; Matern 2002, 174, 181, 269 B181.2
The LIMC, followed by Matern, incorrectly gives Patras as the location of this lamp.

Darb Gase (?), Egypt
Terracotta
1st c. AD?
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (13 rays), chlamys.
Matern 2002, 174, 181, 269 B181.3a

-8. Pl. 62.1
St. Petersburg, Hermitage 62191
Egypt
Terracotta
1st c. AD?
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (13 rays), chlamys, in front of upturned crescent.
Matern 2002, 174, 181, 269 B181.7

-9. Frankfurt, Univ. arch. Mus. 23
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd half 1st c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (13 rays), chlamys.
Matern 2002, 174, 181, 269 B181.5

-10. Pl. 62.2
London, British Museum 1960.4-11.4
Unknown
Terracotta
2nd half 1st c. AD
Frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (13 rays), chlamys, in front of crescent.
Bailey 1975, 238, Q1945

-11. Magdalensburg, Mus. 4679
Unknown
Terracotta
1st half 1st c. AD
Triangular handle; frontal bust of Sol, radiate (12 rays), chlamys, above crescent and volutes.
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Augustan
   Frontal bust of Sol, radiate (23 rays), chlamys, on upturned crescent.  
   LIMC Helios/Sol 56; Matern 2002, 181, 271 B200b

   Acquired by C. Schmidt in Alexandria in 1907
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Handle in the shape of a crescent moon behind a frontal bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (13 rays), chlamys. 
   Heres 1972, 81 nr. 504; Matern 2002, 174, 181, 269 B181.3b

-14. Unknown
   Canopus
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Triangular handle; frontal bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys, above crescent moon and volutes. 
   Matern 2002, 181, 269-70 B186

-15. Frankfurt, Mus. f. Vor- und Frühgeschichte ß561
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Triangular handle; frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys, above two cornucopiae. 
   Matern 2002, 181, 269 B182

-16. Munich, Antikenslg 1363
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Triangular handle; frontal bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys, above crescent moon. 
   Matern 2002, 181, 269-70 B185

-17. Tübingen, Archäologisches Institut
   Unknown
   Terracotta

-18. London, Petrie Museum UC 54435
   Unknown
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Crescent-shaped handle with draped bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (13 rays).

   Ehnasya
   Terracotta
   Undated
   Crescent-shaped handle with draped bust of Sol, radiate nimbus (9? rays).
   Petrie 1905, pl. 54 D1.

G2b. Sol, Luna & Isis
-1. Marseille, Mus.
   Marseille, Rue Belsunce
   Terracotta
   Undated
   On handle, draped bust of Isis on a globe, between Sol (?) and a crescent. 
   Froehner 1897, 219.

G3. Bronze lamps, body
-1. Paris, Louvre?
   Unknown
   Bronze
   Undated
   Upper body of Sol, dressed in chlamys and chiton, right hand raised and globe in left hand. 
   LIMC helios/Sol 67 (with ref.)
   The location for this lamp given in the LIMC is incorrect

G4. Bronze lamps, handle
-1. Lyons, Mus. Beaux Arts 217
   Unknown
   Bronze
   2nd c. AD
   Handle crowned with a head of Sol, radiate (9 rays). 
   LIMC Helios/Sol 11

-2. Paris, Louvre Collection de Clerq (formerly
111).  
Unknown  
Bronze  
2nd-3rd c. AD  
Handle ends in a leaf-ornament from which Sol emerges; Sol is radiate (6 rays), dressed in chiton and chlamys, has his right hand raised and holds a globe in his left hand.  
LIMC Helios/Sol 67 (with refs.); de Ridder 1905, 316 nr. 519, pl. 61.2; Matern 2002, 117, 239 I47.  
The location for this lamp given in the LIMC is incorrect.  

-3.  
Cairo, Mus. 27841  
unknown  
Bronze  
Undated  
Upper body of Sol, radiate, dressed in chiton and chlamys, r. hand raised, globe in lowered l. hand.  
Matern 2002, 117, 239 I45, fig. 54.  

-4.  
Cairo, Mus. 27842  
unknown  
Bronze  
Undated  
Upper body of Sol, radiate, dressed in chiton and chlamys, with whip in lowered l. hand and torch in raised r. hand.  
LIMC Helios/Sol 67; Reinach RépStat IV 61.8; Matern 2002, 97, 117 n. 635, 228 G26, fig. 26.  

-5.  
Cairo, Mus.  
unknown  
Bronze  
Undated  
Upper body of Sol, radiate (7 rays), dressed in chiton, r. hand raised, globe in lowered l. hand.  

-6.  
Paris, Louvre (ex coll. de Clercq)  
Unknown  
Bronze  
Undated  
Handle ends in a bust of Sol?  
De Ridder 1905, 309 nr. 502.  

-7.  
Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. 67481  
Unknown  

---

**G5. Bronze lamps, other**

-1.  
Florence, Arch. Mus. 1676  
Unknown  
Bronze  
2nd - 3rd c. AD  
Handle of a lamp consisting of a bronze circular band, to which are attached two Tritons (the one on the right lost) flanking statuettes of Luna (right) and Sol (left), radiate (7 rays), right hand raised, chlamys, and long-sleeved chiton, globe in l. hand.  
LIMC Helios/Sol 316; von Hesberg 1981, 1151 nr. 45a; Milani 1899, 81-2; Matern 2002, 117, 119, 176, 239 I44, fig. 56.  
Note: Milani (1899) believes that the statue and lamp do not belong together, pointing out that the statue was attached to the lamp some time after 1704 (when they were still separate inv. numbers) and before 1753.  

---

**Note:**

- References and notes have been omitted for brevity. Detailed information is available in the original sources referenced above. The locations and descriptions of the items listed are intended to provide a clear and concise summary of the objects described in the text.
G. Lamps
With this section on Roman lamps with depictions of Sol we turn our attention to a group of simple, mass-produced objects that reached broad layers of society in all corners of the Empire. Most lamps were undecorated, utilitarian and made of terracotta, but significant numbers of terracotta lamps were decorated in varying degrees, primarily on the disc or the handle, with a wide range of images. The invention of a double matrix system of mass production (one matrix or mould for the bowl of the lamp, a second for the covering) in the Hellenistic era made it easy to produce closed lamps on a large scale. This type of lamp generally had only two small openings, one in the spout and one in the disc covering the bowl, which had the advantage of keeping the oil cleaner. The disc, of course, provided an excellent space for decoration and the matrix process enabled factories to produce lamps with relatively high quality relief decorations at relatively little additional cost. It is hence reasonable to assume that such decorated lamps entered the dwellings of a broad segment of Roman society. In addition to these common, industrially produced lamps the Romans also could have luxury lamps of bronze, often decorated, to enhance more prestigious spaces. We find images of Sol on terracotta as well as bronze lamps which is as one would expect, given the range of images with which lamps were adorned. in both areas. Indeed, as source of light Sol is perhaps a “logical” decorative element for lamps, but he is not an especially common one, although he is not particularly rare either.

Chronology
Lamps provide potentially interesting information about the chronology of depictions of Sol. A glance at the catalogue reveals that a relatively large number of lamps date to the first or early second century AD, and that likewise a surprisingly large number of lamps, all from Greece, are from the fifth and sixth century AD. In this sense lamps as a category differ markedly from most other groups in this catalogue, in which most images are dated to the second and third century AD, and only a smaller minority date to the first century AD or earlier. One reason for this difference could be that in the case of lamps, dates are not based on the image but on the lamp-type. That would imply that in at least some of the other cases (reliefs, statuettes, and the like) the accepted dating - more likely to be based on the image: Sol - is too late, and that a larger percentage belongs to the early Imperial period. But other factors can play a role as well. Changes in tastes and practices in lamp-designs may have had an effect, for instance, so that industry-related factors are reflected in the chronological distribution of lamps on which Sol is depicted, rather than the popularity of the image itself and the concepts it represented. We see something like this in Roman imperial coinage, in which the chronological distribution of images of Sol is wholly atypical when compared to other groups in the catalogue. Clearly one cannot postulate a direct correlation between the occurrence of image types within a specific category of material (lamps, coins) and the general popularity of that image type in society at large.

While lamps alone, then, cannot offer a picture of the relative popularity of the image types [sol] from century to century, the fact remains that they can often be dated typologically with considerable accuracy. The relatively large number of lamps from the first century AD thus remains noteworthy as further confirmation of the fact that these image types were well-enough established before the beginning of the imperial period to be deployed routinely. The lamps likewise confirm the uninterrupted use of these image types until well into the Byzantine era in at
least certain parts of the ancient world. Particularly noteworthy are the late lamps from Athens, Corinth, Delphi and Phthiotic Thebes. It is tempting to link these late lamps to lingering pagan sentiments, well-documented in particular in Greek philosophical circles, but we must be careful not to do so based simply on the image on these lamps. We have already come across various post-pagan depictions of the image type [sol] in contexts which cannot possibly be defined as pagan, such as the Visigoth church in Spain (C4.28), the crucifixion scene on a bronze censer (F3.3), not to mention the synagogue mosaics discussed above (D1a2, 4-7), and more examples could be given. Thus we have already established that the image type [sol] was not intrinsically religious or exclusively pagan. It simply depicts the sun, or some directly or indirectly associated concept. As already stated the sun is a fairly logical motif for the decoration of a lamp, and quite possibly that is all there was behind this choice of motif by the early Byzantine lamp makers in Greece. That is not to say that the lamps could not attain considerable added significance in specific contexts, but such added significance was then provided by the context, not inherent in the lamp itself. The cave of Pan at Phyle on the Parnitha above Athens is a good example of such a potentially significant context, for the practice of leaving votive lamps in such caves was certainly not, in origin at least, a Christian one. But even here we should take care not to read too much into the evidence. Many lamps with Christian symbols also ended up in the cave. This does not mean that it had become a Christian place of worship, but rather suggests that the correlation between the cult in the cave and the imagery on the lamps could be quite tenuous. It is therefore best not to view the early Byzantine Greek lamps decorated with a bust of Sol as signs of lingering pagan sentiment per se, but to see them instead as lamps with the generic depiction of the sun.

**Iconography**

Iconographically the images on the lamps listed here adhere to the standard image types for Sol. Most common are busts of Sol, but a few lamps depict him on his quadriga or as full-length figure. Generally he is without an attribute except rays and sometimes nimbus, but on occasion he is depicted with a globe, a whip or both, and sometimes with a raised right hand. Only a

---

303 G1a.71-109

304 Cf. K6.9,


306 The significance of lamp decorations has not received much consideration, and Stewart (2003, 195) notes that images on lamps are often dismissed as essentially meaningless decoration. He offers a number of cogent arguments against this straightforward dismissal (Stewart 2003, 195-207). Particularly relevant to the analysis of the image types [sol] on lamps are his remarks on the problems of establishing and defining the context of lamps and the importance of admitting inconsistency of use (Stewart 2003, 196-7).

307 Quadriga: G1b.1-3; G1d.1-2; full-length standing figure: G1c.5; G5.1; whip: G1a.7-10, 55, 64, 69, 70, G1c.5; G4.4; globe: G1a.28, 58, 62, 64; G1c.2, 5, 6, 10, 17, 19; G3.1; G4.2, 3, 5; G5.1; raised right hand: G1d.1, 2; G3.1; G4.2, 3, 5; G5.1.
relatively small number of lamps depicts Sol and Luna together (G1.c.1-20; G1.d.1-2; G5.1), but on a fair number of other lamps the bust of Sol is depicted above an upturned crescent with two stars, maintaining the close link between Sol and Luna. Other, more complex images incorporating Sol are rare on lamps. Of these the lamps depicting Sol, Luna and the Capitoline Triad have already been mentioned. A few individual lamps have interesting designs, such as the lamp in the British museum on which the profile bust of Sol is being crowned by a small winged Victory (G1.g.2), but there is only one group of lamps that deserves further discussion before we turn to the next section of the catalogue.

A Divine Kiss on the Lips
On a group of nearly identical lamps from Egypt, dating to the third century AD, the frontal bust of Sarapis is depicted next to a profile bust of Sol, who is kissing him. These lamps are of particular interest because they can be securely linked to a specific ritual, and thus may shed light on more cultic aspects of Sol. They depict an event that regularly took place at the Serapeum at Alexandria, and about which Rufinus and Quodvultdeus inform us in some detail. A small, hidden “window” was situated in such a way that when it was opened at a precisely calculated moment it admitted a beam of sunlight that struck the statue of Serapis on the lips. In addition, there was an image of Sol and his quadriga made of “very pure” iron that could be set in motion with the aid of hidden magnetic rocks in the ceiling so that the statue appeared to the viewers to rise into the air of its own accord.

This “kiss of Sol” was a renowned event, and it would appear that these lamps depicting the “kiss” were sold as souvenirs at or near the temple. That in itself places us squarely in the religious sphere, at one of the most spectacular temples of the Roman world. At first glance, therefore, one would conclude that here, surely, we are dealing with the image type [sol] used to depict the traditional sun god. But if we look more closely at the evidence it becomes clear that matters are not so straightforward. Neither the lamps nor the passages in Rufinus and Quodvultdeus indicate to what extent Sol was presented as, or perceived to be an independent actor in this kiss. According to Rufinus, an attendant proclaimed: surrexit Sol, ut valedicens Serapi discedat ad propria (the Sun has risen to return to his own, saying farewell to Sarapis) as the iron statuette began to move, but that still doesn’t tell us very much. Was Sol considered to be a god in the same league as Sarapis, or was his (uncontested) divinity of a different type? Perhaps the question should not be framed in these terms. Instead we should note that there was, apparently, no reason to differentiate, iconographically, between Sol kissing Sarapis and the standard image types [sol], except that his arm may be depicted embracing Sarapis; he is clearly depicted performing an action, namely kissing his counterpart. Iconographically, then, there is a clear difference with the mythological scenes in which Sol’s iconography was much freer and noticeably more independent of the standard image types [sol]. What we have here is the standard image type uncharacteristically performing an action. The closest parallels for this are

---

308 G1.a.6, 30, 33, 40, 42, 47, 51, 67, 120, 127, 130, 139-142; G1.g.2; G2.a.1-3, 6, 8, 10-14, 16-17

the Mithraic panel scenes in which Sol and Mithras are depicted in various actions.

The Mithraic scenes are much more elaborate, however, than the small images on the circular discs on oil lamps under discussion here. As with coins we should bear in mind that these lamp-disc images evoke a famous monument or, in this case, event and can do so without incorporating in detail the more subtle iconographic (and ritual) pointers that may contain information essential to that main monument or ritual. Of particular interest in this respect would have been the iconography of the magnetic statuette of iron. It is not inconceivable that this statuette had iconographic pointers that differentiated it from the standard image type [sol] which could not easily be transferred to the lamp-disc images. There is no evidence for this, and I do not think it likely, but there is no evidence against this either. The absence of essential, but subtle pointers on the lamp-images may reflect a lack of space or be the result of “translating” ritual action into a small fixed image.

Lost in Translation
We cannot, then, take for granted that the image type [sol] as depicted on the lamps faithfully reflects the iconographic details of the ritual itself. But leaving aside the imponderables, I think that in fact, based on what we know of the ritual itself, it is safe to assume that the lamps translate into the visual language of the Romans an aspect of the ritual that in photographic terms was actually quite different. The lamps, in my opinion, directly illustrate the actual ritual moment when the rays of sunlight briefly fell upon the lips of the statue of Sarapis after the hidden window was opened. We should bear in mind that these rays of light admitted into the cella of the temple did not symbolize the sun nor did the statue symbolize Sarapis, nor did the ritual symbolize some far-off meeting of the two. Rather, the rays were the kiss of the sun falling on the lips of the cultic embodiment of Sarapis. The ritual was not symbolic of some actual but far-off divine encounter in the haunts of the gods, but consisted of the real thing: Sol kissing Sarapis. The lamps translate that actual, witnessed event into Roman visual language, in which the image type [sol] stands for those actual rays of light and, by extension, their source, the fiery orb in the sky we call the sun. What the image evoked, in the mind’s eye of the intended viewer, then, was not Sol striding across some heavenly floor to kiss his counterpart Sarapis, but rather the rays of light that struck the lips of Sarapis’ statue at the moment suprême of a major (and no doubt impressive) ritual.310

I cannot prove that this is what these lamp-disc images were meant to evoke in the viewer. We know too little about the details of the ritual and the iconography of the iron statue of Sol to exclude alternatives. But from the point of view of the image type [sol] this explanation is not only feasible, but likely. We have already seen that the anthropomorph image of the sun is not a mimetic image. That Romans did not depict the sun as an orb is a characteristic of Roman art, and in particular of the non-mimetic tradition within Roman art. The Romans considered the sun god to be a fiery orb, but depicted him in Roman art as a nude, beardless, radiate youth, in bust, full-figure, or on his quadriga, because that was the established and accepted visual sign for Sol, not because that was how artist or patron conceived him.

310 I see no indication that the image on the lamp refers to the iron statuette. It rose into the air, but did not kiss Sarapis, and it symbolized Sol’s departure, not his embrace.
A Roman artist wishing to depict the rays of sun touching the lips of Sarapis, poetically described as a kiss of Sol and ritually enacted because of its significance, was thus bound by the strict visual conventions of Roman art and did not have much choice in how to do so. Using any other visual form than the standard image type [sol] to portray the rays falling through the widow was not a real option, just as using another word than sol or helios to identify the one planting the kiss would have been difficult. What is emerging clearly from our review is that just as the words s/Sol and h/Helios were used as a matter of course by pagans, Jews and Christians alike in the Roman imperial period and (well) beyond, so too the image types [sol] could be used by all three groups alike to depict the s/Sun. The anthropomorphism does not denote the sun’s divinity or illustrate how the sun was pictured to be, but is simply the form that the sign, by social agreement, happened to take. We can explain why it first took that form by tracing the historical development of ancient concepts of divinity. That it kept that form is a result of the way Roman art functioned. The visual signifier remained the same even as the signified changed and evolved, changing the nature of the sign from in origin iconic to indexical and even symbolic as early as the end of the Roman Republic.

To depict the bust of Sol embracing and kissing the bust of Sarapis is therefore a logical way to visualize the rays of sunlight on the lips of the statue according to the norms of Roman visual communication. What the image does not tell us is whether the attendant, announcing the departure of the sun ad propria sua thought of the sun as sol or Sol. On the contrary, the image implies that there was no such contrast, which means that when we, in our texts, decide whether to capitalize Sol/Sun or not, we are imposing a differentiation on the meaning of the image type (and the word) that was absent in antiquity.

If, as seems likely, the image type [sol] kissing Sarapis on the lamps from Alexandria is a visualization of the rays of light striking the lips of the statue of Sarapis, we have here an excellent example of the problems that arise in translating ancient ritual into ancient art, and ancient art into modern academic text. In particular it illustrates how careful we must be not to imagine an anthropomorph sun god as the signified of the anthropomorph signifier the image type [sol]

Conclusions
Our brief review of the lamps with images of Sol has further strengthened the evidence for the early emergence and long continuity for the image type [sol]. The fact that we have a substantial number of lamps depicting Sol, from most parts of the Empire, further attests to the fact that the image types [sol] were readily recognized by broad segments of society over a long period of time. The discussion of the Alexandrian lamps depicting Sol kissing Sarapis has reinforced the sense that we should not take the anthropomorph form of the image types [sol] as evidence that Sol continued to be perceived, in Roman times, as an anthropomorph god driving a chariot. We best understand these lamps if we see the image type [sol] as a visualization of the distinctly aniconic, but hugely significant rays of light entering the dusky cella of the Serapeum.

With lamps we have also come into contact with objects that any average Roman could routinely expect to handle. This is also the case with our next category, engraved gems and glass pastes.
H. Intaglio

Note that the catalogue section on intaglio is organized along slightly different lines. Each subsection consists of iconographically closely similar images. Hence the description is given in the heading of each (sub)section and is applicable for each intaglio in that section. Only additional information (if any) is given in the entries of the intaglios individually.

In the descriptions, left and right refer to the gem-image, not the impression. If Sol is described as having his right arm raised, the impression would depict him with his left arm raised. In the case of cretule the description refers to the gem that made the impression, not to the impression itself.

The catalogue of intaglios is divided into two parts, H and HA. Most intaglios are gathered under H, but those still set in ancient rings are presented separately in HA, using the same iconographic subdivisions. This is done for dating purposes. It is notoriously difficult to date intaglios accurately, the main criteria being style, cutting techniques and (to some extent) material and form. Ancient rings, on the other hand, can more often be dated with a reasonable degree of precision, based on type. Thus it is often possible to give an intaglio set in an ancient ring a terminus ante quem without relying on the engraving itself.

H1. Sol in quadriga to left

H1a. ...nude but for chlamys, whip in right hand, reins in left hand.

-1. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 27463
   Aquileia
   Glass paste
   Identification as Sol in quadriga very uncertain (according to Sena Chiesa it is not a quadriga at all, but one horse on undulating terrain)
   50 BC-AD 50
   Sena Chiesa 1966, #1070
   Sena Chiesa states that this is not a ringstone, but a decorative element, possibly connected with representations of the zodiac.

-2. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 27561
   Aquileia
   Glass paste
   Identification as Sol not certain
   50 BC-AD 50

-3. Göttingen, Univ. G.126
   Unknown
   Heliotrope, damaged
   Head of Sol very close to edge; no rays?
   Late 1st c. AD (AGD)
   AGD III, 130 #378

   Unknown
   Sard
   -
   Late 1st - 2nd c. AD
   Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1479

-5. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25935
   Aquileia
   Green jasper
   Identification as Sol not certain
   2nd c. AD
   Sena Chiesa 1966, 308 #865

-6. Private collection
   Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
   Cornelian
   -
   2nd c. AD (Henig)
   Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #63; Matern 2002, 67, 220 Q89.

   Unknown
   Green jasper
   -
   2nd c. AD
   Unpublished

-8. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25981
   Aquileia
   Green jasper, damaged
   Identification as Sol not certain
   Late 2nd-3rd c. AD
   Sena Chiesa 1966, 308 #866

-9. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 26202
   Aquileia
   Black jasper
   Identification as Sol not certain
   Late 2nd-3rd c. AD
   Sena Chiesa 1966, 308 #864
-1. Berlin, Ant. 6314
  Unknown
  Glass paste
  -
  1st c. AD
  Furtwängler 1896, #6314

-2. Berlin, Ant. 8160
  Unknown
  Nicolo
  -
  late 1st-early 2nd c. AD

-3. Munich, Staatl. Münzsg. 2649
  Unknown
  Dark green heliotrope
  -
  2nd - early 3rd c. AD (MK)
  AGD I-3, 84 #2649; Matern 2002, 67, 220 Q85.

-4. Pl. 64.6
  Kassel, Staatl. Kunstschr. 158
  Unknown
  Heliotrope
  Inscribed IA (neg.)
  3rd c. AD (MK); 2nd c. AD (Matern).
  LIMC Helios/Sol 148; Matern 2002, 67, 220 Q82 (with refs.).

-5. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. XII 890
  Unknown
  Heliotrope
  -
  3rd c. AD

-6. Art Market
  Unknown
  Heliotrope
  -
  Undated
  Basel, Münzen und Medaillen AG
  Sonderliste L (1969), #49

-7. Private collection
  Romula
  Cornelian
  Star above horses
  Undated
  Berciu & Petolescu 1976, 55 #60

H1c. ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand.

-1. Florence, Arch. Mus. inv. Migl. 1511
  Unknown
  Green jasper
  Crescent and star in field.
  1st c. AD
  Tondo & Vanni 1990, 172 nr. 77 & 219 fig. 77.
2. Sevilla, Mus. Arqueol. Itálica
Haematite
- 2nd c. AD
Lopez de la Orden 1990, 120-21 #50

-3. Pl. 64.7
Museum of London
Green Jasper
- AD 150-200 (terminus ante quem).
The intaglio was found in the upper portion of the backfill of the well, which also contained pottery dated to AD 150 - 200.

-4. Private collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Red jasper
- 2nd c. AD (Henig)
Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #64

-5. Private collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Green Jasper
- 2nd c. AD (Henig)
Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #65

-6. Berlin, Ägypt. Mus., 9833
Unknown
Plasma
Reverse: Isis & Nephthys stand on a scarab with open wings and protect the remains of Osiris
2nd c. AD (P.)
Philipp 1986, 82-3 #113

-7. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2650
Nijmegen? (formerly Smetius-collection; cf. Maaskant-Kleibrink 1986, 115 app. 31)
Heliotrope, damaged
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
LIMC H 35; Matern 2002, 126, 243-4 166.10c

-8. Cardiff, National Museum of Wales
Caerleon, legionary fortress baths, frigidarium drain
Heliotrope
- Stratified ante quem date of AD 150-230
Zienkiewicz 1986, 134-5 nr. 38, pl. 10; Matern 2002, 243 I66.3

-9. Nijmegen, Valkhof Mus. GN BA VII 65f/G149
Winseling (The Netherlands)
Red cornelian, damaged
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
Maaskant-Kleibrink 1986, 77 #149; Matern 2002, 126, 243-4 I66.11

-10. Columbia (Miss.), Univ. 68.317
Unknown Jasper
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 147; Matern 2002, 126, 243 I66.5

-11. Private collection
Caesarea Maritima
Heliotrope
- 3rd c. AD (MK)
Hamburger 1968, 26 # 21; Matern 2002, 126, 243 I66.6

Unknown
Green Jasper
- Later 3rd c. AD (MK)
Svoronos 1913, 199

Unknown
Green Jasper
- 3rd c. AD (D.-M.)
Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 91 #275; Matern 2002, 125, 242-3 I63.11b
-14. Private collection
   Romula
   Heliotrope, damaged
   -
   Undated
   Berciu & Petolescu 1976, 55 #61

-15. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Mus. CM.52.1904
   Unknown
   Heliotrope
   -
   Undated
   Matern 2002, 67, 220 Q79

-16. Private collection
   Unknown
   Greenish-black jasper
   Seven stars, each with a vowel, in field. On edge, inscription:
   ΕΚΘΕΣΤΡΙΑΛΑΡΠΙΑΙΠΛ.ΛΩΝΚΑΤΡΑ
   ΠΕΡΚ.; on reverse, inscription (pos.?):
   ΣΟΟΜΒΑΟΓΗΒΑΟΑ
   ΣΟΟΜΒΑΛΛΑΚΑΜ
   ΣΟΟΜΒΑΗΩΕΑΕΩΙΕΜΜΕΝΕΘΑΡ..
   Undated
   Bonner 1950, 291 #228

H1d. ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised,
reins in left hand.

-1. Pl. 62.4
   Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus. I 624
   Acquired in Rome
   Glass paste, damaged
   -
   1st c. AD (MK)
   Fossing 1929, 590

-2. Pl. 62.5
   Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus. I 625
   Acquired in Rome
   Glass paste, damaged, part missing
   Identification as Sol uncertain
   1st c. AD
   Fossing 1929, 591

-3. Private collection
   Castlesteads
   Heliotrope
   -
   2nd c. AD (Henig)
   Henig 1974, 13 #35

-4. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2651
   Unknown
   Dark green jasper
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
   AGD I-3, 84 #2651; Matern 2002, 126, 243-4 I66.10b

   Unknown
   Jasper
   -
   Early 3rd c. AD (MK)
   Svoronos 1913, 198

-6. Utrecht, Geldmudeum 1016
   Unknown
   Dark green jasper
   Inscription on the reverse:
   ΑΥΟΑΕΠΘΕ/ΜΕΙΝοΙΙΗΕ/ΚΙΜΟΥΙΘΩΙ/ΜΦ
   3rd c. AD (MK)
   Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 355 #1116

H1da ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised,
reins in left hand; a star and the bust of
Luna on upturned crescent above the
horses; a snake below and in front of the
horses.

-1. Naples, Mus. Arch. 27036/1191
   Unknown
   Green jasper
   On the reverse: schematic ouroboros, two
   letters and a star
   3rd c. AD (SEH)
   Pannuti 1994, #271

H1c. ...nude but for chlamys, reins in both hands.

-1. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus., Excavation Inv. 470
   Oescus (excavations of 1948)
   Dark red cornelian
   -
   1st half 2nd c. AD (D.M.); 1st-early 2nd c. AD
   (MK)
   Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 91 #276; Matern
   2002, 67, 220 Q86.

-2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Lewis Coll.
   Mons Pagus, bought at Smyrna in 1891
   Red and yellow agate, mottled
   -
H1f. ...nude but for chlamys, action and attributes indistinct.
-1 - 6. Tripoli?
    Cyrene
    Cretula (clay impression)
    Identification as Sol uncertain
    1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC - 1\textsuperscript{st} c. AD
    Maddoli 1963/4, 113 #694-99

-7. Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum 14383
    Kastell Niederbieber
    Onyx
    2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD
    Sol ascending his quadriga

-8. Berlin, Ant. 7880
    Unknown
    Cornelian, damaged; representation of Sol largely erased.
    On the reverse an eagle between two standards
    2nd-3rd c. AD
    Furtwängler 1896, 7880

-9. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2648
    Unknown
    Reddish brown cornelian
    Sol appears to be holding a branch or a wreath in his right hand.
    2nd-3rd c. AD
    AGD I-3, 83 #2648; Matern 2002, 126, 243-4 I66.10a

-10- 26. Berlin, Ant., 4585-4601
    Unknown
    Three green, three green and white, four brown and white, one violet, one black, and five brown glass pastes
    Non vidi. Some may be Sol, but unlikely in the case of 965, charioteer with wreath, and 972, charioteer with wreath and palm branch.
    Mainly 50 BC - AD 50
    Fossing 1929, 964-975

H1fa ...nude but for chlamys, action and attributes indistinct, surrounded by a zodiac circle.
-1. Unknown
   Unknown
   Chalcedony
   - undated
   Lippert 1767, I, 194

H1g. ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, reins in right hand.
-1. Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. IX B 607
   Aquileia
   Dark green jasper, damaged
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 150; Matern 2002, 126, 243-4 I66.12

H1h. ...nude but for chlamys, torch in right hand, reins in left hand.
-1. Pl. 64.8
   Berlin, Ant. 2667
   Unknown
   Chalcedony
   - mid 1st-early 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD (SEH)
   Furtwängler 1896, 2667

-2. Unknown
   Unknown
   Red jasper
   -
   Undated
   Lippert 1767, I.IV, 81 #191

H1ha. ...nude but for a chlamys, torch in left hand, reins in right hand, within a zodiac.
-1. Unknown
   Unknown
   Amethyst
   Inscription CEAEYKOC below chariot.
   Early 1\textsuperscript{st} c. AD
   Matern 2002, 67, 221 Q91 (with ref.).
H1i  ...dressed in a long chiton and clamys, right hand raised, globe in left hand, preceded by Lucifer, looking back, and bearing two torches.
-1.  Unknown
   Unknown
   Red Jasper
   On edge: AΞΩΝΙΕΗΠΙΟΔΙΑ; on reverse: ΑΑΧΑΡΜΑΡ ΜΑΡΑΦΒΑ ΣΥΝΘΡΗΣΚΟΝ ΜΕ ΑΓΗΡΑΤΟΝ ΚΕΧΑΡΙΤΩΜΕΝΗ
   Undated
   Carnegie 1908, 173 N51

H1j  No additional description available.
-1.  Museum Carnuntinum 18 043
   Carnuntum
   Heliotrope
   -
   Undated
   Dembski 1969, 118 nr. 226
-2.  Private collection
   Carnuntum
   Brownish red jasper
   -
   Undated
   Dembski 1969, 118 nr. 227
-3.  Museum Carnuntinum 17 912
   Carnuntum
   Carnelian
   -
   Undated
   Dembski 1969, 118 nr. 228
-4.  Cambridge, Fitzwilliam B 323
   Unknown
   Heliotrope
   -
   2nd half 1st c. AD
   Matern 2002, 243 166.4

H2  Sol on quadriga to right
H2a  ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand.
-1.  Utrecht, Geldmuseum 138
    Unknown (Thoms coll., i.e. probably bought in Italy)
    Agate
    Star and crescent under front hooves of horses; in exergue: ευρωγε (inversed).
    1st c. AD
    Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 231-2 #578

H2b  ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, reins in right hand.
-1.  Pl. 64.9
    Berlin, Ant. 2668
    Unknown
    Cornelian
    -
    2nd-3rd c. AD (SEH)
    Furtwängler 1896, 2668
-2.  Berlin, Ägypt. Mus. 10993
    "Nilkiesel" (heliotrope?)
    Reverse: ΑΗΙΚΟ/ΗΙΑΙΤΙΟΗ/ΗΒΙΑΟ/Υ
    1st-2nd AD (Philipp) 2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
    Philipp 1986, 43-4 #33; Matern 2002, 126, 243 166.1

H2c  ...nude but for chlamys, whip in left hand, reins in right hand; behind him winged Victory holding a wreath above his head.
-1.  Pl. 63.4
    Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 1568
    Unknown
    Heliotrope
    -
    2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
    LIMC Helios/Sol 203; Matern 2002, 66-7, 220 Q84.

H2d  ...nude but for chlamys, reins in both hands.
-1.  London, Guildhall Mus. 19067
    London, Walbrook, Bucklersbury House site
    Heliotrope
    -
    1st-2nd AD (Henig)
    Henig 1978, 13 #34

H3  Sol on frontal quadriga, two horses jumping to the left, two to the right
H3a  ...nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand
-1.  Pl. 64.10-11
    Paris, Cab. Méd. M4425 (C1479ter)
    Unknown
    Cornelian
    Reverse: Portrait(?) bust of bearded male, r.
    1st-early 2nd c. AD; portrait on reverse modern.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue number</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Onyx</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Gundel 1992, 249 nr. 156; Matern 2002, 54, 214 Q42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Harrow School Museum 828</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dark cornelian</td>
<td>3rd c. AD (Middleton)</td>
<td>Middleon 1991, 55 #51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Munich, Prähist. Staatsslgl., 1984.3522</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Cornelian</td>
<td>2nd half 3rd c. AD (Z.) (possibly much earlier)</td>
<td>Zählhaas 1985, 41 #44; Matern 2002, 125, 242 163.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vienna, Kunsthst. Mus. IX B 608</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Sard</td>
<td>2nd half 2nd - 1st half 3rd c. AD; Matern 2002, 125, 242-3 163.12</td>
<td>AGWien III, 305-6 nr. 2761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2645</td>
<td>Unpublished</td>
<td>Reddish orange cornelian</td>
<td>3rd c. AD (AGD)</td>
<td>LIMC Helios/Sol 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Harrow School Museum 828</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dark cornelian</td>
<td>3rd c. AD (Middleton)</td>
<td>Middleon 1991, 55 #51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Munich, Prähist. Staatsslgl., 1984.3522</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Cornelian</td>
<td>2nd half 3rd c. AD (Z.)</td>
<td>Zählhaas 1985, 41 #44; Matern 2002, 125, 242 163.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Cornelian</td>
<td>Early 3rd c. AD (V.)</td>
<td>Vollenweider 1984, #442.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Red jasper</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Carnegie 1908, 52-3 D1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, Bonner coll. 5</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mottled jasper, green, yellow &amp; red</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>LIMC Abraxas 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Heliotrope, damaged</td>
<td>Six stars; inscription (pos.): MΙΧΑΗΛΣΑΒΑΒ[θ]ΦΑΝΑ. Reverse: winged Victory with wreath and palm-branch; inscription (pos.): ΡΑΧΑΗΛΑΒΡΑΣΑΞ</td>
<td>Undated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H3aa ...within a zodiac**

1. Florence
   - Onyx
   - Gundel 1992, 249 nr. 156; Matern 2002, 54, 214 Q42

**H3b ...nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised.**

1. Art narket, Medusa-art.com MA531
   - Unknown
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD
   - Unpublished

2. Boston, MFA 1963.1524
   - Athens
Sard
May hold an indistinct object in his left hand.
2nd - 4th c. AD (Vermeule)
Vermeule 1966, 18-35.

H3c  ...nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, reins in left.
-1. New York, MMA 81.6.173
Unknown
Yellowish Chalcedony
1st-2nd c. AD (LIMC H 32)
LIMC H 32; Matern 2002, 125, 242 I63.1

-2. Private collection
Unknown
Cornelian
2nd-3rd c. AD
Sternberg AG, fixed price catalogue 10, 1998, #647

-3. Debrecen (Hungary), Déri Mus: R XI 1.10
Unknown (but produced locally?)
Cornelian
3rd c. AD
LIMC Helios/Sol 125 Matern 2002, 125, 242 I63.3

Unknown
Jasper
3rd-early 4th c. AD (MK)
Svoronos 1913, #197; Richter 1971, 33 #86

-5. Princeton Univ., Art Mus. 40-375
Unknown
Jasper (?)
3rd-4th c. AD (Forbes)
Forbes 1978, 53-5 #37

H3d  ...dressed in a long chiton and chlamys, right hand raised, globe in left.
-1. London, BM 1663 (1772,0315.492)
Unknown
Red jasper
Reverse: Head of city of Caesarea (l.), veiled, crowned with Mount Argaios; inscr.
(pos.): EYT/YXI (left of head), BOK/ONTI (right of head).
3rd c. AD (Walters)
Walters 1926, 179 #1663; Matern 2002, 125, 243 I64.2b

-2. New York, MMA 81.6.297
Unknown
Brownish red jasper, damaged
Above Sol inscr. (pos.): ABAANAΘANAΛABA; in exergue (pos.): 
ΤΥΞΕΥΙ (or TVΞΕVI), with star below. 
Reverse: Mithras in the act of killing the bull.
3rd c. AD (LIMC); 2nd c. AD (SEH)
LIMC Helios/Sol 128
Merkelbach (1984, 394-5 fig. 168) gives an inaccurate description (Sol definitely does not hold a whip in his right hand as M. states); his suggestion that in TYΞΕΥΙ the ζ be read as an inverted E and the I as T (thus creating EYT twice, once inverted and once positive) is ingenious (αβλαναθαναλβα is a palindrome) but farfetched (both beta's in αβλαναθαναλβα are pos.).

H3e  ...nude but for a chlamys, left hand raised, whip and reins in left hand.
-1. Pl. 62.6
Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus. I 628
Acquired in Rome
Cornelian
Small flying Victory crowning Sol from l. 
Two letters to either side: I (or inverted F?) V on the left, F (pos.) E (or I?) on the right. 
Reverse: Nereid on sea-horse.
50 BC - 50 AD (MK); 3rd c. AD (LIMC)
LIMC Helios/Sol 204; Matern 2002, 125, 243 I64.1

-2. Unknown
Egypt
Cornelian
1st-early 2nd c. AD (SEH)
El-Mohsen El-Khachab 1963, 154-5 #22, pl. XXV #21

-3. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25497
Aquileia
Green jasper
2nd c. AD
Sena Chiesa 1966, #87; Matern 2002, 125, 242 I63.1

Private collection
Unknown
Dark red translucent glass paste
Gesture and attribute of r. hand difficult to make out.
Early 3rd c. AD (V.)
Vollenweider 1984, 258 #443.

H3f  ...gesture and attributes indistinguishable
Xanten, chance find, before 1900.
Dark brown jasper, heavily damaged
Most of the body of Sol missing, but he appears to have left hand raised. Obverse:
cock-headed, snake-footed Abrasax with whip and shield. On shield (pos.) IAW;
along border (pos.) КРЕВКЕНТЮЮЮБЕНГИЮС
(KрeвκeнтиююBeпeпиюс). In exergue:
АВРΑΣΑΣΞΣΑΒΑΩ.
2nd-3rd c. AD (Krug)
Krug 1980, #47; Matern 2002, 125, 242 I63.8

-2. "Unknown
Unknown
Banded onyx
- Undated (modern?)
Smith & Hutton 1908 #155

H3g ...dressed in a long chiton and chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left.
-1. Pl. 64.12
Paris, Cab. Méd. S359
Unknown
Green jasper, damaged
Two stars to the left, crescent and star to the right of Sol's head; in exergue:
\[\text{I, o}A\text{BPA}\text{C}A\text{A}z.\]
Amulet, not a ringstone.
2nd-3rd (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 129

H4  Sol in frontal or three-quarter quadriga, horses next to each other.
H4a  ...whip in left hand, reins in right hand.
-1. "Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. DFa 582
Unknown
Heliotrope
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)

-2. "Oxford, Ashmolean, Evans sealing, sheet 17, L Dalmatia, either Aenona (Nona/Nin) or Epidaurum (Ragusa Vecchia)
Cornelian (impression of -), damaged
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (Middleton)
Middleton 1991, 54-55 #50

H4b ...left hand raised, reins in right hand
-1. "Private Collection
Caesarea Maritima
Heliotrope
- 1st-2nd (MK)
Hamburger 1968, 26 #20; Matern 2002, 125, 242 I63.6

-2. Pl. 63.3
Hannover, Kestner Mus. K878
Unknown
Cornelian, damaged
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
LIMC Helios/Sol 146; Matern 2002, 126, 243 I66.7

H4c ...reins in both hands.
-1. Pl. 64.13
Berlin, Ant. 2666
Unknown
Chalcedony
- 1st c. AD (SEH/MK)
Furtwangler 1896, #2666; LIMC Helios 34; Matern 2002, 215 Q47

H4d ...gesture and attributes indistinguishable.
-1. "Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 48591
Aquileia
Haematite
- 1st c. AD (Sena Chiesa)
Sena Chiesa 1966, #1071
On the photograph the head of Sol (with 4 or 5 rays) is vaguely visible above the heads of...
the two central horses. Sena Chiesa omits this in her description.

-2. Tripoli?
Cyrene
Cretula (ancient clay impression)
The auriga is clearly visible but the impression is too indistinct to determine whether he is Sol.
75 BC - AD 113
Maddoli 1963/4, 113 #700

H4da ...gesture and attributes indistinguishable, within zodiac circle.
-1. Unknown
Unknown
Onyx
On reverse Luna in biga
Undated
Lippert 1767, I, 192

H4e ...sceptre in right hand.
-1. Pl. 64.14
Berlin, Ant. 7198
Unknown
Sardonyx
-1st half 1st c. AD (MK)
Furtwängler 1896, #7198; Matern 2002, 67, 219 Q75

H4f ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, the Dioscuri on horseback to the left and right of the quadriga, facing inwards.
-1. Pl. 63.2
Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. M38
Unknown
Glass paste
-50 BC - AD 50 (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 267

H4g ...whip in right hand.
-1. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25451
Aquileia
Dark cornelian
-2nd-3rd c. AD
Sena Chiesa 1966, #1072
The very sketchily executed figure of Sol is described by Sena Chiesa as a star, which it closely resembles (vertical bar and X).

However, the presence of the whip (not described by Sena Chiesa, but clearly visible on the photograph), shows that the figure is Sol.

H4h Apollo/Helios on quadriga to left, nude but for chlamys billowing out behind him, quiver behind his shoulder, torch in either hand. Below the horses lie Oceanus (?) and a nymph (?)
-1. Naples, Mus. Naz. 26806/248
Unknown
Cornelian, cracked
- late 1st c. BC
LIMC Helios/Sol 144; Matern 2002, 61 n. 412, 67-8, 77, 97, 220-1 Q90 (with refs.).

H5. Sol/Usil on frontal triga, both hands raised, possibly bearing unidentifiable objects.

H5a ..., Sol radiate.
-1. Pl. 64.15
Paris, Cab. Méd. C1480
Unknown
Cornelian, scarab
- 3rd c. BC? (MK) - a globolo style
Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1480

H5b Sol not radiate
-1. Pl. 64.16
Paris, Cab. Méd. C1481
Unknown
Cornelian, scarab
- 3rd c. BC? (MK) - a globolo style
Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1481

Unknown
Cornelian, scarab
- 3rd c. BC? (MK) - a globolo style
Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1482

Unknown
Cornelian, scarab
- 3rd c. BC? (MK) - a globolo style
Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1483
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Material/Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. XII 918</td>
<td>Unknown, brownish orange</td>
<td>1st c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #79; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.14c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Berlin, Ant. 3481</td>
<td>Unknown, brownish violet</td>
<td>1st c. AD</td>
<td>Furtwängler 1896, #3481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paris, Cab. Méd. Fr 2868</td>
<td>Unknown, jasper</td>
<td>Late 1st-early 2nd c. AD (MK)</td>
<td>LIMC Abrasax 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 26224</td>
<td>Aquileia, jasper</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #74; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 51921</td>
<td>Aquileia, cornelian, damaged</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #76; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 26218</td>
<td>Aquileia, black jasper</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #78; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 50806</td>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25986</td>
<td>Aquileia, black jasper</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #83; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Malibu, Getty Mus. 83.AN.353.2</td>
<td>Tunisia, heliotrope</td>
<td>Late 1st-early 2nd c. AD (MK)</td>
<td>Spier 1992, 134 #366; Matern 2002, 106-7, 235 I24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Berlin, Ant. 8651</td>
<td>Unknown, heliotrope</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Furtwängler 1896, #8651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vienna, Kunsth. Mus. IX B 1524</td>
<td>Unknown, heliotrope</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #75; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. XII 910, 1023</td>
<td>Unknown, green jasper</td>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #78; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 24829</td>
<td>Aquileia, cornelian</td>
<td>2nd-3rd c. AD</td>
<td>Sena Chiesa 1966, #75; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-14. **Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25937**
   **Aquileia**
   **Jasper**
   - Late 2nd-3rd c. AD
   Sena Chiesa 1966, #77; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1e

-15. **Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 26204**
   **Aquileia**
   **Green jasper**
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD
   Sena Chiesa 1966, #80; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1h

-16. **Udine, Mus. Civ., 1325/109**
   **Aquileia?**
   **Heliotrope**
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD
   Tomaselli 1993, 47 #13

-17. **Cardiff, National Museum of Wales**
   **Caerleon, legionary fortress baths, frigidarium drain**
   **Heliotrope**
   Three horizontal lines on torso, which are difficult to interpret. Zienkiewicz believes they indicate a tunica, but there is no indication of a tunica below the waste. On the other hand, the lines would appear to be too uniform and linear to indicate musculature.
   *Stratified ante quem* date of ca. AD 150-230
   Ziekiewicz 1986, 134 nr. 36, pl. 10

-18. **Utrecht, Rijksmuseum het Catharijneconvent (formerly Aartsbischoppelijk Museum)**
   **Unknown**
   Glass paste imitating nicolo
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD? (SEH)
   Snijder 1932, 19, fig. 6
   The intaglio is part of the elaborate decoration of the cover of the Evangelistarium of St. Ansfridus.

-19. **Berlin, Ant. 8653**
   **Unknown**
   Heliotrope
   Inscription (neg.): CIAONIA XEPE
   Late 2nd-3rd c. AD (SEH/MK)
   Furtwängler 1896, 8653; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.2

-20. **Pl. 64.18**
   **Berlin, Ägypt. Mus. 11928**
   **Unknown**
   Red jasper
   On reverse: ΨΠΟ & pictograms
   2nd-3rd c. AD (Philipp); 2nd c. AD (MK/SEH)
   Philipp 1986, 44-5 #35; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.3

   **Unknown**
   Heliotrope
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD (Krug)
   Krug 1980, 226 #294; Matern 2002, 106-7, 235 I24.6

-22. **Cologne, Röm. Germ. Mus. 472**
   **Unknown**
   Red jasper
   Identification as Sol uncertain - attributes not clear
   2nd-3rd c. AD (Krug)
   Krug 1980, 235 #347

-23. **Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2647**
   **Environs of Nijmegen? (formerly Smetius-coll.)**
   **Cornelian**
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 95; AGD I-3, 83 #2647; Maaskant-Kleibrink 1986, 115 App.#39; Matern 2002, 106-7, 235 I24.9b

-24. **Nürnberg, Germ. Nationalmus. SiSt 1626**
   **Unknown**
   Heliotrope, damaged
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD (Weiß); 2nd c. AD (MK)
   Weiß 1996, 78 #115

-25. **Paris, Cab. Méd. C1478**
   **Unknown**
   Agate
- Late 2nd-early 3rd c. AD
  Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1478

  Aquileia
  Green jasper
  -
  3rd c. AD
  Sena Chiesa 1966, #73; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1

  Aquileia
  Heliotrope
  -
  3rd c. AD
  Sena Chiesa 1966, #85; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1i

  Aquileia
  Green jasper
  -
  3rd c. AD
  Sena Chiesa 1966, #81; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1j

-29. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25683
  Aquileia
  Jasper
  -
  3rd c. AD
  Sena Chiesa 1966, #82; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.1j

-30. Udine, Mus. Civ., 1326/7
  Aquileia?
  Dark orange cornelian
  -
  3rd c. AD
  Tomaselli 1993, 47-8 #14

-31. Narbonne, Pal. d. Archevêques 38.1.4.6
  Narbonne, sarcophagus of Marcia Donata
  Glass paste nicolo
  -
  3rd c. AD (G.)
  Guiraud 1988, 91 #45

  Narbonne, sarcophagus of Marcia Donata
  Glass paste nicolo
  -
  3rd c. AD (G.)
  Guiraud 1988, 91 #45

-33. Tata, Kuny Domokos Museum K 2003
  Szöny (Brigetio)
  green jasper
  -
  1st half 3rd c. AD
  Gesztelyi 2001, 42 nr.28

-34. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus. 3740
  Pleven
  Dark green jasper
  -
  3rd c. AD (D.-M.)
  Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 91-2 #278;
  Matern 2002, 106-7, 235 I24.13a

-35. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus. 4015
  Lom district
  Heliotrope
  -
  3rd c. AD (D.-M.)
  Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 91 #277; Matern
  2002, 106-7 I24.13b

-36. Kassel, Staatl. Kunstsli. 159
  Unknown
  Cornelian
  Star and crescent in front of Sol
  3rd c. AD (AGD); late 2nd-3rd (MK)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 100; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.5b

-37. Kassel, Staatl. Kunstsli. 212
  Unknown
  Nicolo
  A star to either side of Sol's feet. Reverse: R
  HR (lig.) Anchor / EICVYC / XRECTVS / FABRIE / ANANIA / AME
  3rd c. AD
  LIMC Helios/Sol 99; Matern 2002, 106-7, 234 I24.5a

-38. Munich, Staatl. Münzsli. 2646
  Unknown
  Dark green jasper
  -
  Late 3rd c. AD (AGD)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 98 (refers incorrectly to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-40</td>
<td>Princeton Univ. Art Mus. 52-125</td>
<td>Unknown Heliotrope</td>
<td>3rd c. AD (Forbes)</td>
<td>Forbes 1978, 53 #36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-41</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
<td>Unknown Heliotrope</td>
<td>3rd c. AD (V.)</td>
<td>Vollenweider 1984, 259-60 #446; Matern 2002, 106-7, 235 I24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-43</td>
<td>Gloucester City Mus. Ashel Barn, Kingscote, Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Heliotrope</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Henig 1978, 113 App.#47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-45</td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
<td>Carnuntum Carnelian</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>H6aa ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand, next to a burning altar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-46</td>
<td>Museum Carnuntinum 17 792</td>
<td>Carnuntum Green jasper</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Dembski 1969, 115 nr. 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-48</td>
<td>Zalau, Mus. 16/1958, nr. 2</td>
<td>Porolissum Green jasper</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Teposu-Marinescu &amp; Lako 1973, 9 nr. 30, pl. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-49</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, Bonner coll. 30</td>
<td>Unknown Chalcedony</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>LIMC Abraxas 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-50</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Mus. CM.82.1982</td>
<td>Unkknow Sard, damaged</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>Nicholls 1983, 23 #82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-51</td>
<td>Private collection</td>
<td>Unknown Green jasper, damaged</td>
<td>Undated</td>
<td>LIMC Abraxas 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-1. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. A.631
Unknown
Light pinkish glass paste
- 
1st c. BC-1st c. AD (SEH/MK); 3rd c. AD (LIMC & AGD)
LIMC Helios/Sol 97
Unknown
Green jasper
3rd c. AD
Matern 2002, 106-7, 164, 235-6 I25.5
-9. Pl. 63.6
Göttingen G.75
Unknown
Heliotrope
- 
Late 3rd AD; 3rd c. (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 96; Matern 2002, 106-7, 164, 235 I25.6
-10. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2917
Unknown
Yellowish jasper-agate?
Reverse: OPBA/XAXX (neg.)
3rd-5th c. AD (AGD); 3rd c. AD (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 96
-11. Museum Carnuntinum 17 944
Carnuntum
Carnelian
- 
Undated
Dembski 1969, 117 nr. 223

H6ab ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand, standing on a globe between four serpents.
-1. Unknown
Afghanistan
Green jasper mottled red
Inscription: )( ) (ΑΑΟΚ ΜΑΦ ΟΑΝΝ.
Reverse: Abrasax with whip and shield. On shield: ΙΑΝΑΝΙΝΕ; in field ΤΑΙ ΤΑΙ. On edge: AEHIOYW
Undated
Carnegie 1908, 172 #N50

H6ac ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand, standing to the left of Nemesis who is flanked on her right by Minerva.
-1. Utrecht, Geldmuseum 1499
Unknown
Dark red cornelian
Seven stars and a crescent in the field
2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 327 #981; Matern 2002, 106-7, 236 I28; LIMC Nemesis 199.

H6ad ...dressed in chiton and chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand, next to a burning altar.

-1. Berlin, Ant. 8655
Unknown
Heliotrope
-1st-2nd c. AD (SEH)
Furtwängler 1896, #8655

Newstead, Roxburghshire
Cornelian
-2nd c. AD (H.)
Henig 1978, 12 #30; Matern 2002, 98, 170 n. 938, 240-1 156.
Henig interprets the burning altar as a corn ear, followed - tentatively - by Matern.

H6b ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand.

-1. Monistrol-sur-Loire, Dépôt de fouilles
Les Souils (Arlempdes, Haute-Loire)
Green jasper
Possibly an altar in front of Sol
2nd c. AD (G.)
Guiraud 1988, 91 #49

-2. Linares, Mus.
Cástulo
Black jasper
- Late 2nd-3rd c. AD
Lopez de la Orden 1990, 121-2 #52

-3. Private collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Cornelian
Very poor carving; Sol may be dressed in a short chiton
3rd c. AD
Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #67

-4. Munich, Staatl. Münzsgl. 2911
Unknown
Green jasper, lower half missing
Thirteen stars in field; inscription (pos.) around: ..PHNA**BAAN\[. Reverse: Abrasax with whip and shield; inscr. (pos.) around: JECE**IA
3rd c. AD (AGD)
LIMC Helios/Sol 102
The inscription on the obverse includes the palindrome ABAAN\A\ANAABA

-5. Munich, Staatl. Münzsgl. 2658
Unknown
Black jasper, damaged
Stars (or letters?) in field; identification as Sol by no means certain. Reverse: two figures with raised arms; stars.
5th c. AD (AGD)
AGD I-3, #2658

-6. Museum Carnuntinum 17 777
Carnuntum
Carnelian
- Undated
Dembski 1969, 116 nr. 222 (Note: Dembski 1969 117 nr. 224 with the same inventory number).

-7. Bucharest, Cab. Num. 648
Unknown
Green jasper
- Undated
Gramatopol 1974, 60 #279

H6ba ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, next to a burning altar

Unknown
Cornelian
- Late 2nd-early 3rd c. AD (MK)
Svoronos 1913, #196

Unknown
Cornelian
- Undated
Gramatopol 1974, 60 #280
H6bb ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, facing standing male figure, bearded, dressed in himation, staff.
See HA6bb

H6bc ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, facing Jupiter, seated, staff and thunderbolt. Between them an eagle, looking up towards Jupiter.
-1. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2461
Unknown
Red jasper
- 3rd c. AD (AGD)
LIMC Helios/Sol 234; Matern 2002, 110, 237 I38 (omits eagle).

H6bd ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, behind Hera (diadem and sceptre) facing Jupiter, seated, draped, staff. Between them an eagle, looking up towards Jupiter; a second eagle flies above, in the space between Hera and Jupiter; a third flies above the head of Jupiter. Mercurius stands behind Jupiter. Crescent and star above head of Sol.
-1. Pl. 64.19
Berlin, Ant. 2545
Unknown
Chalcedony
- 2nd c. AD (SEH)
LIMC H 332; Matern 2002, 106-7, 236 I27a
Both the LIMC and Furtwängler omit the eagles in their descriptions.

H6be ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, facing standing Jupiter, nude, staff, thunderbolt; between them an eagle looking up towards Jupiter.
-1. Pl. 63.8
Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus. 1677.
Acquired in Rome
Plasma
- Late 1st-early 2nd c. AD (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 233; Matern 2002, 106-7, 236 I28 (error in inv. nr.)

H6bf ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, facing seated Saturn, bearded, capite velato, staff and Harpe.
-1. Pl. 63.9
Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 1457
Bought in Beirut
Jasper
Star and crescent in field
Late 2nd-3rd c. AD
LIMC Helios/Sol 235

H6bg ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand; behind him to the right Victoria, winged, holds a wreath above his head.
-1. Sofia, Arch. Mus., 4714
Unknown
Dark green jasper, mottled brown
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (D.-M.)
Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 43 #58

H6bh ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, stands to the right of a very large burning altar (star and crescent above). Opposite him, on the other side of the altar, a nude male figure in the act of placing something on the altar (or possibly pouring a libation from a bowl).
-1. Berlin, Ant., 8656
Unknown
Green jasper
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (SEH/MK)
Furtwängler 1896, 119 #8656; Matern 2002, 106-7, 236 I27b (Matern describes a different gem on p. 240, 155 under the same inv. Number).

H6bi ...standing on the prow of a boat with six other figures (three fully anthropomorph, two animal-headed, one head missing, identified by Delatte-Derchain as Hermes/Anubis, Anubis, unidentified fig., Sarapis, Anubis, and the unidentified pilot of the ship) on deck; the scene is surrounded by an Ouroboros.
Unknown
Green jasper, damaged
On reverse: Triple Hecate with torch stands next to burning altar which is being approached by three animal-headed figures, of whom the first is in the act of pouring a
libation on the altar; inscriptions (pos.), above: TAPBAΩA/TPAMNHΦIBAW; below: XNHMEWIEPW/0VICPW 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH/MK) LIMC Ouroboros 4; Delatte-Derchain 1964, 215-217 # 294 (detailed description and interpretation); Matern 2002, 106-7, 236 130

H6c ...dressed in chiton and chlamys, left hand raised, globe in right hand.
-1. Private Collection
Unknown
Chalcedony, damaged
According to Bonner, each of the seven rays ended in a vowel, although ιυο are missing as the stone is chipped. Reverse: inscription (pos.): CEMCEIΛ/AMC [horizontal line with five upright bars] XIΩ/ΛABAANA/ΘANABAΦ/PHYX
Undated
Smith & Hutton 1908, 255; Bonner 1950, 290-291 # 223

H6ca ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, globe in right hand, next to a burning altar.
Rome
Heliotrope
Sol is leaning on a pillar. Undated
Righetti 1955, 11 nr. 5 pl. I,3; Matern 2002, 106-7, 164, 236 126, fig. 47.

H6cb ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, globe in right hand within a zodiac circle
Unknown
Silex, damaged
Star and crescent next to Sol's head. On bevelled edge inscription: ABAAΦ.AAB..... On reverse: small Harpocrates with Isis or Aphrodite (only partially preserved) and snake(?)
Late 2nd-3rd c. AD (MK) Gundel 1992, 249 # 157

H6d ...dressed in chiton and chlamys, globe in right hand, whip in left hand.
-
H6fa  ...nude but for chlamys, sceptre or staff in right hand, whip in left hand, facing a small orant with raised arms, dressed in tunica.

-1. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. XII 925
Unknown
Heliotrope, damaged

2nd c. AD (Z.-D.)
LIMC Helios/Sol 190; AGWien, 166 #1262; Matern 2002, 89, 226 G7

H6g  ...nude but for chlamys, sceptre in right hand, burning torch in left hand.

-1. Berlin, Ant. 8654
Unknown
Heliotrope

2nd c. AD (SEH)
Furtwängler's description is confused, mentioning an altar (of which there is no trace) and omitting the torch.

H6h  ...nude, right hand raised, surrounded by zodiac.

-1. Naples, Mus. Arch. 27159/1298
Unknown
Cornelian
Identification as Apollo-Sol very uncertain
Modern? (SEH/MK)
Pannuti 1994 #129

H6i  ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, sceptre in right hand.

-1. London, BM 1660
Unknown
Heliotrope ("bloodstone")

1st half 2nd c. AD (SEH)
Walters 1926, 179 #1660

H6j  ...right hand raised, details otherwise indistinguishable.

-1. Saint-Marcel (Indre), Centre de Recherches Archéologiques Saint-Marcel
Glass paste nicolo

Undated
Guiraud 1988, 91 #47

H6k  ...nude but for chlamys, two torches, facing Jupiter, staff, seated on throne. Between them an eagle, looking up at Jupiter.

-1. Nürnberg, Germ. Nationalmus. SiSt 1458
Unknown
Chalcedony

2nd c. AD (W.)
Weiß 1996, 49 #1

H6l  ...nude but for chlamys, embracing Luna (chiton) on the right.

-1. Berlin, Ägypt. Mus. 10133
Unknown
Magnetite
Reverse: Inscription (pos.): AEH/IOY/W
2nd c. AD (Philipp); 2nd-early 3rd (MK)
Philipp 1986, 44 #34

H6m  ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, details otherwise indistinguishable.

-1. Private collection
Dragonby, Lincolnshire?
Orange cornelian, damaged

Undated
Henig 1978, 12 #32

H6n  ...nude but for chlamys, whip in right hand, left arm hanging downwards above altar.

-1. Aquileia, Mus. Naz. 25938? (This inv. no. is given to two separate gems in Sena Chiesa's catalogue).
Aquileia
Plasma

2nd c. AD
Sena Chiesa 1966, #84; Matern 2002, 98, 227 G16

H6o  ...dressed in short chiton and chlamys, left hand raised, whip in r. hand.

-1. Private Collection
Caesarea Maritima
Heliotrope, damaged
Next to r. leg of Sol along the edge: AMI (pos.)
2nd-3rd c. AD (MK)
Hamburger 1968, 26 #19

-2. Pl. 63.10
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-4.</td>
<td>Paris, Cab. Méd. Fr. 2867</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>A star to either side of Sol. Reverse: ABPA/CA\textsuperscript{\textregistered}</td>
<td>3rd-4th c. AD (MK)</td>
<td>LIMC Abrasax 33a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
<td>Petronell</td>
<td>Green jasper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Private Collection</td>
<td>Carnuntum</td>
<td>Carnelian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H6r** ... nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, globe in left hand.

-1. Private collection
-2. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg A2207

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-1.</th>
<th>Munich, Staatl. Münzslg A2206</th>
<th>Acquired in Istanbul</th>
<th>Aquamarine (a very rarely-used stone in antiquity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3rd-1st c. BC (AGD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGD I-1, 92-3 #524; Matern 2002, 169, 182, 252 B56.4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.</td>
<td>Munich, Staatl. Münzslg A2207</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Heliotrope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3rd-1st c. BC (AGD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AGD I-1, 93 #525; Matern 2002, 169, 182, 253 B56.4b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/665, 74/2719, 74/4095, 74/6553 &amp; 74/9211</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>late 2\textsuperscript{nd} - early 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC (period of use).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 111 nr. Hλ 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/588</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>late 2\textsuperscript{nd} - early 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC (period of use).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 111 nr. Hλ 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-5. Delos, Mus. 74/8144
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 25 bis

-6. Delos, Mus. 74/6337
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 26

-7. Delos, Mus. 75/2845
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 27

-8. Delos, Mus. 75/3061
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 28

-9. Delos, Mus. 75/1873
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 29

-10. Delos, Mus. 74/1382
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 30

-11. Delos, Mus. 74/3330
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 31

-12. Delos, Mus. 74/1202, 74/5926 & 74/6338
Delos, Maison des sceaux

Three cretule with impressions of the same intaglio
Monogram below chin: M
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 32

-13. Delos, Mus. 74/7698
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 33

-14. Delos, Mus. 74/7751
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 34

-15. Delos, Mus. 74/7680
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 35

-16. Delos, Mus. 74/7617
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 36

-17. Delos, Mus. 74/5168
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 37

-18. Delos, Mus. 74/303
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 112 nr. H. 38

-19. Delos, Mus. 74/7628
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Period of Use</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/6345 &amp; 74/6745</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Two cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hλ. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/6345 &amp; 74/6745</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Two cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hλ. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 75/1796</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 75/1796</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/17</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hλ. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/17</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hλ. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/1690</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/1690</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 75/807, 75/963 &amp; 75/984</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Three cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 75/807, 75/963 &amp; 75/984</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Three cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 75/2321 &amp; 75/2441</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Two cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 75/2321 &amp; 75/2441</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Two cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/3847</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/3847</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/1587</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/1587</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/532 &amp; 74/2297</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/532 &amp; 74/2297</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delos, Mus. 74/8116</td>
<td>Delos, Maison des sceaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/6735</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 114 nr. Hλ. 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/6343</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/6348</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 87/71</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/9311</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/6344</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/3588 &amp; 87/1227</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With bow and quiver, according to Boussac, and therefore Helios-Apollo - difficult to discern on photograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 74/9312</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With bow and quiver, according to Boussac, and therefore Helios-Apollo - difficult to discern on photograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 87/258</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cretula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With bow and quiver, according to Boussac, and therefore Helios-Apollo - difficult to discern on photograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 75/1100 &amp; 75/1290</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two cretule with impressions of the same intaglio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With bow and quiver, according to Boussac, and therefore Helios-Apollo - difficult to discern on photograph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boussac 1992, 115 nr. Hλ. 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delos, Mus. 75/1184, 75/1520, 75/1526, 75/1821, 75/2222, 75/2430, 75/2438, 75/2671, 75/2856, 75/2942, 75/2988, 75/3127, 75/3188, 75/4028, 75/4029, 87/299, 87/453, 87/464, 87/524, 87/550, 87/1086 &amp; 87/1149</th>
<th>Delos, Maison des sceaux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-two cretule with impressions of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
same intaglio
With bow and quiver, according to Boussac, and therefore Helios-Apollo - difficult to discern on photograph.
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116 nr. Hλ 71

-47. Delos, Mus. 74/3554
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
Helios-Apollo, according to Boussac, because of hair-roll (chignon)
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116 nr. Hλ 72

-48. Delos, Mus. 74/3514 & 74/8873 (2x)
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Two cretule with a total of three impressions of the same intaglio.
Helios-Apollo, according to Boussac, because of hair-roll (chignon)
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116 nr. Hλ 73

-49. Delos, Mus. 74/6335
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
Helios-Apollo, according to Boussac, because of hair-roll (chignon)
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116 nr. Hλ 74

-50. Delos, Mus. 74/1470
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
Helios-Apollo, according to Boussac, because of hair-roll (chignon)
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116 nr. Hλ 75

-51. Delos, Mus. 74/6351
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
Helios-Apollo, according to Boussac, because of hair-roll (chignon)
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116 nr. Hλ 76

-52. Delos, Mus. 74/24, 74/608, 74/663, 74/1403, 74/2055, 74/2265, 74/3223, 74/5934, 74/5951, 74/5952, 74/5953, 74/5954, 74/5955, 74/5956, 74/5957, 74/5958, 74/6339, 74/6340, 74/6340 bis, 74/6548, 75/3380
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Twenty-one cretule with impressions of the same intaglio
Helios-Apollo, according to Boussac, because the radiate bust has a laurel wreath late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 116-7 nr. Hλ 77

-53. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg., A2208
Unknown
Dark brown sard
Anastole, Alexander-echo?
1st c. BC
LIMC Helios/Sol 17; AGD I-3, 20 #2210;
Matern 2002, 169, 182, 253 B56.4c

-54. Nürnberg, Germ. Nat. Mus., SiSt 1681
Unknown
Brown to apple green plasma
- 1st c. BC (Weiß); 50 BC - AD 50 (MK)
Weiß 1996, 78 #116

-55. Unknown (glass paste copy in Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Mus.)
Unknown
Cornelian
Portrait? Z.-D. suggests the rays are part of a diadem with bands of the ribbon in the neck. This is difficult to make out clearly. 1st c. BC. Modern? (SEH/MK)
Zwierlein-Diehl 1986, 75 #71

-56. Unknown (glass paste copy in Würzburg, Martin von Wagner Mus.)
Unknown
Cornelian
Inscription (pos.): FA VSTVS
Mid 1st c. BC

-57. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus., 2301
Durostorum (Silistriu)
Red cornelian
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (D.-M.); Imperial classicizing (stripy) style; wheel-style, 50BC-AD 50 (MK)
Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 43 #57
Alexandria?
Red jasper
-1st c. BC (M.-E.); to 1st half 1st c. AD (MK)
Mandel-Elzinga 1985, 253-4 #8

-59. Moscow, Pushkin Mus. HC.1000
Neapolis (Crimea), necropolis
Greenish blue glass paste
-2nd c. AD; 50 BC - AD 50 (MK/SEH).
Finogenowa 1993, #76

-60. Oxford, Ashmolean Mus. 1941.443
Unknown
Glass paste, imitating amethyst
-1st c. BC (LIMC)
LIMC Helios 145; Matern 2002, 169, 182,
253 B56.6

Unknown
Mottled cornelian
Portrait?
30 BC-AD 30 (MK)
Svoronos 1913, 197

-62. Pl. 64.20
Berlin, Ant. 6315
Unknown
Yellowish brown glass paste
Seven stars (one between each pair of rays)
and a crescent in front of Sol's forehead
50 BC-AD 50 (SEH/MK)
Furtwängler 1896, #6315.
This glass paste was taken from the same
mould as London, BM 3024 (H7.66), and a
paste in Geneva (H7.64)

-63. Berlin, Ant. 6316
Unknown
Glass paste, layered dark violet, white, light
brown, imitating sardonyx, damaged
-50 BC-AD 50 (SEH/MK)
Furtwängler 1896, #6316

-64. Geneva, Mus. d'Art et d'Hist. MF 1593
Unknown
Yellow glass paste, damaged

-65. Kassel, Staatl. Kunstsg., Ge 113
Unknown
Sardonyx
-50 BC-AD 50 (MK); 3rd c. AD (LIMC)
LIMC Helios/Sol 72; AGD III, 223 #113; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.7

-66. London, BM 3024
Unknown
Glass paste imitating sard
Seven stars (one between each pair of rays)
and a crescent in front of Sol’s forehead
50 BC-AD 50 (SEH/MK)
Walters 1926, 290 #3024
This glass paste was taken from the same
mould as Berlin, Ant. 6315 (H7.62) and a
paste in Geneva (H7.64)

-67. Munich, Staatl. Münzsgl. 3029
Unknown
Glass paste, violet, translucent
-2nd c. AD (LIMC); 50 bc-ad 50 (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 68; AGD I-3, 142 #3029

-68. Munich, Staatl. Münzsgl. 3028
Unknown
Glass paste, red (imitating jasper?)
-2nd c. AD (LIMC); 50 bc-ad 50 (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 68; AGD I-3, 141 #3028

Unknown
Glass paste
-1st c. BC-1st c. AD
This gem is mentioned by Henig 1974, 12
under #28

-70. Princeton Univ., Art Mus. 52-155
Unknown

346
Red jasper
- 1st BC-1st c. AD
Forbes 1978, 57-8 #40

-71-78. Tripoli?
Cyrene
Cretule (clay impressions), some damaged
- 75 BC-AD 113

-79. Florence, Mus. Arch. 72441
Luni
Yellow glass paste
- Early 1st c. AD (S.C.)
Sena Chiesa 1978, 97-8, #94; Matern 2002, 169, 182, 252 B56.1b

-80. Lyon, Mus. Civ. Gallo-Romaine
Lyon
Cornelian
- 1st c. AD
Guiraud 1988, 91-2 #50
Found on the floor of a dwelling dating to the 1st-2nd c. AD (fouilles du Verbe Incarné)

-81. Private collection
Nanstallon, Cornwall
Glass paste, light blue on black, imitating onyx
- 1st c. AD (Henig)
Henig 1978, 110 App. 20

-82. Malibu, Getty Mus. 84.AN.1.42
Asia Minor
Cornelian
Inscription (neg.): CKY (reading upward)
1st c. AD (Spier)

-83. Berlin, Ant. 7201
Unknown
Cornelian
Crescent above head, star below; inscription (neg.) CEΣ TIANOC
1st c. AD (MK/SEH) - poorly executed but
not late
Furtwängler 1896, 269 #7201; Matern 2002, 182, 276 B235b.

-84. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Lewis Coll.
Unknown
Cornelian
- 1st c. AD (Henig)
Henig 1978, 16 #17

-85. Hannover, Kestner Mus., K481
Unknown
Heliotrope
- 1st c. AD (MK); 2nd c. AD (AGD)
LIMC Helios/Sol 69; AGD IV Hannover, 291 #1587; Matern 2002, 182, 275 B233.6.

-86. Indiana Univ. Art Mus., B.Y. Berry Coll.
Unknown
Cornelian
- 1st c. AD? (SEH)
Berry 1969, 40 #72

-87. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus., IX B 318?
Unknown
Dark green heliotrope
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (Z.D.); 1st c. AD (SEH/MK)
(but perhaps not ancient?)
LIMC Helios/Sol 70; AGWien 166 #1264; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.11b.
Note that AGWien 963 has the same inventory number.

-88. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus., IX B 606
Unknown
Cornelian
Inscription (pos) HAI OC
2nd c. AD (Z.D.); 1st c. AD (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 70; AGWien 166 #1263; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.11a

-89. Cardiff, National Museum of Wales
Caerleon, legionary fortress baths,
frigidarium drain
Pale orange carnelian
-
Stratified ante quem date of AD 85-110 Zienkiewicz 1986, 130 nr 8, pl. 6.

-90. Private collection
   Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
   Burnt cornelian
   -
   1st-2nd c. AD
   Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #61

-91. Princeton Univ., Art Mus. 34-81
   Egypt
   Red jasper
   -
   1st-2nd c. AD
   Forbes 1978, 57-8 #40

   Unknown
   Orange cornelian
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (T.); 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
   Tamma 1991, 69 #86

-93. Berlin, Ant. 7757
   Unknown
   Sardonyx
   -
   1st-2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
   Furtwängler 1896, #7757

-94. Nürnberg, Germ. Nat. Mus., SiSt 1680
   Unknown
   Red jasper
   -
   2nd c. AD (Weiβ); 1st-early 2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
   Weiβ 1996, 78 #117

-95. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus. 8052
   Novae, chance find
   Red cornelian
   -
   2nd c. AD (Dimitrova-Milcheva); imitation of late-Hellenistic types, either ancient or modern, impossible to date (MK).
   Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 84 #246
   According to Dimitrova-Milcheva, "protectress of the city with corona muralis".

-96. Private collection
   Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
   Cornelian
   -
   2nd c. AD
   Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #60

-97. Winchester, Hampshire
   Winchester, early medieval grave (probably not intentionally placed in grave)
   Glass paste nicolo
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (Henig)
   Henig 1978, 12 #28

-98. Nijmegen, Valkhof Mus. Km 18 C1/G119
   Unknown
   Green heliotrope
   -
   2nd-early 3rd c. AD
   Maaskant-Kleibrink 1986, 60 #119; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.10

-99. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus. 8035
   Novae, chance find
   White jasper
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (D.-M.); 1st c. AD (SEH/MK)
   Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 43 #56

-100. Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 1458
   Unknown (acquired in Beirut)
   Multicolored stone ("pietra screziata")
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (LIMC); 1st c. AD, if ancient (MK/SEH, but impossible to determine conclusively on basis of the photograph).
   LIMC Helios/Sol 73; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.8

-101. Geneva, Mus. d'Art et d'histoire C466
   Cruscilles, Haute-Savoie
   Glass paste nicolo
   -
   3rd c. AD (context: found in a treasure buried in the middle of the 3rd c.)
   Guiraud 1988, 92 #51

-102. Hyères, Mus. 45.134
   Hyères
   Lapis-Lazuli
   -
3rd c. AD (G.); modern (MK)  
Guiraud 1988, 92 #53

-103.  Rennes, Mus. de Bretagne?  
Rennes  
Glass paste nicolo  
-  
3rd c. AD  
Guiraud 1988, 92 #52  
Note: Guiraud gives the inventory number as 2233, but F. Berretrot of the Musée de Bretagne informed me that this number is incorrect, and that he had been unable to locate the gem.

-104.  Belgrade, Mus. Naz. 942  
Unknown  
Chalcedony  
-  
3rd c. AD (LIMC)  
LIMC H 71

-105.  Geneva, Mus. d'Art et d'Hist. 20892  
Unknown  
Cornelian  
-  
Early 3rd c. AD (V.)  
Vollenweider 1979, 255 #267; Matern 2002, 182, 275 B233.5a

-106.  Unknown  
Aldborough, Yorkshire  
Cornelian  
-  
Undated  
Henig 1978, 12 #29

-107.  Museum Carnuntinum 18 039  
Carnuntum  
Reddish brown carnelian  
-  
Undated  
Dembski 1969, 201 nr. 378

-108.  Museum Carnuntinum 17 771  
Carnuntum  
Orange carnelian  
-  
Undated  
Dembski 1969, 201 nr. 379

-109.  Zalau, Mus. 30/195§

-110.  Zalau, Mus. 408/1966  
Porolissum  
Pink jasper  
-  
Undated  
Teposu-Marinescu & Lako 1969, 9 nr. 32, pl. II.  
Note: described as radiate, but rays not visible on illustration in catalogue.

-111.  Private collection  
Petronell  
Rusty red jasper  
-  
Undated  
Dembski 1969, 200-1 nr. 377

-112.  Private collection  
Petronell  
Reddish brown jasper  
-  
Undated  
Dembski 1969, 201-2 nr. 380

-113.  Private collection  
Carnuntum  
Orange carnelian  
-  
Undated  
Dembski 1969, 202 nr. 381

-114.  Private collection  
Carnuntum  
Dark orange carnelian  
-  
Undated  
Dembski 1969, 202 nr. 382

-115.  Unknown  
Unknown  
Chalcedony  
-  
Undated
Carnegie's suggestion that this may be a portrait of Nero has no merit.

Unknown
Green jasper
- 3rd-4th c. AD (M.R.); modern (MK)
Mandrioli Rizzarri 1987, 124 #253; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B233.1b

Unknown
Green jasper
- 3rd-4th c. AD (M.R.); modern? (MK)

-118. Ferrara, Mus. Civ., RA 715
Unknown
Lapislazuli
- 3rd-4th c. AD; modern (SEH/MK)
D’Agostini 1989, 40 #59; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.4

Unknown
Cornelian
- 3rd-4th c. AD (V.); Renaissance (probably 16th c.) (MK).
Vollenweider 1979, 257-8 #269; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.5b.

-120. Paris, Cab. Méd., C1475
Unknown
Yellowish citrine (quartz)
- Modern (SEH/MK)
Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1475
Treatment of hair (especially under the rays), eye, and stone-type bring us to classify this gem as modern.

H7a, ..., whip
-1. Paris, Cab. Méd., H2427
Unknown
Cornelian
- 1st c. BC (SEH)
Unpublished
Possibly a portrait? The presence of the whip strongly suggests Sol is meant.

-2. Udine, Mus. Civ., 63/827
Unknown
Heliotrope
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (T.); 1st-2nd (SEH)
Tomaselli 1993, 146 #360

-3. Unknown (Impression in Oxford, Ashmolean Mus., Evans sealing sheet 1,1)
Aequum (Sitluk), Dalmatia
Unknown
- 1st-2nd c. AD (Middleton)
Middleton 1991, 56 #53

-4. Florence, Arch. Mus. 1521
Unknown
Yellow jasper
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (1st c. AD?)
Tondo & Vanni 1990, 174 nr. 110, 208 fig. 110.

-5. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. XII 886
Unknown
Red jasper
- 2nd half 2nd - 1st half 3rd c. AD
AGWien III, 306 nr. 2764; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.11d

Unknown
Dark red jasper
- 270/80 AD (Vollenweider); 2nd-early 3rd c. AD (MK - see note Nijmegen 119)
Vollenweider 1983, 187-8 #238; Matern 2002, 182, 275 B233.5c.

Unknown
Cornelian
- Undated
Nicholls 1983, 18-19 #51
H7b  ...on upturned crescent
-1.  Unknown (sealing in Oxford, Ashmolean Mus., Evans sealing sheet 23)
   Salona, Dalmatia
   Sard
   - 2nd-1st c. BC (Middleton)
   Middleton 1991, 33-4 #2

-2.  Oxford, Ashmolean 1941, 557 (also Evans sealing, sheet 38)
   Scardona (Skradin), Dalmatia
   Cornelian
   - 1st c. BC-1st c. AD (Middleton)
   Middleton 1991, 55-6 #52

-3.  Utrecht, Geldmuseum 583
   Unknown
   Red cornelian
   7 stars in field below crescent
   1st-2nd c. AD
   Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 218 #517
   Identified by Maaskant-Kleibrink as Selene/Luna; however, there can be no doubt that Sol is meant, as Selene is never depicted radiate, but always with a crescent in her hair. Cf. H7ba, where the whip further emphasizes that Sol, not Luna is meant.

H7ba  ...on upturned crescent, whip.
-1.  Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus., IX B 1460
   Unknown
   Cornelian, somewhat translucent
   Star below crescent
   1st-2nd c. AD (MK); 3rd c. AD (AGWien)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 75; AGWien, 166 #1265;
   Matern 2002, 182, 276 B239.

H7bb  ...on upturned crescent, between two eagles, star on each point of crescent.
-1.  Paris, Cab. Méd. E681 (C1477bis)
   Unknown
   Lapis Lazuli
   - 1st-2nd c. AD? Dubious; could well be modern (MK)
   Unpublished

H7bc  ...on upturned crescent, star on each point of crescent
-1.  Pl. 63.12

H7c  ...next to upturned crescent
-1.  Berlin, Ant. 6317
   Unknown
   Yellowish brown glass paste
   - 50 BC-AD 50 (SEH/MK)
   Furtwängler 1896, 6317

-2.  Berlin, ex Stosch coll. (glass paste in M. von Wagner mus. in Würzburg)
   Unknown
   Cornelian
   - Early 2nd c. AD (AGD)
   AGD I-3, 83 #2644
   Incorrectly identified as bust of Selene

-3.  Munich, Staatl. Münzslg. 2644
   Unknown
   Cornelian
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD (Z.-D.)

-4.  Oxford, Ashmolean, 1892.1453
   Unknown
   Heliotrope
   - Undated
   Unpublished; referred to by Middleton 1991 under #52

   Acquired in Rome
   Green quartz
   - 1st c. BC-early 1st c. AD (MK); 3rd c. AD (LIMC)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 74; Matern 2002, 182, 276 B238
   LIMC and Matern give incorrect inv. number.
H7d  ...facing bust of Luna
  Unknown
  Yellow cornelian, translucent
  Three letters (neg.) between: C Y M.
  Vollenweider & Avisseau-Broustet believe that the two busts are portraits, possibly of
  Antiochus IX & Cleopatra.
  Late 2nd-early 1st c. BC (Vollenweider & Avisseau-Broustet); 50-25 BC (Z.-D.); 1st c.
  AD; the hair of Sol and Luna was reworked in modern times. (MK)
  Matern (2002, 182, 276 B240) catalogues only the paste in Würzburg.

  Unknown
  Pseudo-nicolo
  -
  1st c. AD (MK)
  Svoronos 1913, 200

-3. Hannover, Kestner Mus. K1302
  Unknown
  Moss agate
  Below busts, a lizard
  2nd c. AD (AGD); 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 309; AGD IV Hannover, 310 #1709; Matern 2002, 182, 276 B236

  Unknown
  Mottled cornelian
  -
  Undated
  Referred to by Middleton 1991, 56 #53

H7e  ...next to bust of Luna
-1. Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 8577 (lost)
  Unknown
  Heliotrope
  -
  3rd c. AD (LIMC); 1st-early 2nd c. if not modern (MK)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 310; Matern 2002, 182, 276 B237

H7f  ...above star and scorpion
-1. London, BM 1666
  Unknown
  Yellow jasper
  -
  "Late Roman" (Walters); 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH).
  Walters 1926, #1666

H7g  ...between two standards(?)
-1. Vienna, Kunsthist.Mus. IX B 1367
  Acquired in Vienna in 1837
  Red jasper
  -
  1st-2nd c. AD
  AGWien III, 306 nr. 2765; Matern 2002, 182, 274-5 B233.11c.

H7h  ...upturned crescent above head
-1. Delos, Mus. 74/947
  Delos, Maison des sceaux
  Cretula
  Crescent difficult to see on photograph
  late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
  Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hl. 49

-2. Delos, Mus. 74/5875, 74/6294 & 74/6803
  Delos, Maison des sceaux
  Three cretule with impressions of the same intaglio
  -
  late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
  Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hl. 50

-3. Delos, Mus. 74/6073
  Delos, Maison des sceaux
  Cretula
  Crescent uncertain
  late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
  Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hl. 51

-4. Delos, Mus. 74/2846
  Delos, Maison des sceaux
  Cretula
  -
  late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
  Boussac 1992, 113 nr. Hl. 52

-5. Delos, Mus. 74/1916
  Delos, Maison des sceaux
  Cretula
  -

352
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 113 nr. H8, 53

H8 **Bust or head of Sol, radiate, to the right.**

-1. Poitiers, Mus. Sainte-Croix (Coll. Bonsergent)
Environ of Poitiers
Lapis Lazuli
- 3rd c. AD? Modern (MK)
Guiraud 1988, 92 #54

Unknown
Reddish cornelian, translucent
Portrait?
Undated
Gramatopol 1974, 71 #416

Unknown
Red jasper
An object in front of Sol, identified by
Gramatopol as a cross, may be a whip (but
difficult to make out from the photograph).
Undated
Gramatopol 1974, 71 #411

-4. Art market, Medusa-art.com MA244
Unknown
Carnelian
- 1st c. AD or (more probably) modern
Unpublished.

H8a **...facing a rabbit(?); 7 stars.**

-1. Debrecen (Hungary), Déri Mus., R XI 1.38
Unknown
Jasper
Reverse: a lion (?) jumps l.; above, inscr.
(pos.): ΞPHN
3rd c. AD
LIMC Helios/Sol 188

H8b **...facing bust of Luna**

-1. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus., 5159
Vratsa District
Dark brown jasper
- 2nd c. AD (D.-M.)
Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 68 #168

H8c **...facing cock, above lion walking to the right**

-1. Berlin, Ägypt. Mus., 12475
Unknown (acquired in Strasbourg)
Heliotrope
Inscription (pos.): from above Sol's head
along the edge: AIPBAAl.l; in front of Sol:
N; Behind Sol, along the edge, downward:
ΦPH. Reverse: inscription (pos.)
AKPa/MAXA/MAPE?1 f
2nd-early 3rd c. AD (Philipp); 1st-2nd c. AD
(MK)
Philipp 1986, 43 #32

H9 **Frontal or three-quarters bust or head of Sol**

-1. Palermo, Mus. Arch.
Selinunte, Temple C
Cretula, clay impression, damaged
- 4th-early 3rd c. BC (Terminus ante quem of
250 BC)
Salinas 1883, #492 (Type CLH)

-2-23. Delos, Mus. 74/6574, 74/9117, 74/728,
74/634, 74/1280, 74/6326, 74/1512,
75/2646, 74/3814, 74/6330, 74/5181,
74/6327, 74/1955, 74/6333, 74/6331,
74/6328, 74/4233, 74/2691, 74/3245,
74/6346, 74/6396, 87/463, 74/379,
74/1249, 74/3297, 74/2855, 75/1282.
Delos, Maison des sceaux
27 cretule with impressions of the 22
different intaglios.
Boussac suggests there may be a protome of
a horse next to the head of Sol.
late 2nd - early 1st c. BC (period of use).

-24. London, BM 1167
Unknown
Sard
Alexander-like features?
Hellenistic (MK); Matern 2002, 169, 182,
252 B56.3
LIMC Helios 147

-25 Berlin, Ant., 4851
Unknown
Black glass paste, banded white
- 1st c. BC (SEH/MK)
-26. Pl. 63.13
Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus, I 622
Acquired in Rome
Sardonyx
Inscription (neg.): CÆS
50 BC-AD 50 (MK); 1st c. AD (LIMC)
LIMC Helios/Sol 38; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B230.

-27. Udine, Mus. Civ., 777/253
Aquileia?
Greenish black jasper
Unfinished
1st BC-1st c. AD?
Tomaselli 1993, 146 #359

-28. Pl. 64.21
Berlin, Ant., 2378
Unknown
Plasma
Very Alexander-like (anastole)
Late Hellenistic/50 BC - AD 50 (SEH)
LIMC H 149; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B225

-29. Pl. 64.3
Hannover, Kestner Mus., K482
Unknown
Bright orange cornelian
- 1st c. BC-1st c. AD (MK); 2nd c. AD (AGD)
LIMC Helios/Sol 39; AGD IV, Hannover,
291 #1588; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B228

-30-32. Tripoli?
Cyrene
Three cretule (clay impression), all damaged, of three different intaglios
- 75 BC-AD 113
Maddoli 1963/4, 99 #469-471

-33. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum B325
Unknown
Heliotrope
3rd c. AD

-34. Private collection
Carnuntum
Reddish brown jasper
- Unrated
Dembski 1969, 202 nr. 383

-35. Petersburg, Hermitage
Unknown
- Unrated

-36. Unknown
Unknown
Reddish brown jasper
- Unrated
Frank Sternberg Auktion XXIV, 19-20 nov.
1990, #513

-37. Berlin, Ägypt. Mus., 9847
Unknown
Lapislazuli
Obverse: Anubis; inscr. (pos.):
ANOXAPIAMIOITIMIOBIOYBAA BHA;
bevelled edge, inscription (pos.):
ANOXAPIAMIOITIMIOBIOYBAA BHA.
(Reading following Philipp, not all letters equally clear on my impression).
1st c. AD (Philipp); modern (MK)
Philipp 1986, 95 #141

-38. Copenhagen, Nat. Mus., 234
Italy
Cornelian-onyx
- Modern? (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 40; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B231.

H9a ...frontal face surrounded by rays
Unknown
Opal
- Modern (SEH/MK)
Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1485

H9b ...within zodiac circle
-1. London, BM 1168
Unknown
Garnet
Hellenistic (SEH)
Gundel 1992, 152; LIMC H 324; Matern 2002, 182, 253 B57.2

Unknown
Green agate
- Late 2nd-early 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC (V.)
Vollenweider 1983, 178-80 #228; Gundel 1992, 152.1; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B227

H9c...on upturned crescent
-1. Florence, Mus. Arch., 72440
Luni
Dark cornelian, damaged
A star on each point of the crescent
Late 2nd-early 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC
Sena Chiesa 1978, 98-9, #95; Matern 2002, 169, 182, 252 B56.1a

-2. Private collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Heliotrope
- 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC
Henig & Whiting 1987, 11 #59

-3. Unknown
Unknown
Garnet
Inscription (neg.) ΔΙΠΑ
Undated
Carnegie 1908, 53 #D2

H9d...crowned by two Victories
-1. Kassel, Staatl. Münzslg., Ge 114
Unknown
Cornelian, damaged
- 50 BC-AD 50 (MK); 1\textsuperscript{st} c. AD (AGD)
LIMC Helios/Sol 202; AGD III, 224 #114; Matern 2002, 182, 274 B229

H9e...between profile busts, facing inwards, of Saturn and Luna
-1. Unknown
Unknown
Chalcedony
Seven stars in field
1st-2nd c. AD (SEH)

Smith & Hutton 1908, #108.

H9f...below an upturned crescent (the crescent is independent of the head).
-1. Delos, Mus. 75/508
Delos, Maison des sceaux
Cretula
- late 2\textsuperscript{nd} - early 1\textsuperscript{st} c. BC (period of use).
Boussac 1992, 111 nr. Hx 22

H10Sol as a minor figure
H10a...Sol on chariot to left, whip in right hand, reins in left hand, faced by bust of Sarapis to right; below: Aesculapius (right), Hygieia (centre) and Isis. Five stars and an upturned crescent.
-1. Berlin, Ant. 2669
Unknown
Cornelian
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. AD (SEH/AD)
Furtwängler 1896, 123 nr. 2669; LIMC Helios 85; Matern 2002, 67, 220 Q77
There are 5 stars in the field, rather than 4 as stated by Furtwängler, the LIMC, and Matern.

H10b Above: fairly large frontal bust of Sol between Isis and Harpocrates; below: characters/letters.
-1. Berlin, Ägypt. Mus., 11933
Unknown
Lapislazuli, damaged
Reverse: palm branch (or cypress?) within a laurel or olive wreath
1\textsuperscript{st} c. AD (reworked in 18th/19th c.) (Philipp); modern.
Philipp 1986, 42-3 #31

H10c To the right, in front of a column on a high base, a herm with erect phallus protruding from the table-like base bearing a bearded head facing left. In front of the herm a burning altar; to the left, three heads facing right, next to each other: the rear head bearded, the other two clean-shaven. Above the heads, bust of Sol, radiate, facing right; behind Sol a cornucopiae, in front of Sol, above the altar, a phallus. To the right above the phallus, a small radiate globe (sun?, star?), and another phallus above the
herm. Behind the column a small upturned crescent.

-1. Berlin, Ant., 3366
  Unknown
  Brown sard
  -
  Modern? But in that case of exceptional quality. Perhaps Republican, but then very strange.
  LIMC H 315

H10d Seated Cybele (?), facing right, between a small lion (?) and holding a wreath (?) and staff (?); Facing her, Fortuna with modius, cornucopiae and rudder. Above, between them, frontal bust of Sol on upturned crescent.

-1. Berlin, Ant., 8626
  Unknown
  Red jasper, damaged
  -
  2nd-3rd c. AD (SEH)
  Furtwängler 1896, 8626
  One lion only, not two as described by Furtwängler.

H10e Sarapis on throne, with modius and staff, facing right; in front of him three-headed Cerberus. Sarapis is flanked to the right by bust of Sol facing left, and to the left by upturned crescent with two stars.

-1. Pl. 64.2
  Hannover, Kestner Mus., K446
  Unknown
  Jasper
  -
  2nd-3rd c. AD (AGD); 2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 390

H10f Bust of Sol facing left above an eagle between two army standards.

-1. Munich, Staatl. Münzslg., 2463
  Unknown
  Reddish orange cornelian
  Sol may - according to AGD - be Zeus Ammon
  3rd c. AD (AGD)
  AGD I-3, 60 #2463

H10g Two busts of Dioscuri, facing each other; behind each a palm branch. Between them, below, frontal bust of Sol with a staff above his head and an upturned crescent at the top.

  Unknown (acquired in Istanbul)
  Red cornelian, damaged
  Below: inscription (neg.): ΑΓΑΘΟΠΟΥΣ
  1st c. AD (AGD); 50 BC-AD 50 (MK)
  AGD I-3, 39 #2330
  For γιθοσος, cf. The modern Greek concept of “lucky feet”. A C. Iulius Agatopus was a goldsmith in Rome in the first century AD (CIL 3945).

H10h Large, convex stone, empty but for a very small bust of Sol on one side and the name ΠΠΑΡΧΟΥ. On the bevelled edge:
  ΠΠΑΡ.

  Unknown
  Agate.
  -
  Late Hellenistic?
  Chabouillet 1858, 209 #1484
  Chabouillet omits the inscription on the edge

H10i Two Fortunae (each with cornucopia and modius) facing each other, clasping hands above a modius; above the clasped hands small bust of Sol to left. Above the modius an inscription ΧΑΠΑ (difficult to see on photograph).

-1. Malibu, Getty Mus., 85.AN.370.72
  Unknown
  Dark brown agate
  -
  2nd c. AD (Spier)

H10ia As previous, but a griffin instead of a modius below the clasped hands; no inscription.

-1. Utrecht, Geldmuseum 1507
  Unknown
  Red cornelian
  -
  1st-2nd c. AD
  Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 303 #883

-2. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. XII 912, 1677
  Unknown
  Heliotrope
  The “griffin” damaged, identified by Zwierlein-Diehl as an owl, followed by
Matern.
2nd c. AD
AGWien III, 314 nr. 2820; Matern 2002, 182, 277 B248c.

H10ib ...with two Fortunae, each with cornucopia, clasping hands above inscription XAPA; bust of Sol above their clasped hands.
-1. Berlin, Ant., 8667
Unknown
Brown and green jasper
- 2nd c. AD (very poor impression, later mislaid, so this date is very tentative).
Furtwängler 1896, 317 #8667

H10j Above: small figure of Mars (?), standing, with lance and armor, facing left, opposite bust of Sol facing right and star. Below: eagle with spread wings filling the whole lower half of the stone.
Unknown
Red jasper
- Undated
Gramatopol 1974, 68 #379

H10k Sol and the planetary deities.
H10ka Obverse: Sol, Jupiter, Luna and Mercury together with four signs of the zodiac and a star.
Reverse: Saturn, Venus and Mars; a woman reclining on a couch and two signs of the zodiac.
-1. Kassel, Staatl. Kunstslg., Ge 80
Unknown
Yellow jasper
- 1st c. AD
LIMC Helios/Sol 295; AGD III, 216 #80; Matern 2002, 182, 276-7 B244b.

H10kb Bust of Sarapis facing left within two concentric circles; in the inner circle the gods of the days of the week; in the outer circle: signs of the zodiac.
-1. London, BM 1668 (1907.7-17-1)
Egypt
Amethyst
- 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH)
Gundel 1992, 126 fig. 56b; 246 cat. #144; Walters 1926, 180 #1668

H10l At the right, Victory, winged, with palm branch (?) holds up a wreath behind a radiate bust of Sol facing left, where Fortuna stands with cornucopia and rudder. Below Sol inscription XAPA (neg.) above two clasped hands.
-1. London, BM 1665
Unknown
Yellow jasper
Above hands and below bust of Sol, inscription (neg.): XAP/A 2nd half 3rd c. AD (Walters); 2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 205; Walters 1926, 1665

H10m On a Nile-ship made of reeds, Sarapis (winged scarab on his head) is seated in the centre, facing left, on a throne. He holds a staff in his left hand, and with his right hand he points to a human-headed scarab in front of him. Above the scarab a bust of Sol, radiate, facing Sarapis. Behind the throne of Sarapis stands Fortuna with cornucopia, holding the rudder of the ship. On the bow and stern of the ship the heads of Osiris and Isis respectively, both facing inwards.
-1. Unknown
Unknown
Heliotrope
In field, inscriptions (pos.): ΙΑΑ ΔΑ (above); ΒΑΙΜ (below the ship).
On reverse: ΜΙΧΑΗΑΛ / ΠΑΦΡΙΗΛ / ΣΑΜΑΗΑ / ΡΑΦΡΙΗΛ
2nd c. AD
Sternberg, Auktion XXXIII (1997)

H10n Above a base line, an assembly of deities: (from r. to l.) seated Jupiter holding a globe surmounted by a Victory, Mars, Minerva, Apollo, Diana, and Nemesis; above them two letters in mirror image: b (?) and F. Below the line, small figure of Sol, standing, radiate (4 rays), nude but for a chlamys, r. hand raised, whip in left, between a crescent and star. Note that contrary to the letters, the image of Sol is not in mirror image.
-1. Gotha, Mus.
Unknown
sardonyx
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
LIMC Nemesis 288

H11  **Busts of Sol and Luna as minor figures.**
H11a  _...in depictions of the Mithraic tauroctony._

-1.  Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 42.1342
Nemea, Greece?
Sard
- 1st c. AD (MK/SEH)
CIMRM II, 393 #2367

Unknown
Yellow chalcedony, damaged
Luna as crescent rather than as bust
2nd c. AD (LIMC); 1st c. AD (MK)
LIMC Helios/Sol 384; CIMRM II, #2363

-3.  Florence, Mus. Arch.; also glass pastes in M. von Wagnermus. in Würzburg
Unknown
Red jasper
Reverse: lion and spread out in field,
inscription: CHMEA KANTEY KONTEY
KHPIΔEY ΔAPYNKW ΑΥΚΥΝΞ
Late 1st-2nd c. AD (Z.-D.)
LIMC Helios/Sol 386; Zwierlein-Diehl 1986, 246-7 #736
For the inscr. cf. H3a.3

-4.  Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery 42.868
Unknown
Haematite
Reverse: Abrasax with shield and whip
2nd-3rd c. AD (LIMC)
LIMC Helios/Sol 385; LIMC Abraxas 43

-5.  Udine, Mus. Civ. 1138/152
Aquilae?  
Cornelian
- 3rd c. AD (LIMC); 2nd-3rd c. AD (SEH)
LIMC Helios/Sol 386; Ianovitz 1972, 30 fig. 2; Tomaselli 1993, 46-7 #12

-6.  Bad Deutsch-Altenburg, Mus. Carnuntinum

Carnuntum
Cornelian
- 3rd c. AD
LIMC Helios/Sol 385

-7.  Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus., IX 2599
Kostolac (Viminacium), Yugoslavia (near Belgrade)
Dark red jasper
- 3rd c. AD
Zwierlein-Diehl 1979, 184 #1376

-8.  Museum Carnuntinum 17 752
Carnuntum
Rusty red jasper
- Undated
Dembski 1969, 122 nr. 233.

-9.  Cairo, Mus. Egypt
Jasper, chipped
Reverse: inscription (pos.):
NEIKA/ΠΙΑΗΞ/IAW. On edge,
inscription (pos.): ACWNIHA
Undated
CIMRM II, 392 #2359; Barry 1906, 247-8 #9

-10.  Unknown
Unknown
Sard
- Undated
Carnegie 1908, 182-3 #N64

-11.  Unknown
Unknown
Sard
- Undated
Carnegie 1908, 180-2 #N63

H11b  _...in depictions of the Danube riders._

-1.  Paris, Cab. Méd., M-5992?
Unknown
Haematite
- (bust of Sol r., Luna l.)
3rd c. AD (SEH)
LIMC Helios/Sol 387; LIMC Heros

358
Equitans 437; Giglioli 1951, 202-3 #VI; LIMC Nemesis 202.
Note: the inventory number given in the literature is incorrect as I was informed by Mme. Avisseau-Broustet that the gem under this inventory number did not correspond with the description given.

Unknown
Unknown
- 3rd c. AD (SEH)
Tudor 1969 I, 106 #187
Instead of busts of Sol and Luna only crescent and star are depicted.

-3. Lost; two impressions in Prague and Magdeburg, archives of Bishop Bruno of Olmütz, who used the inatglio as his seal in 1245-47.
Unknown
Unknown
- 3rd c. AD
Tudor 1969 I, 113-4 #199

-4. Unknown
Near East
Chalcedony
Reverse: walking lion with star and crescent; inscription (neg.) TAYAFG
Undated
Giglioli 1951, 201 #III; Tudor 1969 I, 108 #191

Unknown
Black jasper, damaged
Reverse: Abrasax with shield and whip
Undated
Tudor 1969 II, 20 #228

-6. Unknown
Unknown
Unknown, damaged
Reverse; lion & inscr. AEWN
Undated
Giglioli 1951, 202 #V; Tudor 1969 I, 109 #192

-7. Unknown
Chalcedony
Reverse: a crater, a bowl, two large stars, two serpents and two bows.
Undated
Giglioli 1951, 200-1 #II; Tudor 1969 I, 109-10 #193

-8. Unknown; drawing in German Arch. Inst., Rome
Unknown
Unknown
Reverse: Triple Hecate and woman; below them prostrate, nude man. Letters scattered in field haphazardly: I Ï È I È N I A I I Z Z Z Y
Undated
LIMC Heros Equitans 438; Tudor 1969 I, 110-1 #194; LIMC Nemesis 203

H11c ...with two Fortunae, each with cornucopia, clapping hands above inscription XAPA and clasped hands.

-1. Private collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Heliotrope
Inscription pos.
1st-2nd c. AD (H.&W.)
Henig & Whiting 1987, 16 #119

-2. Kassel, Staatl. Kunstsbg., Ge 82
Unknown
Greenish red jasper, cracked
Inscription neg.
2nd c. AD (AGD); 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH)
AGD III, 217 #82

H11ca ...with two Fortunae, each with cornucopia, clapping hands above a tripod.

-1. Berlin, Ant.
Unknown
Milky white Chalcedony
- 2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)

H11cb ...with two Fortunae, each with cornucopia, clapping hands above an eagle.

-1. Kassel, Staatl. Kunstsbg., Ge 83
Unknown

359
Very dark green jasper
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
AGD III, 217 #83

H11cc  As previous, but a burning altar instead of a eagle below the clasped hands; rather than bust of Sol and Luna, a star and a crescent.
- 1. Braunschweig, Mus.
Unknown
Green jasper, damaged
- 3rd c. AD (AGD)
AGD III, 38 #113

H11d  ...with winged Victory on the right, holding palm branch and wreath, facing Fortuna with modius and cornucopia on the left; between them griffin facing Fortuna.
Unknown
Dark orange-red cornelian
- 1st-2nd c. AD (MK)
AGWien 152 #1198; Matern 2002, 182, 277 B248b
Zwierlein-Diehl identifies the Fortuna as Sarapis, as does Matern.

H11da  ...with winged Victory on the right, holding palm branch and wreath, facing Fortuna with modius and cornucopia on the left; between them clasped hands holding corn-ear.
- 1. Private Collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Blue glass paste
- 1st c. AD (H.&W.)
Henig & Whiting 1987, 38 #399

H11db  ...with winged Victory on the right, holding palm branch and wreath, facing Fortuna with modius and cornucopia on the left; between them lion with one paw on head of animal
- 1. Berlin, Ant., 7173
Unknown
Light brown sard
- 2nd c. AD (SEH)

H11dc  ...with winged Victory on the right, holding a wreath, facing Fortuna with modius, rudder and cornucopia, inscription XAPA and clasped hands.
- 1. London, BM 3025
Unknown
Black glass paste
- Late 3rd c. AD (Walters); 1st c. AD (SEH)
Walters 1926, 290 #3025

H11e  ...with Ephesian Artemis between two deer.
- 1. Munich, Staatl. Kunstsgr., A 1872
Unknown
Reddish orange cornelian
- 1st c. AD (AGD)
AGD I-3, 30 #2277

- 2. Utrecht, Geldmuseum 1965/195
Acquired at Isparta, Turkey, 1965
Dark brownish-red cornelian
- 1st-2nd c. AD
Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 256 #673

- 3. Pl. 64.1
Hannover, Kestner Mus., K97
Unknown
Dark orange cornelian, broken
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (AGD)

- 4. Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus. 647
Acquired in Rome
Cornelian
- Undated
Fossing 1929, 231 #1707

- 5. New York, MMA, 81.6.175
Unknown
Cornelian
- Undated
LIMC Helios 316
H11ea ...with Ephesian Artemis between two deer and two Nemeses of Smyrna.
-1. London, BM 1340
  Unknown
  Sard
  2nd c. AD (Walters); 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH)
  Walters 1926, 151 #1340; Matern 2002, 182, 277 B245b; LIMC Nemesis 196.

H11f ...with Venus on throne, 7 stars.
-1. Unknown (glass cast in M. von Wagner mus., Würzburg)
  Unknown
  Unknown
  1st c. AD
  Zwierlein-Diehl 1986, 115 #332

-2. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus., IX B 635
  Unknown
  Sardonyx, yellowish to reddish brown
  2nd c. AD (AGWien); 1st-2nd c. AD (SEH)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 388

H11g ...with Venus Anadyomene, herm (Pan), two stars, crescent and inscription.
-1. Munich, Staatl. Münzsg., A. 1855
  Acquired in Rome
  Reddish orange cornelian, damaged
  Inscription: three letters remain, scattered in field: IO C
  1st c. BC (AGD); 2nd c. AD (MK)

H12 Sol riding on horseback
H12a ...to left, right hand raised, whip in left hand.
-1. Aquileia, Mus. Naz., 25964
  Aquileia
  Black jasper
  3rd c. AD
  Sena Chiesa 1966, 86

-2. Reading Mus., Duke of Wellington coll., 03001
  Silchester, Hampshire
  Green prase with dark patches
  3rd c. AD (H.); 2nd c. AD (SEH)
  Henig 1978, 12 #33

  Unknown
  Red jasper
  No whip
  3rd-4th c. AD
  Forbes 1978, 56-7 #39

-4. Utrecht, Geldmuseum 1489
  Unknown
  Heliotrope
  In field, crescent and inscription (pos., letters scattered): IAW; on reverse, inscription (pos.): IOYC/CON
  Undated
  Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 358 #1133

H12b ...to left, reins in right hand, lance in left hand, spearing lion below front hooves of the horse; under horse lies a man.
-1. Utrecht, Geldmuseum 1490
  Unknown
  Haematite
  In field inscription (pos.): STN E; on reverse: standing figure in long dress, lifting hand to mouth - probably Harpocrates.
  2nd-3rd c. AD
  Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 358-9 #1134
  Probably not Sol, but given the presence of Harpocrates, possibly Souchos (cf. H12c.1).

H12c ...to right, left hand raised, whip in right hand. Crocodile below horse.
-1. Sofia, Nat. Arch. Mus. 8042
  Novae
  Light red cornelian
  2nd-3rd c. AD (D.-M.)
  Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 90-1 #274;
globe in left hand.
- 1. Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. 243
   Italy
   Heliotrope
   -
   3rd c. AD (LIMC); modern?

H13b  ...facing right, whip in right hand.
- 1. Utrecht, Geldmuseum 2238
   Unknown
   Heliotrope
   -
   1st-2nd c. AD

H14  Sol on biga to left, right hand raised, whip in left hand.
- 1. Private collection
   Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
   Cornelian
   -
   2nd c. AD (H.&W.)

- 2. Private collection
   Unknown
   Heliotrope
   -
   2nd-3rd c. AD (V.)
   Vollenweider 1984, 259 #445; Matern 2002, 67, 220 Q80

H15  Sol with animal
H15a  Profile bust of Sol on back of bull, right.
- 1. London, BM, 2345
   Unknown
   Garnet, broken
   -
   Hellenistic?
   Walters 1926, 238, #2345; Matern 2002, 182, 277 B245a

H15b  Profile bust of Sol between horns of bull walking left: upturned crescent and seven stars in field; two corn ears in front of bull.
   Unknown
   Cornelian
   -
   2nd-4th (AGD); 2nd half 1st c. BC - 1st half 1st c. AD (ZD); 1st-2nd (MK)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 390; Zwierlein-Diehl 1986, 232 #656; Matern 2002, 182, 276-7 B244a.

H15b  Profile bust of Sol on back of lion walking to left.
- 1. Aquileia, Mus. Naz., 25713
   Aquileia
   Nicolo
   -
   1st-2nd c. AD
   Sena Chiesa 1966, #1171

H15a  Profile bust of Sol on back of lion walking to left.
- 1. Private collection
   Unknown
   Pyrites
   Inscription (pos.): IAW (above); ΑΒΡΑΣΑΣ (in exergue). On reverse: cock-headed anguipede with shield (inscribed IAW) and whip.
   Undated
   Bonner 1950, 291 #226

H15b  Sol riding on lion to right, r. hand raised, forepaw of lion on a skull(?) of an ox(?); facing Sol a female worshipper (Bonner) with r. hand raised.
- 1. Private collection
   Unknown
   Pyrites
   Inscription (pos.): IAW (above); ΑΒΡΑΣΑΣ (in exergue). On reverse: cock-headed anguipede with shield (inscribed IAW) and whip.
   Undated
   Bonner 1950, 291 #226

H15c  Profile bust of Sol on back of lion walking to left.
- 1. Paris, Cab. Méd. 2174bis
   Corbeny (Aisne)
   Jasper (heliotrope?)
   Inscription (pos.): ΝΟΦΗΡ
   ΑΒΑΑΑΘΑΝΑΒΑ; reverse: cock-headed anguipede (shield and whip) above Medusa-head; inscription (pos.):
H16  Sol standing, staff in left hand, wreath in right hand, on top of mount Argaios (inscr.).
-1. London, BM, 1662
   Unknown
   Red jasper
   In exergue, inscription (neg.): ΑΡΓΑΙΟΣ.
   Walters 1926 179 #1662

H17  Dubitanda
H17a  Hercules and Cerberus on the right, male warrior, radiate, with lance and armor, grabbing an opponent by the hair on the left.
   Acquired in Rome
   Plasma
   "Sol" has boots and is wearing armor. Perhaps he is an oriental monarch with radiate crown?
   Late 1st-early 2nd c. AD (style; plasma used only from Flavian period to ca. AD 120)
   AGD I-3, 94 #2717

-2. Berlin, Ant. 6855
   Unknown
   Red jasper
   Furtwängler notes that in this intaglio "Sol" is bearded, and may be Commodus.
   Undated
   Furtwängler 1896, 253 #6855

H17b  Young radiate male figure, nude, holding caduceus and surrounded by a large variety of symbols; magical inscriptions.
-1. Naples, Mus. Arch., 27020/1175
   Unknown
   Jasper, damaged
   Between the rays, inscription (pos.):
   XΑΡΧΕΝΑΑΒΡΑΧ. On reverse inscription (neg.):
   CΕΜΕ/ΣΕΙΛΑΝΕ/ΜΙΧΑΗΛ/ΑΧΕΑΧ/ΙΟΥ
   /ΙΟΥ/ΙΟΥ ΑΚΡ...ΚΟΜΑ. On the bevelled edge, inscription (neg.): 1st circle
   WΑΙΑΒΑΛΑΝΑΘΑΝΑΒΙΕΜ/ΝΥΡΝΗΑΜΕ
   ΑΗΙΑΑ [...ΑΔ; 2nd circle

363
AGWien 89 #963
Note: AGWien #1264 has the same inventory number.

H17d  Livia (head and upper body only) holding a cornucopia from which head of Augustus/Sol emerges.
-1. London, BM, 1977
   Unknown
   Cornelian, damaged
   Early 1st c. AD (LIMC)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 429

H17e  Standing youth, radiate, nude but for chlamys, leaning with his right arm on a column, holding a whip (?) in his left hand (partially damaged), quiver (?) behind r. shoulder.
-1. London, BM, 1219
   Unknown
   Glass paste, imitating sard, damaged
   -
   Walters 1926, 139 #1219
   This would appear to be a radiate Apollo.

H18  Varia

H18a  Bust of Souchos Helios right, above crocodile; he is radiate and has a small raised right hand, and faces Premamnes.
-1. Florence, Mus. Arch.
   Unknown
   Jasper
   -
   Undated
   LIMC Souchos 26

H18b  Fragment of intaglio, consisting of zodiac circle (partially preserved) around bust (almost wholly destroyed).
-1. London, BM, 1669
   Unknown
   Sard
   No indication of the presence of Sol
   Walters 1926, 180 #1669

H18c  Lion crouching, left; behind him a tree with an eagled on a branch holding a wreath in his beak; inscription (neg.) "Hiae.
-1. Pl. 64.4

Braunschweig, Mus., 290
Unknown
Cornelian, damaged
- 3rd c. AD (AGD); 1st-2nd c. AD? (SEH)
AGD III, 54 #188

H18d  Hybrid figure of Sol (both arms raised, radiate) and scarab with outspread wings.
-1. Berlin, Ägypt. Mus. 9876
   Unknown
   Plasma
   Reverse: inscription (pos.):
   CYΠΠΟ/..AZ.ZXΠ/ΠΠΟΗΙΑΙΑΙΑΩΙΑ ΄Α
   KINCHΦΙΔΙΘΗΝΟΕΝΗΜΕΡΙΑΡΠΒΑΘΑΓΡΑ
   MNΗΠΙΒΑ Washing
   2nd c. AD (P.)
   Philipp 1986, 84-5 #118

HA. Intaglios in ancient rings

HA1. Sol in quadriga to left

HA1a ...nude but for chlamys, whip in right hand, reins in left hand.
-1. Vienna, Kunsthistor. Mus. VI 1813
   Acquired in Budapest in 1873
   Heliotrope
   Bronze ring of the 4th c. AD. The stone does not fit well.
   -
   2nd half 2nd - 1st half 3rd c. AD

HA1b ...nude but for chlamys, whip in left hand, reins in right hand.
-1. Basel, Mus., 3243
   Augst
   Green jasper
   Silver ring, form Guiraud 3g
   -
   3rd c. AD
   Henkel 1913, 61 #444

HA1c ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand.
-1. Saalburg Mus., P.641
   Saalburg
   Heliotrope (dark green jasper mottled red)
   Iron ring, form not clear (cf. Henkel 1913, 172 #1895)
   It may be that Sol has raised his left arm -
difficult to make out on the photograph.
2nd-3rd c. AD (Krug)
Krug 1978, 499 #34

HA1d ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, reins in left hand.
-1. Cologne, Röm.-Germ. mus., 5260
Cologne, Luxemburgerstrasse
Heliotrope
Silver ring, form Guiraud 3g
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (Krug); ring 3rd c. AD.
Krug 1980, 188 #75; Matern 2002, 126, 243 I66.8

HA3 Sol on frontal quadriga, two horses jumping to the left, two to the right
HA3a ...nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand
-1. Pl. 63.1
Hamburg, Mus., KG 1967,17
Unknown
Heliotrope
Silver ring
- 1st half 2nd c. AD (small grooves style) (MK); 2nd-3rd c. AD (LIMC); Matern 2002, 125, 242 I63.5.
LIMC Helios/Sol 127; LIMC Helios 33

HA3c ...nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, reins in left hand.
-1. Pl. 62.7
Copenhagen, Thorvaldsen Mus., I 1618
Acquired in Rome
Cornelian
Silver ring.
- 3rd-4th c. (Fossing).
LIMC Helios/Sol 125; Fossing 1929, 1686

HA3e ...nude but for a chlamys, left hand raised, whip and reins in right hand
-1. London, BM, 1661
Unknown
Nicolo
Gold ring
- 3rd c. AD (Walters)
Marshall 1908, 91 #534; Walters 1926 1661; Matern 2002, 125, 243 I64.2a.

HA6 Sol, standing
HA6a ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand.
-1. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus., VII B 367
Unknown
Red jasper
- 1st-early 2nd c. AD (MK); 2nd c. AD (AGWien)
AGWien 165-6 #1261; LIMC Helios/Sol 95; Matern 2002, 110, 237-8 I39.
The LIMC (Helios Sol 94 & 95) confuses Vienna Inv. nos. IX B 1524 & VII B 367.
-2. London, BM, 1659
Unknown
Heliotrope
Bronze ring, flat hoop expanding upwards
- 2nd c. AD (SEH/MK)
Walters 1926, #1659; Marshall 1908, 1351
La Celle-en-Morvan
Glass paste nicolo
Ring, form Guiraud 2d
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
Guiraud 1988, 91 #43
-4. Munich, Prähistorische Staatssammlung, 1984.3513
Der-el Zor (Syria)
Jasper
Gold ring
- 4th c. AD (Zahlhaas)
Zahlhaas 1985, 37 #35; Matern 2002, 106-7, 235 I24.10

HA6aa ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand, next to a burning altar.
-1. Private collection
Gadara, Decapolis (Umm Qeis)
Heliotrope
Iron ring, frgm.
star and crescent by Sol's feet
2nd c. AD (H.&W.)
Henig & Whiting 1987, 12 #66
-2. London, BM, 1647
Egypt
Nicolo, truncated cone
Gold ring, hoop thin below, expanding upwards, hollow and rounded without, a very sharp angle on either side.
- 3rd c. AD (Walters)
Walters 1926, 179, #1657 pl. 22; Marshall 1908, 84-5 #493; Matern 2002, 106-7, 164, 236 I25.7.

HA6ae ...nude but for chlamys, left hand raised, whip in right hand, behind Jupiter, standing, nude, spear in right hand, an eagle in front of him.
-1. Private collection
Carnuntum
Cornelian
Iron ring, form unknown
- Undated
Dembski 1969, 21 nr. 30.

HA6b ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand.
-1. Private collection
Province of Sevilla
Cornelian
Bronze ring, form unclear from photograph
- Late 2nd c. AD
Lopez de la Orden, 121 #51

-2. Private Collection
Türkenfeld
Chalcedony
- 2nd-3rd c. AD
Henkel 1913, #423

-3. Berlin, Ant., 7199
Unknown
Cornelian
Silver ring, form Guiraud 2d; Vollenweider 2618; Henig X
- 2nd-3rd c. AD (ring type)
Furtwängler 1896, 7194

HA6bb ...nude but for chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand, facing standing male figure, bearded, dressed in himation, staff.
-1. London, BM, 1658
Unknown
Sard
Gilded bronze ring, rounded hoop expanding upwards
Two stars and a crescent in field
Late 1st-2nd c. AD
Walters 1926, 179 #1658; Marshall 1908, 1366

HA6d ...dressed in chiton and chlamys, globe in right hand, whip in left hand.
-1. Berlin, Ant., 8161
Friesdorf, near Bonn
Nicolo
Ring, type Guiraud 2d; Vollenweider 2618; Henig X
- 2nd c. AD (MK)
Henkel 1913, #414; Matern 90, 98, 227 G17

-2. Cologne, Röm.-Germ. Mus., 1000
Cologne, Apostelkloster
Nicolo
Silver ring.
- 2nd c. AD (Krug)

HA7 Head or bust of Sol, radiate, left
-1. Paris, Cab. Méd., de Clerq 3065
Unknown
Gray chalcedony
- 1st c. BC
Vollenweider & Avisseau-Broustet 1995, 181-2 #196

-2. Mainz, Mus., 349
Mainz
Unknown
- 50 BC-AD 50 (MK, Nijmegen #119
Henkel 1913, 1442

Pompeii
Red jasper
Bronze ring
-
1st c. AD
Henkel 1913, 201-2 #2278

-4. Formerly Dumfries, Burgh Mus. (stolen)
   Carzield, Dumfriesshire
   Sard
   Iron ring, Henig type II
   1st c. AD (Henig)
   Henig 1978, 11-12 #27

   Formerly Dumfries, Burgh Mus. (stolen)
   Carzield, Dumfriesshire
   Sard
   Iron ring, Henig type II
   1st c. AD (Henig)
   Henig 1978, 11-12 #27

-5. Boston MFA 1970.588
   Unknown
   Carnelian
   Gold ring
   2nd - 3rd c. AD
   Morgan 1975/76, 45 #52.

-6. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Lewis Coll.
   Unknown
   Cornelian
   Hollow gold ring
   2nd-3rd c. (Henig)
   Henig 1978, 16 #18

-7. Sofia, Mus. Arch., 4797
   Nikolaev (Pleven distr.)
   ? (not given by D.-M.)
   Silver ring
   Undated
   Dimitrova-Milcheva 1981, 43 #59

HA9 Frontal bust or head of Sol

HA9b ...within zodiac circle
-1. Private Collection
   Unknown
   Cornelian
   Gold ring, form: Cf. Henkel 118, 137, 182
   (hellenistic-Roman and early imperial).
   Inscription (neg.): BAEDRO; only 11 signs of the zodiac
   1st half 1st c. BC
   Vollenweider, Deliciae Leonis 122, #208;
   Matern 2002, 182, 253 B57.1

HA10n ...above Abrasax; below a crescent moon.
-1. British museum 489

HA11ca ...with two Fortunae, each with cornucopia, facing each other; between them: griffin.
-1. Vienna, Kunsthst. Mus., VII A 146
   Unknown
   Brownish red cornelian
   -
   2nd c. AD (AGWien)
   LIMC Helios/Sol 323; Matern 2002, 182,
   277 B248a

HA12 Sol riding on horseback
HA12a ...on horseback to left, right hand raised, whip in left hand.
-1. Leyden, RMO(?), NS 28
   Nymegen
   Cornelian
   Silver ring
   3rd c. AD
   Henkel 1913, 63 #455

Unknown
Lapis lazuli
Gold ring, hoop thin below, expanding upwards, strongly projecting shoulders.
-2nd-3rd c. AD (Marshall)
Marshall, 1907, 84, nr. 489
Intaglio quite possibly modern (non vidi) because of stone-type.
H. Intaglios
The largest material group of representations of Sol, barring coins, is formed by intaglios. For this reason alone the group deserves special attention, but in addition intaglios provide important information concerning both the chronology and the diversity of iconographic themes related to the image type [sol]. Furthermore, intaglios were intensely personal objects with significant symbolic values and functions.\footnote{Platt 2006.} We will first briefly discuss the production and ownership of intaglios, and then review the occurrence of the image type [sol].

Production, ownership and use of intaglios with Sol.
Intaglios were produced by engraving the desired design in a semi-precious stone (intagliare) which could then be used for a variety of purposes, ranging from seal stamp to amulet. A by-product of intaglios were glass-pastes. An impression, usually in clay, was made of an intaglio, which served as a mould into which heated glass paste was pressed. Thus whereas each intaglio is unique, there are potentially countless glass pastes with identical designs. In some cases more than one glass paste still survive from the same mould.\footnote{Cf. H7.62, 64, and 66 (glass pastes in Berlin, London and Geneva).}

With very few exceptions all stones used for intaglios in antiquity were semi-precious. Confusion still reigns when it comes to describing the type of stone used, for there are many discrepancies between modern mineralogical terminology and the names traditionally given to gems by scholars.\footnote{To further complicate matters, terms used in antiquity to denote one type of stone may now be used for a different type: in Pliny (NH 37:XL) the term sappir is used for lapis lazuli, to give but one example (Maaskant-Kleibrink, pers. comm.).} This has resulted in a somewhat mixed use of terms over the years, with different scholars using different names to denote the same stone. I have, where possible, standardized the terms used in this catalogue, opting for the "classicist" terminology. Chalcedony is thus used only for more or less translucent, white stones of that family. For other chalcedonies the terms cornelian (red, translucent), sard (brown, translucent), plasma (dark green, opaque), prase (green, translucent), jasper (opaque, various colours), agate (banded chalcedonies in a variety of colours), sardonyx (stratified chalcedony in which white layers alternate with layers of sard), and nicolo (stratified chalcedony of two layers, a dark one underneath and a bluish one above) are used. In addition to the monochrome varieties of jasper I use the term heliotrope to denote green jaspers mottled red. In the case of Sol, stone types not of the chalcedony family include garnet, lapis lazuli (almost invariably modern forgeries), onyx, haematite, serpentine, magnetite, silex, citrine, quartz, opal, amethyst, aquamarine and pyrites.\footnote{On stones used in antiquity cf. Guiraud 1996, 28-36.} All are rare, and together they account for less than 7% of the intaglios. It should be noted that over a quarter of intaglios produced in antiquity were glass pastes.\footnote{Guiraud (1996, 36) bases this high percentage on data from excavations, pointing out that glass pastes, being artistically less accomplished, are underrepresented in major gem collections.}
Intaglios and the moulds for glass pastes were produced by gemmarii active in various parts of the Empire. According to some scholars, the vast majority of Roman intaglios were produced in a very limited number of production centres, from where they were shipped to all corners of the Empire. Others believe that there were countless gemmarii all over the empire in every major economic centre. We have very little firm information, but evidence from Pompeii suggests that at least two gemmarii were active in one district of that city alone. The house of one of these, Pinarius Cerialis, revealed inter alia 114 uncut gems and finished intaglios in a box, as well as gem-cutting instruments. This evidence from Pompeii is potentially valuable in helping determine the social status and affluence of gemmarii. However, the problem with Pinarius Cerialis is that we cannot be certain that he actually was a gemmarius. Pannuti (1975, 187-188) remarks on the widely differing style and quality of the 30 gems in Pinarius's box, which suggest that they may not all have been made by the same person. On the other hand he points out that as they were found together with 83 (sic) uncut stones, one can hardly speak of Pinarius as a collector of intaglio's either. This leaves open the possibility that Pinarius was a jeweller who used both the intaglios and the uncut gems in the jewellery he produced. The presence of three different glass pastes in the box supports this view. It seems unlikely that these were produced by Pinarius, as glass paste intaglios were mass-produced and one would then expect a larger number of identical glass pastes to have been found in his house. If the glass pastes were produced elsewhere, the same may hold true for some or all of the other intaglios, but this would leave unexplained the evidence of gem-cutting instruments found there. The most probable conclusion thus remains that Pinarius did actually produce at least some of the intaglios himself. Perhaps he worked with assistants or apprentices, as this could explain the wide range of quality of the intaglios found in his house.

The house of Pinarius Cerialis is quite modest, showing little sign of wealth. Yet of the

---

316 AGWien 3, 15-16.
318 Cf. Sena Chiesa 1985, 11. On the location of gem production centres she takes an intermediate position, and suggests that there was a limited but nonetheless significant number such centres, including Pompeii. Funerary inscriptions for gemmarii have been found in Rome (CIL VI, 245, 9433-9436), Pompeii (CIL IV, 8505), and Forum Novum (Vescovio), CIL IX, 4795.
319 Pinarius has been described as relatively affluent in view of the quality of the frescoes in the house. Actually, only two small rooms (a & b) were decorated with high-quality frescoes, the frescoes of the Peristile and the triclinium being of very modest quality. De Vos (PPM III, 436) suggests that the gemmarius had ordered the fine paintings first, but finding that these were beyond his means was forced to let a lesser bottega complete the decoration of his house. It is more likely, however, that the fine paintings were meant to impress visitors and customers. The two finely decorated rooms belong to the most public part of the house, and it was no doubt here that Pinarius transacted his business. Thus the decoration of these rooms enhanced and underlined the status of his own artistic work (which was considerable; cf. Henig 1978, 29). On the differentiation between public and private in Roman houses cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1988, 77-96 (on business in the house esp. 84-86), and Wallace-Hadrill 1994, 17-61. The box containing the gems, cammeo's and glass pastes was found in the southeastern corner of the Oecus.
cut stones, some were of exceptionally good quality. Clearly therefore, even a *gemmarius* capable of above average work (or a jeweller utilizing such work) could be a normal member of the artisan class, living comfortably enough, perhaps, but hardly well-to-do. Two inscriptions found in Rome mention *gemmarii* who were freedmen, a third a *gemmarius* who had dependent freedmen. All these *gemmarii* in Rome conducted their business along the Via Sacra, including the well-to-do *gemmarius* M. Lollius Alexander, who may have been the personal *gemmarius* of the wealthy Lollii family, notorious for commissioning jewellery worth 40 million *sestertii*. Even if Pinarius himself was not a *gemmarius* but a jeweller handling gems engraved by others, there must have been countless like him in the Roman Empire - we know of at least one other in the same district in Pompeii (Henig 1978, 29) - implying that the average intaglio was well within financial reach of Romans with even only a modest income. This is particularly the case if one includes the inexpensive, mass-produced glass pastes, although these had almost ceased to be used by the latter part of the first century AD. Other evidence for the ownership of intaglios also suggests they reached broad segments of Roman society. They are not limited to rich graves, and are not set in precious metals only, but also in bronze and iron rings. Finds from legionary camps suggests that many soldiers had rings with engraved gems, and the number of gems that were lost accidentally in bathhouses and ended up in the drains also implies that many visitors to the baths wore rings with intaglios. Consequently, when dealing with the iconography of intaglios and glass pastes, we are dealing with subjects and themes which, potentially at least, were common currency within broad strata of Roman Society.

Traditionally, gems were used to make impressions (Henig 1978, 24) in soft material (clay or wax, e.g.), which would serve as signature or guarantee of the owner or as seal to close and safeguard a document. They were thus the personal possession of one owner or institution, and the choice of theme was his. In private as well as public archives, sealed documents could be stored, sometimes for generations. If an archive was destroyed by fire, baking the clay seals, these seals (known as *cretule*) are preserved, sometimes in large numbers. The *Maison des Sceaux* on Delos yielded a large number of such *cretule*. Seals could be used in a similar manner to secure property, sealing doors or securing the lids of containers. Clement of

---

320 Pannuti (1975) catalogues of 24 intaglios (3 glass pastes, the rest gems) and 6 cameos. De Vos speaks of 28 engraved stones (PPM III, 436). Pannuti's sums don't compute as 30 intaglios and 83 uncut stones do not give the total of 114 which he claims were found in the box.

321 As Cerialis was apparently also active in politics, his social position was certainly not negligible (NotScav 1927, 101).

322 CIL VI, 9434-5 (freedmen), 9433 (patron of freedmen).


324 Zienkiewicz 1986.

325 Boussac 1992. A well-preserved archive at Elephantine in Egypt yielded documents of the Hellenistic period with seals still attached; Rubensohn 1972 [1907].
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Alexandria stresses that for Christians these are the only reasons to own an intaglio. They are permitted one golden ring, not as ornament, but

“for sealing things which are worth keeping safe in the house in the exercise of their charge of housekeeping. For if all were well trained, there would be no need of seals, if servants and masters were equally honest. But since want of training produces an inclination to dishonesty, we require seals.”

By Clement’s time, however, intaglios had long since acquired a broader range of functions. For the early imperial period, Zazoff (1983, 329) identifies three types of production: aristocratic glyptic art, popular glyptic art, and imperial glyptic art. The first represents the traditional intaglios, of high to superb artistic quality, reflecting the taste and culture of the owner and serving as his personal seal. The second group represents far more hastily executed, simple intaglio's, and include magical gems and amulets, thus betraying a broader range of functions than simply that of a personal seal. Finally, imperial glyptic art includes what Zazoff describes as a flood of propagandistic gems, to which he adds collections of gems deposited in temples, where they had both a propagandistic and a popularizing effect.

This division recognizes the broader range of uses made of intaglios, but is still too simple. The vast majority of intaglios, and certainly most of those in our catalogue, belong to Zazoff’s category of “popular” glyptic art, and this category in particular is rather under defined, betraying the strong art historical emphasis in much of glyptic research to date. From an aesthetic and artistic perspective most “popular” intaglios, of mediocre quality at best, truly have little to offer and aside from brief entries in museum catalogues and corpora such as the LIMC they receive scant attention. From a social perspective, however, such intaglios are as significant as the “aristocratic” or “imperial” ones. They rank among the most personal and personally important possessions a Roman had. As personal seal they stand for the person whose seal they are, functioning as their guarantee and word of honour. That alone gives the engraved gem a protective function, securing and safeguarding the integrity of a document, the contents of a vessel, or the like by sealing it shut, or a powerful promise or bond through exchange or gifting of the intaglio itself. This protective function could be enhanced to the point where the intaglio became an amulet with magical properties through the nature of the image, often divine or magical and sometimes including incantations and the like, as well as through the properties of the gemstone itself. While it is common practice to treat amulets as a separate group of

326 Clement Paedagogus 3, 1

327 The term propaganda is perhaps not the best choice for what Zazoff has in mind. Unlike coins, gems themselves did not circulate, i.e. they did not carry a message from one (the minting authority, i.e. the emperor) to many. Intaglio's and perhaps even glass pastes could be distributed as gifts, and as such convey specific messages from a patron to a client. Thus gems could enhance the status of patrons or, more importantly, serve as a tangible token of his patronage and appreciation, enhancing the status of the client.


329 On magical gems: Bonner 1950, Delatte & Derchain 1964, Philipp 1986. A gem did not have to bear a “magical” image and/or words to have amuletic qualities. The most important ancient source on the properties of gemstones is Thphr. Lap. A typical example of a protective amulet is one against drunkenness - a certain type of gem
“magical” gems, this distinction of amulets as a separate category is thus misleading. A wide range of engraved gems had at least a certain degree of amuletic qualities through their stone type, as well as their role as seal, safeguard and guarantee.

In other respects as well, intaglios and the rings in which they were set were socially significant. In Roman society clothes most definitely defined the man and at all times there were clear - if shifting - codes establishing what dress and jewellery it was appropriate for a given person to wear. Often attempts were made to enshrine these codes in law. Traditionally, for example, only Roman ambassadors and, later, Roman senators had the right to wear a gold ring, and in the first century B.C. one still had to be at least a knight to wear one, although sometimes patrons could bestow this distinction (and the honors which went with it) on lesser men.\textsuperscript{330} Others wore iron rings, which were very common in the Republic, generally with glass pastes or intaglios.\textsuperscript{331} During the empire, rings continued to carry a message of social rank, albeit a watered-down one.\textsuperscript{332}

We can identify five major, and sometimes partially overlapping functions of rings in the Roman empire: jewellery, signet-rings, status/class-denoting rings, award-rings, pledge-rings. Rings can have judicial, religious, magical or symbolic meaning. There were official rings, bestowed by the state, an official, a corpus and the like, and private rings, often given as gifts to a friend or loved one. To this we can add military rings, wedding-rings, magical rings and the like.\textsuperscript{333} Naturally, not all gems came from rings, although it is reasonable to suppose that the majority did. Even so, without further information (context) it is difficult if not impossible to establish the function of the ring (and thus the gem).\textsuperscript{334} This does not diminish the semiotic power and importance of intaglios, but merely makes it more difficult for us to grasp.\textsuperscript{335}

The significance of intaglios and the rings in which they are set does not automatically translate into a particular significance of the images on intaglios. Clearly the image can have great relevance for the significance of the intaglio as a whole; one thinks in particular of the images of magical gems. But besides image and stone type, much of the meaning of intaglios is derived from whom it represents, as that person’s seal, rather than what it depicts. The significance of Pliny’s seal stone, which depicted a quadriga, lies primarily in the fact that it represents Pliny. The fact that the engraving in the stone depicted a quadriga does not automatically mean that quadrigae (or their aurigae) had special significance for Pliny. The

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{330} Marshall 1908, xviii-xix; Henkel 1913, xxiv-xxvi; cf. Cic. \textit{Ad Fam.} X.32.2.
\item \textsuperscript{331} According to Henkel (1913, xxvi) iron rings without intaglios did not exist.
\item \textsuperscript{332} Marshall 1908, xx-xxi. For the broader context, Schenke 2003 (with thanks to Dr. E.M. Moormann for bringing this book to my attention).
\item \textsuperscript{333} Henkel 1913, 330-340.
\item \textsuperscript{334} Henkel 1913, 350-351.
\item \textsuperscript{335} Platt 2006, 237-8.
\end{itemize}
engraved gem is but part of the ring as a whole, and that ring may have come into his possession as a gift, through inheritance, through membership of a particular association of some sort, or through purchase. Of course, Pliny’s quadriga is not meaningless either. There must have been a reason why it was engraved into the stone in the first place. But the connection between ring, image and owner is not straightforward and the complexity of an intaglio’s semiotic potential is clear.

The issues at play in the choice of images are further complicated by the fact that certain medium-related factors may also have influenced their choice or perceived suitability. In Gaul, for instance, popular local deities such as the Matres, Epona, and others, well represented in sculpture and relief, are completely absent from intaglios. This may be an indication that Gaul lacked important centres of intaglio production. The tradition of producing intaglios was Graeco-Roman and Oriental, and this may be why typically Egyptian or Near Eastern deities do show up on Roman intaglios. But at least one major production centre, Aquileia, was so close to regions where Epona and the Matres, for instance, were popular that unfamiliarity with these deities cannot have been the reason why they were not depicted.

It follows that we should not seek to pin down what the image type [sol] meant on specific gems for specific owners. There are simply too many options: Sol would be appropriate for an amulet of a chariot racer, a suitable image for a ring sealing an oath, a logical choice for the signet ring of, say, Iulius Anicetus, an obvious adornment for a ring given to someone upon attaining the rank of Sun-runner in the Mithraic mysteries, in astrological terms the preferred choice of someone born on a Sunday, etcetera. Various emperors could well have chosen to distribute rings with intaglios engraved with Sol as gifts to soldiers or other dependents; Aurelian and Constantine in particular come to mind, but one can also think of Gallienus or Heliogabalus. Chance may also have played a role; the ring may simply have caught the buyers fancy because of the colour of the stone or the shape of the ring itself. It is true that Clement of Alexandria urged his Christian followers to take care to choose appropriate designs for their rings:

> And may our seals be either a dove, or a fish, or a ship sailing before the wind, or a lyre, as Polycrates had, or an anchor, which Seleucus had engraved as his seal; and if it is an angler, he will recall the apostle and the children drawn out of the water. For we are not to engrave the images of idols, as we are prohibited to adhere to them. Neither should we depict a sword, nor a bow, being followers of peace, nor drinking-cups, being temperate.

But there is no suggestion here that the image should hold particular meaning for the owner, and the implication is that owners did not give the images on their rings much thought. That, at least, appears to be Clement’s concern. Why else would he need to warn Christians against choosing images of pagan gods?

---


337 Guiraud 1988, 62-67,

338 See chapter 5.

It will be clear that the importance of intaglios for the present study does not, therefore, lie in the meanings the image types [sol] conveyed and constructed through these intaglios. Too many factors contributing to those specific meanings are personal and beyond recovery. But the mere fact of the substantial number of rings on which the image type [sol] occurs in one form or another is significant. They further enhance our understanding of the social, geographic, and chronological distribution of this image type in its basic forms. They also contribute further examples of the image type [sol] ‘in action’ as a contributing element to complex images. In short, intaglios further enhance our insights into the social roles of the image type [sol].

Dates
Virtually all intaglios bearing Sol can be dated to the later Hellenistic, late Republican, and Roman imperial periods. Greek, Etruscan and earlier Hellenistic or Republican intaglios with Helios, Sol or Usil are quite rare. That said, it should be noted that the dating of intaglios is notoriously difficult. I have opted for an approach that favours external criteria over internal ones. This means that where possible factors such as find-context or ring type are taken into account to establish a terminus ante quem. Material can also be of help: glass paste intaglios, with the exception of imitation-nicolos, can rarely be dated before the first century BC or beyond the first c. AD. Imitation nicolos, by contrast were introduced in the first century AD, only to disappear and then reappear in the course of the second century AD, remaining in use in the third century. Another example are garnets (rare), which were used in the late Republic and early Empire only. Unfortunately only a small percentage of intaglio's have a stratified find-context or are set in a typologically datable ancient ring, so that we are left with style and engraving-technique as the main dating-criteria. It must also be kept in mind that external termini ante quem have only limited value as intaglio's could remain in circulation for long periods; an intaglio buried in the third century may well have been produced in the first.

Fortunately, important advances have been made in the past 30 years in establishing the chronology of Roman gems along stylistic and technical lines, taking intaglio's with clearly established termini ante quem as point of departure. Consensus is building on these dates, although it has not yet been achieved as far as the terminology for the various styles and techniques is concerned. The most notable result has been that the previous tendency to date good workmanship earlier and mediocre workmanship later has proven to be unsustainable. Many gems in stiff, hasty styles such as the imperial small grooves style or imperial plain grooves style can be dated to the first century AD, as is shown by their presence in Velsen I or


341 Zwierlein-Diehl (1991, 14), however, points out that material should never be the primary criterium as exceptions can occur.

342 Zwierlein-Diehl 1991, 13 & n. 24

343 Zwierlein-Diehl 1991, 11-12 gives an overview of the different terms currently being used.

344 This tendency is clearly recognizable, e.g., in the dates suggested by Walters (1926).
Pompeii. Even such very crude styles as the imperial rigid chin-mouth-nose style or the imperial incoherent grooves style can be shown to have been in existence as early as the late first century AD.\textsuperscript{345}

Although the evidence for these early \textit{termini ante quem} is incontrovertible, and broad consensus on these early dates has been reached among specialists, the traditional tendency to date mediocre workmanship to the later second and third centuries AD is still found in many fairly recent corpora (such as some volumes of the AGD, the LIMC, etc.). This means that published dates can be unreliable. Where possible, I have either studied gem impressions or clear photographs together with Prof. Marianne Maaskant-Kleibrink to establish the date of the intaglio. Unfortunately, these were not always available, and often the published photographs are inadequate, leaving me no choice but to accept the given date (if any). In establishing and dating the forms of rings, I have followed the typologies of Guiraud (1988) and Zwierlein Diehl (1991).

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Gemstones used for intaglios of Sol} &  \\
\hline
Cornelian & 22.8\% \\
Heliotrope & 17.5\% \\
Green jasper & 8.1\% \\
Red jasper & 6.6\% \\
Black jasper & 2.5\% \\
Other or unspecified jasper & 6.1\% \\
Chalcedony & 4.6\% \\
Sard & 3.5\% \\
Agate & 1.8\% \\
Nicolo & 1.5\% \\
Lapis lazuli & 1.5\% \\
Haematite & 1.3\% \\
Plasma & 1.3\% \\
Sardonyx & 1.3\% \\
Garnet & 0.8\% \\
Onyx & 0.8\% \\
Glass paste & 6.6\% \\
Glass paste nicolo & 2.3\% \\
Other & 4.8\% \\
Unknown/not given & 4.6\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Gemstones used for intaglios of Sol}
\end{table}

The catalogue lists well over 500 intaglios with Sol.\textsuperscript{346} No stone type predominates, but cornelian

\textsuperscript{345} Cf. Zwierlein-Diehl 1991, 13, for a survey and examples.

\textsuperscript{346} This includes some gems which have been published elsewhere as authentic, but which I believe to be modern forgeries. Not included in this total are the 37 gems listed under H1f representing quadrigae (r.) with a driver who cannot be securely identified for lack of clear attributes.
(23%) and heliotrope (18%) together account for over two-fifths of all intaglios (see table 1). The percentage of glass pastes (7%) is quite low, especially in view of Guiraud's (1996, 36) estimate that in fact glass pastes constitute over 25% of all intaglios produced in antiquity. The low percentage of glass pastes with Sol may simply be the result, however, of the fact that glass pastes are under represented in the major published museum collections.

The intaglios date from the third century BC to the fifth century AD (see table 2); the second and third centuries AD account for about 50%, the first century BC and the first century AD for about 28%. Around 19% of the intaglios remain undated due to the unavailability of good impressions or photographs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Dates of intaglios of Sol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd c. BC or earlier</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-1st c. BC</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st c. BC</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st c. BC-1st c. AD</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st c. AD</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-2nd c. AD</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd c. AD</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-3rd c. AD</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd c. AD</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd-4th c. AD</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th c. AD or later</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Few intaglios have known provenances, but those that do come from all parts of the Roman Empire. I have not included a table of provenances, however, because the statistics are overly skewed by the rather haphazard publications of corpora of Fundgemmen (Aquileia, Gadara, Caesarea Maritima, Britain, France, etc.). This, together with the fact that the provenance of the vast majority of intaglios is unknown, makes any statistics concerning provenance misleading rather than illuminating.

**Iconography**

The range of representations of Sol on intaglios is large and includes variants or themes not preserved in other media. The following discussion begins with the three main image types [sol] (as auriga of a quadriga, as standing figure, as bust), followed by remarks about some of the rarer images on intaglios. The discussion is meant to give an impression of the range of images but is neither comprehensive nor exhaustive.
Sol in quadriga

Sol is represented on a quadriga on about 21% of the intaglios. This group is dominated by Sol on a quadriga to the left (H1, over 54 %), followed by Sol in a frontal quadriga (H3 & H4). Only five gems depict Sol on a quadriga to the right (H2). The earliest gems in this group depict Sol on a frontal or three-quarter quadriga, and date to the latter part of the first century BC. This includes the superb cornelian from Naples, which both technically and iconographically is in a league of its own (H4h.1). Sol on a quadriga in profile appears about a century later. In general, Sol as quadrigatus is most popular in the 2nd-third century AD.

Sol was obviously not the only charioteer of quadrigae. When the charioteer is radiate, and/or has a raised right hand or is holding a globe, it is usually safe to assume that he is Sol (barring the presence of other attributes, not connected with Sol). However, quadrigati with no distinguishing attributes can be anyone. When the intaglio is clear, and well-preserved, there need be no doubt whether Sol is meant, or simply some anonymous charioteer. Problems arise, however, when the intaglio is damaged, worn, or vague due to poor workmanship (as is the case with many glass-pastes, cretule, and some gems in styles such as the imperial incoherent grooves style). Sometimes the gesture, traces of an attribute, or general iconography provides sufficient evidence to merit their identification as Sol, despite the fact that in the corpus they are merely described as a charioteer. Especially in older corpora, illustrations are too poor, or altogether lacking, thus making it impossible to determine which of these charioteers may be Sol, and which not, without actually studying the gems themselves (which was not always feasible). Under H1f I have included a quite random selection of such intaglios, mainly from two large collections, simply to give an impression of the numbers and the material involved. They range from stones which almost certainly depict Sol (H1f.8) to stones which almost certainly do not (H1f.27-38). I have not included the intaglios of H1f in my computations in this section.

In general, the representations Sol as charioteer are straightforward, without iconographic surprises: Sol is usually nude but for his chlamys, or is sometimes represented clothed in chiton and chlamys. His main attribute - logically - is a whip, but he sometimes has a globe or a torch. He is also often shown with his right hand raised, an issue to which I shall return below. There are a few intaglios with more complex representations, such as H1da, with a bust of Luna above the horses and a snake in front of them, H1fa, H4da where Sol (?) is surrounded by a zodiac circle; and H1i, where he is preceded by Phosphorus. In each of these cases, the intaglio's

---

347 This does not include the inconclusive gems of H1f.

348 67% if H1f is included.

349 Pliny, as we have seen, describes the design of his ring as a quadriga, and it would be fair to assume that if Sol was the quadrigatus, Pliny would have said so. He does not: signata est anulo meo, cuius est aposphragisma quadriga (Plin., Epist. X, 74.3).

350 For quadrigati who are not Sol, alone or in circus-scenes, cf. Maaskant 1978, nrs. 187, 258, 268, 636, 637, 716, 792, 892, to give some random examples.

351 Cf. Maaskant-Kleibrink (1978, #1116), where the charioteer is clearly Sol (raised right hand), although he is not radiate, and is therefore not identified as Sol by Maaskant.
authenticity cannot be verified, and is doubtful. This leaves only three intaglios in this group with more complex scenes which are undoubtedly authentic: the famous Naples cornelian of the first century BC (H4h.1, Oceanus and a Nymph below Apollo-Helios on a quadriga to the left); H2ca, Sol crowned by a Victory, and H4f, a glass paste of Sol (probably, but not completely certain) on a frontal quadriga between the two Dioscuri.

Two additional groups of intaglios show Sol as a charioteer. The first consists of a globulo scarabs of the third century BC on which he is depicted on a frontal triga (H5). I have listed only the four from Paris. The identity of the charioteer as Sol is based on one of the four, H5a, on which the charioteer is clearly radiate. Both iconographically and chronologically these intaglios form a distinct group, however, which is unrelated to the other intaglios presented here, and which has no direct relevance for this study. They have been included in the catalogue only as an indication of their existence.

The two intaglios of Sol as the charioteer of a biga present a more difficult case (H14.1-2). There can be little doubt that both are authentic, and no doubt whatsoever that Sol is meant (radiate, right hand raised). There are no parallels for Sol on a biga (normally reserved for Luna), and I can offer no explanation for this deviation from the norm that Sol’s chariot is drawn by four horses.

**Sol standing**

The intaglios with Sol standing can be divided into two main groups, namely Sol standing alone and Sol standing with other figures. Standing alone, Sol is depicted with his normal attributes (whip, globe, staff or sceptre, torch). The globe, however, is relatively more rare than in other media, while the staff or sceptre on the other hand is relatively common. Sol is usually nude, but sometimes wears a chiton. The chiton is not restricted to specific types of scenes or iconographies.

On eighteen intaglios he stands next to a burning altar, and on one he is faced by a small orant. The dates of these intaglios reach back to the first century AD, and the group includes one intaglio in a second-century ring (HA6aa.1), and one excavated in a later second-century context (H6aa.3). Known findspots are in Gaul, Britain, Pannonia and Syria. The presence of such images in Italian collections suggests at least some were found in Italy as well. Taken alone, this group of gems does not tell us much, but in the light of the other evidence collected in this study it can be seen as further support for our conclusion that Sol had a role as a Roman god, with cult and sacrifice, continuously throughout Roman imperial times, in most if not all parts of the Empire. This conclusion is further supported by most of the intaglios on which Sol appears with other figures. On four intaglios he faces Jupiter (alone on three, accompanied by Hera and

---

352 I would like to thank Mme. M. Aviseau-Broustet for calling my attention to these scarabs, and sending me excellent impressions of them.

353 H6aa, HA6aa, H6ad, H6ba, H6ca, H6fa, H6n.

354 H6aa.6,8; H6ca.1.
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Mercury on one);\textsuperscript{355} once he faces Nemesis and Minerva,\textsuperscript{356} once Saturn,\textsuperscript{357} and once an unidentified bearded male;\textsuperscript{358} on one intaglio he is crowned by Victory.\textsuperscript{359} In all cases Sol is depicted as a god on an (almost) equal footing with the other deities. As his iconography (radiate, naked, raised right hand, whip) does not deviate from the norm for the image type [sol], this again shows that the standard image types [sol] could be perceived to depict him as a Roman god, judging by the company he keeps on these intaglios.

The last three intaglios in this group on which Sol appears with others differ slightly from the preceding. On one, Sol stands next to a very large altar, and an unidentified male figure of equal size is shown pouring a libation on the other side.\textsuperscript{360} This suggests a scene where Sol is being venerated as a god, but the fact that the libant is as large as Sol is puzzling. More magical than religious is the scene on an intaglio in Paris with Sol as one of seven figures on a Nile-boat, surrounded by an Ouroboros.\textsuperscript{361} The identification of the other six figures as Hermes/Anubis, Anubis, an unidentified figure, Sarapis, Anubis, and the unidentified pilot of the ship, is unsatisfactory, but an alternative eludes me. The fact that two, or possibly three of the six are animal-headed does confirm the Egyptian milieu of this scene, in which Sol participates in his traditional, Graeco-Roman iconography. Finally, there is one intaglio depicting Sol embracing Luna.\textsuperscript{362}

**Bust or head of Sol**

Of the intaglios and cretule depicting the bust of Sol, about 75% depict Sol facing left, only 3% show Sol facing right, and the rest depict a frontal head or bust of Sol. On the majority of intaglios in this group, Sol is depicted alone;\textsuperscript{363} on almost all the rest he is portrayed with Luna, depicted as a bust or more often as a crescent.\textsuperscript{364} In most cases the crescent is below the bust of

\textsuperscript{355} H6bc, H6bd, H6be, H6k.

\textsuperscript{356} H6ac.

\textsuperscript{357} H6bf.

\textsuperscript{358} HA6bb.

\textsuperscript{359} H6bg.

\textsuperscript{360} H6bh.

\textsuperscript{361} H6bi.

\textsuperscript{362} H6l

\textsuperscript{363} H7, H7a, H7bc, H7g, H8, H9, H9a (modern), H9b.

\textsuperscript{364} H7b, H7ba, H7bb, H7c-e, H7h, H8b, H9c, H9f.
Sol, but in one case it is next to his head,\textsuperscript{365} and in Delos it was often above him.\textsuperscript{366} Sometimes there is a star on each point of the crescent. On one intaglio, Sol and Luna are joined by Saturn.\textsuperscript{367} Three early frontal busts of Sol are surrounded by a zodiac circle.\textsuperscript{368} One frontal bust is being crowned by two Victories.\textsuperscript{369} In a few cases Sol is accompanied by animals or star signs.\textsuperscript{370}

Sol is not always easily recognizable, especially on the earlier intaglios, for lack of attributes. As we have seen, the radiate crown alone is not enough to identify Sol securely. On Roman coins and later intaglios this problem was solved by clearly depicting the radiate crown of humans as an actual object, fastened at the back by carefully depicted ribbons (see chapters three and six). On late Hellenistic intaglios, this differentiation was apparently not made, and a fair number of Hellenistic radiate busts have been published as portraits of often unidentified rulers.\textsuperscript{371} Most such portraits have not been included in the catalogue, but I am not convinced of the validity of the assumption a high-quality late Hellenistic male bust - radiate or not - was always a portrait. An unpublished cornelian from Paris dating to the first century BC could readily be taken for a portrait, were it not that there is a whip, barely visible, behind the bust's left shoulder. The conclusion that in this case Sol is meant is thus almost inescapable.\textsuperscript{372} As most radiate busts of Sol from the Roman period lack additional defining attributes, we must, however, leave open the possibility that Hellenistic radiate busts are not necessarily portraits, unless identified as Sol by additional attributes. In fact, bearing in mind how rare radiate portrait busts of rulers were on Hellenistic coins, I would prefer to take the perspective that our default position should be that such busts are not portraits unless they can be unambiguously identified as such.\textsuperscript{373} This problem is not, of course, confined to intaglios depicting Sol. One need but think of the sculptural busts of Sol that have been confused with Alexander the Great.

Early dates predominate in this group. A significant number of the intaglios predate the Imperial period and relatively few postdate the second century AD. The early dates are supported by four intaglios in rings of the first century AD, one of which was found in Pompeii.\textsuperscript{374} These early dates also include gems with Sol and Luna.

\textsuperscript{365} H7c.
\textsuperscript{366} H7h, H9f.
\textsuperscript{367} H9e.
\textsuperscript{368} H9b.
\textsuperscript{369} H9d.
\textsuperscript{370} H7bb, H7f, H8a, H8c.
\textsuperscript{371} Cf. H7d.1.
\textsuperscript{372} H7a.1
\textsuperscript{373} Bergmann 1998, 5, 58-67.
\textsuperscript{374} HA7.1-3, HA9b.
Finally it should be noted that this group includes a few of the earliest intaglios depicting Helios/Sol. One *cretula* (from an excavated, dated context) dates to the fourth-third century BC. It shows a frontal radiate bust, and I have no reason to identify it otherwise than as Helios/Sol. 375

**Sol as a minor figure, alone or with Luna**

Sol as a minor figure, with or without Luna, also occurs on intaglios with some frequency, but is proportionally less common than in most other media, except coins. 376 This is quite simply because engraved gems and coins provide such a small surface area for the image that incorporating Sol as a minute minor figure requires significant additional effort and skill. The dates for Sol in this type of iconography tend to be early, though rarely pre-imperial: almost two-thirds of the intaglios are dated to the first or second century AD. Of the remainder about half are undated. This is further evidence that the iconographical convention of representing Sol, alone or with Luna, as a minor, symbolical figure, was established no later than the end of the first century BC, and was widely used before the beginning of the second century AD.

There are numerous subgroups, of which a few deserve specific mention. Interesting are the groups with two Fortunae or with Fortuna and Victory facing each other. 377 These ring-stones, sometimes with the inscription η α (joy), clasped hands, and other additional images, are excellent examples of how the Romans constructed fairly detailed messages through visual means. The combined images of Fortune, Power, Concord, and Joy, all eternal and stable (Sol/Luna) compose an evocative message when - as seems likely - such a ring was given as a (wedding?) gift.

Other intaglios which deserve mention are those with Mithraic representations, eleven in all, and those showing the Danube riders (eight intaglios). 378 The dates of the Mithraic intaglios are noteworthy as they too are quite early: two are dated to the first century AD and one to the first or second century AD. Of the other eight, four are undated, two date to the second century, one to the second or third century, and one to the third century AD. Unfortunately, the early dates cannot be confirmed by independent means (ring or find-context). There is, however, sufficient other evidence for Mithraic monuments in the first century AD to support the possibility of these dates. 379 The three dated intaglios with Danube rider-depictions (all third century AD) conform to what is known about the late emergence of this cult.

The intaglios depicting Diana of Ephesus or the throning Venus flanked by tiny busts of Sol and Luna represent compositions that as far as I am aware have not survived in other media. Besides these examples on which the image type [sol] is fully depicted, there is a reasonable

375 H9.1
376 H10 and H11.
377 H10i, H10ia, H10ib, H10l, H11c, H11ca, H11cb, H11cc, H11d, H11da, H11db, H11de; 14 intaglio's in all, of which 6 with inscription η α.
378 H11a and H11b.
number of similar gems that simply depict a star and a crescent in the place of the busts of Sol and Luna. Such representations have not been included in the catalogue, but do have a place in our discussion of the significance and occurrence of Sol and Luna as a symbolic pair.\footnote{380}

**Sol on Horseback**

Remarkable are nine intaglio's, all fairly late (insofar as can be determined) that depict Sol riding on horseback.\footnote{381} Strictly speaking they do not belong in this study as they do not adhere to one of the three basic image types [sol], but I have included them because they may illustrate how a new image type could emerge and because they serve as a reminder that Sol or sol-like figures were not wholly restricted to those three image types. Although none predate the second century AD, half remain undated and with the provenance of six of the nine intaglios unknown, nothing can be said with certainty about the possibly local nature of this iconography. It is unfortunate that our knowledge of this group is so limited, for iconographically the rider, radiate, right hand raised (once left, once neither), and holding a whip (once a lance) strongly echoes that of Sol, and one wonders whether we are dealing with a regional assimilation or some other variant of the standard Roman Sol.\footnote{382} This is further suggested by a relief from Corbridge (C2d.7) on which Sol is also depicted on horseback. In this case the horse is winged, but in other respects the iconography is closely reminiscent of Sol on these intaglios. The relief, originally part of the Dolichenum of Corbridge, also includes a Dioscure and Apollo. Irby-Massie (1999, 68-9) remarks on the extended nature of the pantheon represented at this Dolichenum, which also included Brigantia, a Celtic goddess here closely identified with Dea Caelestis and Juno Dolichenae. Her name implies local roots, but whether we can extend that to include Sol in his exceptional iconography is difficult to say.

**Varia**

The remaining intaglios in the catalogue either depict complex scenes in which Sol has a minor role, or serve as examples of hybrid iconographies incorporating aspects of the standard iconography of the image types [sol].

**Gem and seal**

The iconography of Sol includes an element - the raised right hand - that confronts the engraver of gems with an interesting dilemma: which image is the more important? That of the gem, or its mirror image produced with each seal or impression made with the gem? In Roman art, Sol was never depicted with his left arm and hand raised, rather than his right, a rule that included all the (numerous) coin issues on which Sol is depicted with a raised right hand. In the case of coins the die engraver faced a similar situation as the gem engraver as he had to deal with two images, that

\footnote{380} H11e and H11f. Cf. e.g. Maaskant-Kleibrink 1978, 672, 674.

\footnote{381} H12.

\footnote{382} For an intaglio depicting Sol riding a dromedary, cf. Raspe & Tassie 1791, 217 nr. 3102 (images are hard to find, but there is online at www.beazley.ox.ac.uk). Cf. Also the equestrian statue of Helios in Termessus (A2f.2).
of the die and its mirror image, the coin. But the die engraver did not face the same dilemma as
the gem engraver, because the dominant image was obviously the coin, so that die had to be
carved in the mirror image of the intended coin design. Gems, however, did not have an obvious
dominant image. As amulet or jewellery the stone itself and its engraving were the important
image, but for signet rings the gem, like the coin die, is the conduit for the actual image which is
the impression or seal. Signet rings were also jewellery of course, and there was no reason why
an amulet could not double as a seal. As we have seen, a strict division between the two was not
possible. De facto, then, intaglios had two images, the one engraved into the stone and the other
its mirror image, the intaglio’s impression. To what extent these images were interchangeable
depended on the iconographic conventions governing the image, but in the case of Sol with his
raised right hand, only one of the two images can be correct while the other clearly is not. The
engraver had to choose which that would be: the intaglio itself or its impression.

A glance at the catalogue shows that this was apparently neither random chance nor a
foregone conclusion, but a real and deliberate choice. Sol is almost as likely to be depicted with
his right hand raised (intaglio itself the preferred image) as with his left hand raised (intaglio the
mirror image of the preferred one). In many cases, therefore, it was the impression that presented
the correct image rather than the intaglio itself. That in itself is interesting, but does not tell us
whether or not this was a matter of chance. In the case of profile images of Sol, however, it is not
just the arm, but also the direction of the profile that changes from gem to impression. Here we
find clear evidence that gem engravers took into account which image - intaglio or impression -
was to be the more important. On the vast majority of intaglios depicting Sol in a profile
quadriga he is riding to the left (H1), while only a small number depict the quadriga in the
opposite direction (H2). Of the intaglios with the quadriga riding to the left, twenty depict Sol
with a raised right hand and only one with a raised left hand,383 while of the five gems depicting
Sol’s quadriga to the right, three depict him with a raised hand, and in all three cases it is his left
hand. This shows that the latter were clearly meant to produce a seal as dominant image, on
which Sol would be depicted riding left with his right hand raised. It also shows that in the case
of intaglio-images the correct direction for Sol to face is left. This is in marked contrast to other
depictions of Sol in a chariot, which almost always face right in all media except coinage. I have
no explanation for this, but it is in itself noteworthy that even a seemingly insignificant
iconographic detail such as the direction of Sol's chariot was fixed by convention in Roman
glyptic art.

In the case of frontal images (Sol standing, Sol on a frontal chariot) the impression does
not differ essentially from the intaglio except in which hand is raised. It would appear that
intaglios depicting Sol in a frontal chariot were also generally not meant primarily for sealing.
Sol's right hand is raised on 21 intaglio's of H3 while the left hand is raised on five. Of the eleven
intaglio's of H4, only three depict Sol with a raised hand at all, once his right hand, twice his left.
Interestingly, matters are different with Sol as standing figure. A large majority of these gems
(86) depict Sol with a raised hand, in 66 cases his left, in 20 his right (the latter including eight of
the ten multiple-figure scenes). In the case of the frontal chariots as well as the standing figure of

383 The exception is J207, Vienna IX B 607. Although I am fairly confident that it is Sol's left hand which is
raised here, I am not completely certain that this is the case.
Sol it is impossible to establish whether it is chance or purpose which determined with which arm Sol was depicted making his striking gesture. As for the profile quadrigae, however, there can be no doubt that the dominant direction was left and that each intaglio was designed in such a manner to ensure that in the dominant image the quadriga faced left and Sol had his right hand raised. The left-facing preference extends to busts of Sol, the vast majority of which also face left (H7). By analogy with the profile chariots, one could argue that the intaglios with busts of Sol facing right were therefore also designed to produce the dominant image in the seal.

The care with which the left-facing direction of Sol is maintained on intaglios is further evidence of how strictly defined such iconographical conventions were in the Roman world. This was maintained over a considerable period of time, for the intaglios on which Sol has raised his right arm include gems dated to the first and early second c. AD, with the early dates backed up by the evidence of fairly early (1st-2nd c.) ring types. Perhaps the most interesting result, however, is the fact that a far larger percentage of intaglios depicting Sol standing are engraved in mirror image, i.e., with the left hand raised so that the impression is the correct image, than the percentage of intaglios depicting Sol as charioteer. Does this mean anything? Quite possibly it simply shows that gems that for sake of the mirror image had to be “wrong” on two counts - wrong hand raised and wrong direction - were too jarring and hence avoided. The result would then be, of course, that these gems could not easily be used as seals which in turn would mean that when it came to Sol as seal-image the standing figure or bust was the preferred choice, rather than Sol as charioteer. Consequently, a ring with an intaglio depicting Sol as a standing figure would have a slightly different set of associated meanings than one depicting Sol as charioteer.

This suggests that different shades of meaning, however slight, existed between the three basic image types [sol], which should not surprise us although we have not, so far, pursued that possibility. Indeed, this is corroborated by other evidence. As minor, framing figure with Luna, Sol can be depicted as bust or charioteer, but virtually never as standing figure. Separated from his chariot, yet depicted full-length rather than as a bust, Sol was at his most independent. He is not engaged in the eternal cosmic cyclical motion implied by the chariot, nor has he been abbreviated to a bust, but he is autonomous and ready for, if not actually engaged in, self-directed action.

To what extent these shades of meaning mattered and how strongly they were felt is difficult to say and requires further research. One area to look at is obviously that of coins, that are as it were the “seals” of the intaglio-like coin dies. The standing figure is by far the most popular on coins. He is normally depicted with a raised hand, and invariably it is his right. Sol is occasionally depicted in a profile quadriga on Roman imperial coins, and the dominant direction is to the left as it is on intaglios. Often Sol has raised one arm, and again it is invariably the right. Busts or heads of Sol are also not terribly common on Roman coins, and surprisingly

---


385 Sol in a quadriga riding to the left: RIC IV.1, 250-1 nrs 265a-h, 254 nrs 282a-f, 256 nrs 294a-c, 302 nrs. 543a-b, 304-7 nrs 551, 556, 562, 566, 570, RIC V.1, 63 nrs 421-2, 174 nrs 497-8, 351 nrs 17-8, 360 nrs 114-5, RIC V.2, 45 nr 267, 100-1 nrs 767-774, 113 nrs 871-4, 250 nr 152, 478 nr 170, 498 nrs 408-9. Sol in a quadriga riding to
here the direction is the opposite: contrary to the left-facing busts of most intaglios, busts of Sol on coins face right almost exclusively. Thus coins and intaglios do not fully complement each other, unless we take the numismatic evidence to indicate that all left-facing busts and heads of Sol on intaglios were meant to produce right-facing seals in concord with the coins.

The direction profile busts or quadrigae face on intaglios or coins is clearly not random, but the direction varied between image types and genres. It would appear that while consistency mattered, the actual direction was a relatively meaningless convention. The alternative is to postulate that right-facing busts have a different connotation from left-facing quadrigae by virtue of the direction they face. That is not impossible, but would require more evidence than we have at present.

Conclusion
Our review of the image types [sol] on intaglios has raised a number of interesting points. Iconographically the range of images is rich but contains few real surprises. Most noteworthy are the gems depicting Sol on horseback, but their number is too small to warrant the conclusion that they represent a separate image type [sol], the more so because there are virtually no parallels outside glyptic art. We know from the relief in Corbridge (C2d.7), the epigraphic evidence from Asia Minor and Termessus that solar statues on horseback were possible, but cannot say how they were perceived to relate to the standard image types [sol].

The number of intaglios and cretule with the image type [sol] is substantial and implies that the use of the image as seal would not raise eyebrows, although Sol was not especially common. This was already the case in the Hellenistic era, for which we have the evidence of numerous cretule. That it continued to be the case in the Roman era is clear from the intaglios engraved in the mirror image of the intended depiction which was the seal. Given the important, personal nature of seal stones this is a significant indication of the way images of Sol were perceived and experienced in the Roman Empire. Besides being used as personal seal, the image of Sol also occurred on magical gems, indicating an amuletic function, while intaglios depicting Sol within a zodiac circle or Sol and Leo, for instance, also attest to astrological connections.

The iconographic rules governing the depiction of Sol on intaglios were apparently so strict that even the direction of the profile bust or profile quadriga was fixed.

A final, potentially quite significant point was the evidence suggesting that the three image types [sol] were not completely interchangeable. The full-length figure of Sol, we saw, was far more likely to be depicted in mirror image on an intaglio than the profile quadriga of Sol. This would appear to be more than a quirk of glyptic design, for the standing figure is also rarely

the right: RIC II, 360 nrs 167-8, RIC V.1, 274 nr 77, RIC VI, 638 nr 143.


387 Sol and zodiac: H1fa.1, H1ha.1, H3aa.1, H4da.1, H6cb.1, H6h.1, H9b.1-2, H10ka.1, H10kb.1, H18b.1(?); Sol and Leo: H8a.1(?), H8c.1, H10d.1, H11a.3, H11b.4, 6, H15c.1, H15ca.1, H15cb.1, H15cc.1, H18d.1.
used as a minor, “framing” figure (in contrast with both the bust of Sol and Sol as _auriga_ of a quadriga. On coins too, as we shall see, Sol as a standing figure is far more common than the quadriga or bust of Sol.

### I. Cameos

I am not aware of any ancient cameos on which the image type Sol occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. Jewellery, costume (including ependytes), personal ornaments</th>
<th>J1. Diadems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 65.5</td>
<td>-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg, Hermitage II 1834.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koul-Ouba (near Kertsch), tomb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th c. BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scene, repeated to either side of a central, knot-shaped ornament, depicting the rape of Persephone. Seated on a rock, Helios. LIMC Demeter 323; LIMC Hades 106 (with refs.); LIMC Helios/Sol 323; Matern 2002,51-2, 209, Q9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilded bronze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st c. AD (Matern).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two aedicula-shaped bronze plaques, both damaged, connected by hinges; left-hand plaque: seated Sabazius surrounded by cultic symbols, in tympanum eagle. Right-hand plaque: throning Cybele between Mercurius and Attis; in tympanum frontal head of Sol (7 rays) above quadriga, two horses' protomes jumping left, two to the right. LIMC Helios/Sol 229; Vermasere 1976, 82 nr. 304; Matern 2002, 53, 56, 215 Q48 A second set from the same mould also survives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem, Israel Mus. 76.63.50 (665)</td>
<td>-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nablus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-3rd c. AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Sol to either side of the 12 Gods. LIMC Helios/Sol 227; LIMC Dodekatheoi 58.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir, Mus.</td>
<td>-4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd-3rd c. AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, formerly coll. Goluchow</td>
<td>-5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd half 3rd c. AD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diadem: frontal radiate head of Sol between the 12 gods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two frontal busts of Sol, flanking 3 deities. LIMC Helios/Sol 228.

Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Mus. 74.383

Acquired in Aleppo, Art Market; reputedly from Laodicea. Gold

2nd half 3rd c. AD (dated on dubious grounds)

Diadem: in centre, bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays) above four horses' protomes, between ten gods on the left and eight gods (from the same matrix) on the right. LIMC Helios/Sol 269; Long 1987, 320-22; Matern 2002, 56-7, 216 Q53.

Pl. 65.1

Copenhagen, Mus. Nat. 4977

Rome

Bronze

3rd c. AD

Small, aedicula-shaped bronze plaque, which formed part of a diadem. In the tympanon, frontal chariot (two horses to the left, two to the right) of Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys billowing out behind him, whip in left hand, globe (?) in right hand; two stars in the corners. In the upper corners outside the tympanon the Dioscuri. In the main field, Sabazius standing, surrounded by a large array of cultic objects and animals; in the upper right hand corner bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays), chlamys, and in the upper left hand corner bust of Luna. LIMC Helios/Sol 230 & 349a; LIMC Dioskouroi/Castores 51 (with lit.); Matern 2002, 53, 214 Q43 (incorrect inv. nr.).

Unknown, formerly coll. Goluchow

Unknown

Gold

2nd half 3rd c. AD

Diadem: frontal radiate head of Sol between the 12 gods.
### J2. Sol as decorative element of ependytes.

#### J2a. Aphrodisian Aprodite.\(^{388}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.</td>
<td>Erlangen, Univ. I 505</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>2nd c. AD (LIMC); 3rd c. AD (Noelke)</td>
<td>Fragment of a statuette; preserved is the torso from the neck down to slightly above the waist; on the ependytes: busts of Sol and Luna.</td>
<td>LIMC Helios 293; LIMC Aprodite (Aphrodisias) 15 (with refs.); Noelke 1983, 118-9 nr. 17 fig. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4.</td>
<td>Unknown Ostia</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>Mid 2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Small statuette of Aprodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna</td>
<td>LIMC Aprodite (Aphrodisias) 38; Noelke 1983, 122 nr. 26, 123 fig. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Private collection Split</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>Mid 2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Statuette of Aprodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.</td>
<td>LIMC Aprodite (Aphrodisias) 33; Noelke 1983, 117 nr. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Aphrodisias (Geyre), depot Aphrodisias</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>Mid 2nd c. AD</td>
<td>Damaged statue of Aprodite of Aphrodisias. On ependytes: busts of Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays) and Luna.</td>
<td>LIMC Aprodite (Aphrodisias) 18; Noelke 1983, 129 nr. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Pl. 65.2 Athens, Nat. Mus. 1795 &amp; 2147 Athens</td>
<td>Marble</td>
<td>2nd c. AD (and not BC, as mistakenly in LIMC)</td>
<td>Two parts of a statue of Aprodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.</td>
<td>LIMC Helios 291; Noelke 1983, 121 nr. 22; LIMC Aprodite (Aphrodisias) 11.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{388}\) L. Brody, *The Aprodite of Aphrodisias*, Mainz 2007, was not yet available to me when I finalized this section of the catalogue.
Rome
Marble
3rd c. AD (Noelke)
Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 26; Noelke 1983, 123 nr. 27.

-16. Parma, Mus.
Parma
Marble
Undated
Torso of a statuette of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 28; Noelke 1983, 116 nr. 6.

Cologne, Römisch-Germanisches Museum
Italy?
Marble
Undated
Statuette of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 31; Noelke 1983, 115 nr. 2; Floriani Squarciapino 1959 figs. 4-5.

-17. Pl. 65.4
Rome, Mus. Naz. Rom. 6755b
Rome?
Marble
Undated
Torso of a statuette of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes frontal busts of Sol (right), radiate nimbus, and Luna (left).

Florence, Uffizi 490
Unknown, possibly found locally
Marble
Undated
Torso of a statuette of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 20a (with ref.).

-18. Unknown
Ariccia, near Rome
Marble
Undated
Statuette of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 37; Noelke 1983, 115 nr. 4.

London, Sloane Mus. M430
Italy
Marble
Undated
Upper part of the torso of a statue of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias. Below the belt the tips of a few rays of Sol's radiate crown have been preserved.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 22; Noelke 1983, 119-20 nr. 19.

-19. Aphrodisias (Geyre), depot 69/293
Aphrodisias
Marble
Undated
Fragment of a statue of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias. On ependytes: busts of Sol, radiate nimbus (11 rays) and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 19; Noelke 1983, 129 nr. 29.

-20. Ephesus (Selçuk), Mus. W 66/158
Ephesus
Marble
Undated
Fragment of a statue of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias. On ependytes: busts of Sol, radiate nimbus and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 34 & 36;
Noelke 1983, 118 nr. 16.

Aphrodisias
Marble
1st c. AD?
Fragment of a relief depicting Aphrodite of Aphrodisias. On ependytes: busts of Sol, radiate nimbus and Luna.
Mendel 1914, nr. 516.

-22. Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery
Baalbek
Bronze
Undated
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 40; Noelke 1983, 117 nr. 12

-23. Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. 139
Unknown
Marble
Undated
Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 35; Noelke 1983, 123 nr. 28, fig. 17.

-24. Private Collection
Unknown
Marble
Undated
Headless statuette of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; on ependytes busts of Sol and Luna.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 27; Noelke 1983, 116-7 nr. 10, figs. 20-21.

-25. Unknown, copy in Berlin
Unknown
Unknown (copy in bronze)
Undated
Aphrodite of Aphrodisias; busts of Sol and Luna on ependytes.
LIMC Aphrodite (Aphrodisias) 41 (with refs.); Noelke 1983, 122 (under nr. 26).

J2b. Heliopolis, Jupiter.

-1. Pl. 65.3
Istanbul, Arch. Mus. 2570

Soukhné, Northeast of Palmyra
Limestone
2nd-3rd c. AD
Statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. On ependytes, inter alia, bust of Sol, radiate, and Luna (crescent) flanking the bust of Jupiter Heliopolitanus or, according to Hajjar, the Palmyrene triad of Bel, Yarhibol, and Aglibol.
Mendel 1914, 613-616 nr. 1404; Fleischer 1973, 328 H6, pl. 148 (with lit.); Hajjar 1977, 211-214 nr. 186 pl. 70.
Hajjar rejects the identification of the central bust as Jupiter Heliopolitanus on the grounds that it is unlikely that the ependytes of the god would be decorated with an image of the god.

-2. Avignon, Mus. Calvet 41
Marseille
Marble
Undated
Stele with depiction, in high relief, of Jupiter Heliopolitanus, his ependytes decorated with three groups of two busts - all worn and damaged - separated vertically by a herm.
Hajjar recognizes the planetary deities in the busts and herm, with Sol (left) and Luna (right) at the top to either side of the bust of Mercury surmounting the herm.
Hajjar 1977, 349-352 nr. 284 pl. 105.

-3. Beirut Mus. 3279
Apamea
Limestone
Undated
Rectangular base for a column. On the base a relief depiction of Jupiter Heliopolitanus, with on the ependytes two busts, badly worn but almost certainly Sol and Luna (Hajjar).
Hajjar 1977, 197-8 nr. 172, pl. 65.

-4. Berlin, Staatliche Museen VA 3360
Kafr Yasin (between Beirut and Byblos)
Bronze
Undated
Statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. His ependytes is decorated at the top with the busts of Sol, radiate (l.), and Luna (r.).
Hajjar 1977, 264-6 nr. 226, pl. 85.

-5. Lost (formerly Graz, Joanneum)
-6. Paris, Louvre AO 11.446  
Lebanon, Beka’a region  
Bronze  
Undated  
Statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. On the ependytes, busts of Sol (l.) radiate, and Luna.  
Hajjar 1977 409-11 nr. 313, pl. 124.

-7. Paris, Louvre AO 11.451  
Beirut  
gilded bronze  
Undated  
Statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. On the ependytes two busts, without distinguishing attributes but nonetheless “without doubt” Sol and Luna (Hajjar) above a bearded bust of Saturnus.  

Baalbek?  
Bronze  
Undated  
Statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. On his ependytes, upper register, busts of Sol (l.) with long, wavy hair (no rays?), and Luna (r.); in the next register, three standing figures identified as Zeus between Ares and Hermes, and in the third register standing figure of Tyche.  
Hajjar 1977, 236-239 nr. 208, pls.78-9.

Lebanon  
Bronze  
Undated  
Statuette of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. On his ependytes, at the top, the busts of Sol (draped, long hair, not radiate) and Luna, followed below by the busts of the other planetary deities: first Saturnus (l.) and Jupiter (r); next Mars (l.) and Venus, and finally Mercury. On the back, an eagle, a solar disc, and the busts of Neptune, Ceres/Demeter, Minerva, Diana, and Hercules. Together with the seven planetary deities, these are the gods connected with the twelve signs of the zodiac.  
Hajjar 1977. 284-6 nr. 233 pls. 90-1.

-10. Paris, Louvre AO 22268  
Phoenicia  
bronze  
Not dated  
Statuette, damaged, of Jupiter Heliopolitanus. On his breast: bust of Sol, radiate.  
Hajjar 1977, 234.

J2c. Myra, Artemis Eleuthera  
-1. Myra, Theatre  
_In situ_  
Limestone  
After AD 141, when the theatre was restored after being destroyed by an earthquake.  
Relief of Artemis Eleuthera: on her ependytes bust of Sol, radiate, and crescent.  
LIMC Artemis Eleuthera 2 (with ref.); LIMC Helios 292.  
This is the only representation of Artemis Eleuthera which is sufficiently well preserved to give an idea of the iconography of the main cult statue. It appears to confirm that Sol and Luna were included on the decoration of the ependytes.

J2d. Hecate  
-1. Sibiu, Mus. Bruckenthal  
Oena Mures  
Marble  
2nd c. AD  
Statuette of triple Hecate, two dressed in chiton, one in ependytes. On ependytes: frontal bust of Sol, radiate (? rays).  
LIMC Helios/Sol 217.

J2e. Other.  
-1. Art Market, New York  
Unknown  
Bronze  
Undated
Two figures, one male and one female, wearing a common ependytes, on which are depicted, *inter alia*, the planetary deities (Sol, Mars, Mercury and Saturn on the front, Luna, Venus and Jupiter on the back) and a nude youth on the front holding a zodiac circle which encircles the statuette. Hecht (n.d.), nr. 22.

**J3. Other decorative elements of statues and statuettes**

1. **Pl. 66.1**
   - Brussels, Mus. Roy.
   - Unknown
   - Marble
   - 1st-2nd c. AD
   - Portrait of a young, clean-shaven man. Above his forehead a small disc bearing a face within a full circle of rays (*Sonnengesicht*) - very worn.
   - LIMC Helios/Sol 5.

2. **Lost**
   - Southern France
   - Silver
   - 2nd-3rd c. AD
   - Pantheistic, winged Tutela, with cornucopia, rudder, wheel, and mural crown with Isis emblem; to either side of the crown, busts of Sol and Luna.
   - LIMC Helios/Sol 339; Boucher 1976, 150 n.262.

3. **Pl. 66.2**
   - London, BM 1824.4-24.1 (silver 33)
   - Mâcon
   - Gilded silver
   - Ca. AD 260 (date of burial)
   - Pantheistic Tutela, with patera, two cornucopiae topped with the busts of Sol and Luna, and above her head the two Dioscuri and the seven planetary deities.
   - LIMC Dodekatheoi 54 (with references)

4. **Lost**
   - Montpellier
   - Bronze
   - Undated
   - Busts of the seven planetary deities, beginning with Saturn (l.), on a crescent.
   - Duval suggests it may be part of a statuette comparable to the one from Mâcon in the British Museum (J3.3).

**J4. Rings**

1. **London, British Museum**
   - Tarsus
   - Gold
   - 2nd half 3rd AD
   - Massive, hexagonal gold ring; in relief, facing busts of Sol and Sarapis.
   - Marshall 1908, 47 nr. 268
   - Found in 1863 as part of the "Trésor de Tarse" (cf. Longpérier 1868). A coin of Gordian of AD 243 gives the *terminus post quem*. The name Gerontius on one of the rings in the treasure (Marshall 1908, nr. 188) was common in the 4th c., but not in the 3rd.

2. **London, British Museum 72 6-4 319**
   - Unknown
   - Gold
   - 3rd-4th c. (?)
   - Three plain rings, fastened together by two small rings surmounted by small rectangular plaques with engraved design; on the one: two facing busts, the right-hand one radiate, possibly Sol, the left-hand one unidentifiable. On the other: radiate profile head of Sol on the left, facing right, crescent above star.
   - Marshall 1908, 983.

3. **London, British Museum 1143**
   - Byblos
   - Silver
   - Undated
   - Ring ending in two facing snakes' heads holding a small, hexagonal (partially broken) plate with frontal bust of Sol (radiate) in relief.
   - Marshall 1908, 1143

**J5 Earrings**

1. **Pl. 67.1**
   - Paris, Louvre C112
   - Bolsena
   - Gold
   - Late Republican
   - Sol in frontal quadriga, between two Victories. Sol is radiate and raises his right hand.

391
hand.

LIMC Helios 87; Matern 2002, 208, Q6;
both with lit.
According to Matern Sol may be holding a whip.

J6 Bracelets
-1. Lost
Syria
Gold
Roman Imperial
Bracelet with the busts of Tyche and the seven planetary deities, their names inscribed in Greek, starting with Kronos.
LIMC Planetae 32

J. Jewellery, costume, and other adornments
This is a rather heterogenous group of objects, ranging from adorned statues to gold earrings, and there is certainly a degree of arbitrariness in its composition. This is particularly the case with the decision, for instance, to include decorative elements of *ependytes* in this section but decorative elements of armor in the next. That arbitrariness need not concern us. Our aim was to produce a catalogue that organized the material with a degree of logic but without concern for the manner in which the image types [sol] were deployed. It is important, therefore, that all *ependytes* end up in the same section, but does not matter if all armor is catalogued under a different heading.

There is little here that is new. The variety of images again illustrates how widely the image types [sol] were deployed, and reminds us not to discount rare contexts as anomalies or chance occurrences. For example the two votive reliefs to Sabazius from the Balkans (C2t.1-2) depicting Sol and Luna do not stand alone, but find *comparanda* in bronze foil plaques of diadems found in Rome (J1.6, cf. J.1.2). Other contexts are more familiar. We find the planetary deities, in the order of the week starting with Saturn; Sol and Luna, of course, sometimes with the Dioscuri, and the like.\(^{389}\) The objects come from most parts of the Empire and span its full history. Dates and provenances contain few surprises although the earrings from Bolsena, dated to the first century BC or earlier are noteworthy in view of Sol’s raised right hand (J5.1).

The most interesting depictions of Sol in this section, however, are the ones on the *ependytes* of Aphrodite of Aphrodisias, Jupiter Heliopolitanus, Artemis Eleuthera of Myra, Hecate and an unidentified pair of gods, listed in the various sections of J2. The authenticity of the pair of deities wearing a single ependytes (J2e.1) cannot be confirmed, and the statue of the triple Hecate (J2d.1) is rather exceptional, but the statues of the Aphrodisian Aphrodite and Jupiter of Heliopolis represent the standard type for these deities as, apparently, does the statue of Artemis Eleuthera even though it is the sole surviving example. It is on these three that we will focus our attention.

All three are local deities and their iconography emphasizes their local roots. The sheath-like ependytes that encases and effectively hides their bodies is one of the most important

\(^{389}\) Planetary deities: J2b.1.,8-9, J2e.1, J3.3-4, J6.1; Dioscuri: J1.6, J3.3.
elements of this local iconography. By Graeco-Roman standards it is distinctive in its
foreignness. Nonetheless the iconography is Roman insofar as all surviving statues of these
particular versions of Aphrodite, Jupiter and Artemis date to the Roman imperial era. In the case
of the Aphrodisian Aphrodite the provenance of most statues is Italy, further emphasizing the
Roman nature of these statues. The statues of Jupiter Heliopolitanus are predominantly from the
Levant, but could also travel, as at least one made its way to Gaul (J2b.1). Artemis Eleuthera
appears to have been more strictly local.

This combination of Roman and local sheds an interesting light on the decoration of the
ependytes of these statues. The Aphrodisian Aphrodite has a range of distinctly Graeco-Roman
images adorning her dress: the three graces, the image type [sol and luna], a nude, reclining
Aphrodite seen from behind with a marine goat, and a number of Erotes. All stand in marked
contrast to the local guise of the statue in other respects. The marine goat is particularly
remarkable because the dominant sign of the horoscope of Augustus was Capricorn. Aphrodisias
forged close links with Augustus and his Julio-Claudian successors, as reflected, inter alia, in the
Sebasteion built between about AD 20 and 60. This monumental arch and street leading to the
temple of Aphrodite was replete with imagery extolling Roman rule and the Julio-Claudian
rulers. The city’s ancient and venerable cult of Aphrodite naturally played a key role in this
process, for it was in Asia Minor that Aphrodite bore Aeneas, the Trojan ancestor of Augustus,
and in Asia Minor no cult centre to Aphrodite was more important than that of Aphrodisias.

It is tempting to include a redesigning of the cult statue among the Aphrodisian projects
undertaken to cement the bonds between their Aphrodite and the Julio-Claudians. This could
quite literally have been a matter of new clothes for the venerable cult image, particularly the
richly decorated garment that is so characteristic of the statues and statuettes of the goddess
dating to the Roman imperial era. That would give added relevance to the symbolic imagery in
Graeco-Roman style with which the garment is adorned, the implication being that the imagery
should help anchor the local goddess within the broader Roman Empire in general, and to its
Julio-Claudian rulers in particular. The sea-goat/capricorn image can certainly be explained along
these lines, and we have already postulated previously that the image type [sol-luna] could carry
connotations of romanness. But this does not amount to proof that the design of the adornments
was part of a conscious redefinition of the cult statue in the (early) Julio-Claudian era. Further
research is needed both on the history of the cult image and the context of the transformations
Aphrodisias underwent during the early imperial era. A similar line of reasoning could be valid
for the Heliopolitan Jupiter and even Artemis Eleuthera, but again further research is necessary.

In conclusion, this section offers further interesting examples of the use of the image type
[sol] that can be understood along the same lines as images discussed in previous sections.


391 Aphrodisias was not the first city to forge links to Rome with a claim to shared mythical roots. In
Pergamum in the early 2nd c. BC the emphasis on the role of Telephos, son of Hercules and father of Rhome/Roma
had been deployed in like manner.

392 Reynolds (1996, 44) points out that under Tiberius, a reorganization of the cult led to Aphrodite of
Aphrodisias being equated with Venus Genetrix and referred to as προμήτωρ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ.
K. Minor objects

K1. Appliques

-1. Pl. 67.2
  Copenhagen, Nat. Mus.
  Agersbol
  Silver
  1st c. AD
  Frontal face surrounded by rays (Sonnengesicht).
  LIMC Helios/Sol 10

-2. Art market
  Syria
  Terracotta
  1st - 2nd c. AD
  Star-shaped applique with bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, possibly a quiver.
  Matern 2002, 265 B143 (with ref.).

  Vaison, Maison au Dauphin, lararium
  Bronze
  2nd c. AD
  Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
  Goudineau 1979, 30, 167, pl. 3; Rolland 1965, 79 nr. 127.

-4. Pl. 67.4
  Avenches, Mus. Rom. 1912/5521
  Avenches
  Bronze
  2nd-3rd c. AD
  Bust of Sol, radiate (8? rays, of which 5 preserved).
  LIMC Helios/Sol 65.

-5. Székesfehérvár, Mus. Arch. 75.37.2
  Adony, Dolichenum
  Bronze
  2nd-3rd c. AD
  Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys.
  LIMC Helios/Sol 59 (with refs.); Fitz 1998, 96 nr. 161

  Rimat, near Saïda, Syria
  Bronze
  2nd-3rd c.
  Bust of Sol, radiate.
  Babelon-Blanchet 55 nr. 118; Matern 2002, 182, 249 B34

-7. Pl. 67.3
  Kassel, Staatl. Kunstsbg. Br. 132
  Unknown
  2nd-3rd c. AD
  Bronze
  Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 66; Bieber, SkulptCassel 307 pl. 49

  Unknown
  2nd-3rd c.
  Bust of Sol, radiate (6 rays), whip by right shoulder.
  Babelon-Blanchet 54 nr. 116; Matern 2002, 172, 182, 249 B32.

  Unknown
  2nd-3rd c.
  Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
  Babelon-Blanchet 56 nr. 119; Matern 2002, 182, 249 B35

-10. Pl. 66.3
  Unknown
  2nd-3rd c.
  Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), the tops of the rays connected to each other by a semi-circular band.
  Babelon-Blanchet 56 nr. 120; Matern 2002, 182, 249 B36

-11. Pl. 67.6
  Paris, Louvre Br 523
  Unknown
  2nd-3rd c.
  Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays)
  LIMC Helios/Sol 66

-12. Pl. 68.1
  St.-Germain-en-Laye, Mus. Ant. Nat. MAN 12843
  Châlons-sur-Marne
  Bronze
  3rd c. AD (?)
Bronze medallion of a phalera; head of Medusa within double concentric circle, between two maritime creatures (?) - only their tails survive), below frontal head of Sol, radiate (7 rays) within a wreath. Schauenburg 1955, 33-4 fig. 18; LIMC Helios/Sol 207.


-14. Bucharest, Nat. Mus. Romula Terracotta 3rd c. AD Vase-applique; Sol, nude (?) but for a chlamys, head damaged, right hand raised, whip in left hand, on quadriga r. within a partially preserved zodiac circle. LIMC Helios/Sol 297; Gundel 1992, 237 nr. 96.1; Matern 2002, 243 165.


-17. Pl. 67.5 Besançon, Mus. des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie 852.2.7 Besançon, "le champ noir" Bronze Undated Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays). LIMC Helios/Sol 66; Lebel 1961 nr. 165. Lebel refers to a second applique, taken from a cast of the first. Monsieur Jacques-Marie Dubois of the museum in Besançon informs me that this is a copy dating from the 18th or 19th c. (inv. A 478).

-18. Pl. 68.3 Besançon, Mus. des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie 859.9.3 Sournay (Haute-Saône) Bronze Undated Bust of Sol, radiate (5 rays, now lost). Lebel 1961 nr. 164. Lebel gives an incorrect inv. nr. The cast he mentions under nr. 290 (p. 77) is not a Dioscure, but actually an 18th or 19th c. cast of this applique.

-19. Pl. 68.4 London, British Museum 79.11-30.1 Palmyra Terracotta Undated Medallion-like applique; Atargatis or Allath seated, between two lions. On the left frontal bust of a woman (face worn), on the right frontal bust of male deity, radiate nimbus (10 rays), chlamys, armor, above a globe (?) - not a star as commonly stated) and crescent. LIMC Helios (in per. or.) 13, with ref.


**Unknown**
Bronze
Undated
Mask of Sol, radiate.

-23. **Art Market**
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Bust of Sol, chlamys.
Matern 2002, 265 B147.

-24. **Berlin, Staatl. Mus.**
Aïn-Djoudj
Lead
Roman?
Four votive appliques, originally crowning wooden shafts (Seyrig 1929, 339); radiate head above a disc. A single or double crescent almost encircles the disc from below.
LIMC Helios (in per. or.) 11b (with refs.)

-25. **Berlin, Staatl. Mus.**
Aïn-Djoudj
Lead
Roman?
As previous, but instead of a disc crowned with a head the crescent is surmounted by a radiate bust of Sol.
LIMC Helios (in per. or.) 11b (with refs.)

-26. **London, BM 1978, 0102.17**
West Hill, Uley, Gloucestershire
Bronze
Roman Imperial
Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays, of which 5 survive), chlamys (?).
Woodward & Leach 1993, fig. 85.1.

**K2. Armor and harness**

-1. **Naples, Mus. Naz. 5687**
Herculaneum
Silver
Augustean (Künzl)
Part of a cingulum, consisting of a rectangular plate with representation of Othryades to which a large round boss is connected depicting Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys and long chiton, in a quadriga to the right, reins in the right, long whip in his left hand. Forms a pair with a mirror-image part, also depicting Othryades, with Luna on the boss in a biga to the left. Said probably to have been used for the fastening of a pugio (Künzl 1977, 84 & n. 4), but that leaves the companion-element with Luna (on the right hip) without a function (swords in the early principate were carried with a shoulder-belt). Künzl 1977; Ensoli 1995, 400 nr. 6.17.2; Matern 2002, 65, 70 n. 444, 218 Q69.

-2. Vatican, Bracchio Nuovo 2290
Primaporta
Marble
Ca. 17 BC
Statue of Augustus. On breastplate, below Caelus, Sol, chiton and chlamys, in quadriga r., preceded by Luna (not in biga!) with torch disappearing behind winged Aurora carrying a jug above the main scene depicting the return of legionary standards to a Roman (or Mars?) by the Parthians, with a seated, mourning woman to either side, representing conquered (or client) states. Below, reclining Tellus with cornucopia, between Apollo with lyre on griffin (left) and Diana on a stag (right) with torch (!) and quiver

-3. Pl. 69
Naples, Mus. Naz. 5014
Pompeii
Bronze
mid 1st c. AD
So-called Caligula-statuette. Breastplate decorated with silver inlay depicting Sol, radiate, in frontal chariot above Tellus between two animals (Bull and Ram? - star signs?).
LIMC Helios/Sol 218; Matern 2002, 56, 216-7 Q58 (with refs.).

-4. Pl. 70.1
Vatican, Mus. Greg. Prof. 9948
Caere
Marble
Mid 1st c. AD, possibly AD 39/41, possibly Neronian.
Statue of a loricatus; on breastplate: Sol, radiate (? rays), chlamys, on frontal
quadriga (2 horses to the left, two to the right, heads of all horses facing outwards) emerging from the sea.
LIMC Helios/Sol 214 (incorrect ref. to Stemmer); Stemmer 1978, 96-7 nr. VIIa2, pl. 65 1-2; Matern 2002, 55-6, 217 Q59 (with refs.); Kantorowicz 1963, 120-1 fig. 13.
The date of AD 39/41 is based on the find-context, but as Boschung (2002, 88-9) argues, the find-context is not conclusive for the group of statues discovered in 1840, to which this one belongs, as they were found dumped in a well, and hence their original context is unknown. A Neronian date has also been suggested for our statue (cf. Boschung 2002, 89 n. 30, with refs.).

-5. Cartagena, Mus. Cartagena
Marble
Tiberian
Fragment of a statue of a loricatus with, on the breastplate, remains of a frontal quadriga of Sol.
Stemmer 1978, 97 nr. VIIa3, pl. 65.3;
Matern 2002, 55, 216 Q55

-6. Unknown private collection, possibly in Graz?
Salona
Marble
Tiberian
Statue of a loricatus; on breastplate: Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys, on frontal quadriga (2 horses to the left, two to the right, heads of inner horses facing inwards) emerging from the sea.
Stemmer 1978, 56 nr. V 1, pl. 34, 1; Matern 2002, 56, 216 Q56; Kantorowicz 1963, 120-1, fig. 14.

-7. Turin, Mus. 313
Susa
Marble
Tiberian
Bust of a general; on breastplate, Sol, not radiate, in frontal chariot, two horses to the left, and two to the right.
Stemmer 1978, 96 nr. VIIa1; Matern 2002, 217 Q60; Kantorowicz 1963, 120, fig. 12.

-8. Lecce, Mus. Prov. 4598
Lecce (Theatre)
Marble
Late 1st - mid 2nd c. AD
Torso of a loricatus: Sol, radiate (only 2 rays preserved), chiton and chlamys, in frontal quadriga emerging from waves (only two horses preserved. Below the waves 2 Nereids on kete.
LIMC Helios/Sol 215

Hatra
Marble
2nd c. AD
Statue of Apollo/Nabu; on breastplate, bust of Sol.
LIMC Helios 140; LIMC Helios (in per. or.) 9 (with refs.)

-10. Liverpool, Mus. (formerly Ince Blundell Hall)
Unknown
Marble
Trajanic and Hadrianic/Antoninian
Head of Trajan on a mailed bust of later date. On the shoulder straps of the breastplate: bust of Sol, radiate, chlamys (right) and Luna (left).
LIMC Helios/Sol 366 (with refs.).
LIMC’s date for the bust (as opposed to the head) is too early.

-11. Sofia, Nat. Mus. Toptschi
Silver-plated bronze foil
3rd c. AD
Fore-head piece of parade-harness of a horse, decorated with a frontal winged Victory raising a disc above her head depicting the face of Sol surrounded by rays (Sonnengesicht).
LIMC Helios/Sol 206

Jordan
Bronze
Early 3rd c. AD
Fragment of a bronze helmet. On the front: two winged Victorias holding a medallion with a portrait of a clean-shaven man; on the back on each side, Sol?, nude but for a
chlamys, each on a chariot, and each holding a spear in each hand. According to LIMC: Sol Oriens and Sol Occidens. According to Schauenburg (1955, 38), Sol and Neptunus.

-13. Pl. 70.2
Vienna, Kunsthist. Mus. VI 1673
Nikyup (Bulgaria)
Bronze
Undated
Helmet, damaged. Partially preserved head of Sol in relief, frontal, surrounded by rays (originally ca. 17)
LIMC Helios/Sol 191 (with refs.).

K2a. Military standards
-1. Pl. 70.3
Hexham Abbey
Corbridge
Sandstone
Terminus ante quem: AD 98
Funerary stele for Flavinus, standard bearer of the ala Petriana. Flavinus, on horseback, carries a long pole diagonally by his side, surmounted by a round signum decorated with the frontal bust of Sol, radiate, 5 rays (of the original ??) surviving. Inscription. Matern 2002, 259 B97; RIB 1172.
Often interpreted as the radiate portrait of an emperor. Frontal radiate depictions of emperors are quite rare, making the interpretation of this image as Sol both more likely and more straightforward.

K3. Decorative elements of chariots
-1. Pl. 70.4
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 03.983
Unknown
Bronze
Ca. AD 200
Rein guide for a chariot, with an elaborate sculptural decoration depicting the battle of gods and giants. The gods are represented by Sol and Luna standing in a fortress with a large gate and corner towers. Luna, velificans, has a small crescent above her head. Sol, head lost, is nude but for a chlamys. He is repelling a snake-legged giant attacking the fortress from the left. Sol’s weapon is difficult to make out but appears to be a staff, possibly a whip. The attacking giant rests on the left-hand loop of the rein guide which consists of the protome of a griffin emerging from leaves. Below the fortress is a second snake-legged giant. The right-hand loop of the rein guide, the giant on it, and most of the defender against this giant are lost.
Comstock & Vermeule 1971, no. 671. The identification of the headless male figure as Sol seems likely, but cannot be certain. There is no obvious candidate for the third defending deity, largely lost.

-2. Pl. 70.5
Lyon, Mus. Gallo-Romain Br 29
Les-Roches-de-Condrieu (Isère)
Bronze
2nd-3rd c. AD (too late, in my opinion no later than 2nd c.).
Roughly rectangular plaque, possibly decorative element of a chariot? (or of a parade harness?). Head of Sol, radiate (6 rays), between the busts of Diana (quiver) and Juno (?) above the main figures (Bacchus and Silenus).
LIMC Helios/Sol 268; LIMC Dionysus/Bacchus (in per. occ.) 115 (with refs); Matern 2002, 264 B137.

K4. Sundials
Athens
Marble
Roman Imperial
Block of marble, originally of an altar?, reworked as a sundial. Below the concave sundial, frontal face with "radiate" waving hair: Sol?
Beschreibung 1891, 417 nr. 1048.

K5. Parapeg mata
K5a. ... image of Sol preserved
-1. Dura Europos EA 23
Dura Europos
Stucco
AD 164-215
Graffito, fragmentary, of parapegma.
Preserved are the busts of all seven planetary deities; Sol is radiate (7 rays) and holds a whip. Three busts recur below, including bust of Sol, radiate (10 rays), whip, and Luna.
-2. Pl. 70.6
Avignon, Archives du Palais du Roure, Fondation Flandreysy-Espérandieu (Fonds Espérandieu A12).
Alesia
Bronze
3rd c. AD
Bronze disc with a hole in the centre, incised busts of the seven planetary deities arranged in a circle along the edge. Sol is radiate (7 rays), wears a chlamys and has a whip behind his right shoulder.
LIMC Helios/Sol 275 (with refs.).

-3. Pl. 71.1
Trier, Rheinisches Landesmus. S.T. 12014 Altbachtal
Terracotta
3rd quarter 3rd c. AD
Upper left-hand part of a parapegma; preserved are the busts of Saturn, Sol (radiate, 5 rays), Luna, Mars and Mercurius in the upper register, and the upper part of a next register.
Meyboom 1978, 785; LIMC Helios/Sol 286; Lehoux 2007, 176 B.ix

-4. Lost, but known from early 19th c. drawings and a terracotta copy.
Rome, Domus Aurea room 21
Graffito in stucco
Undated
Parapegma incised into the stucco of a wall. Above: busts of the planetary deities - from Saturn to Venus - with attributes; Sol, radiate (8 rays), whip behind right shoulder. Below: zodiac circle between two vertical rows of 15 holes numbered 1 - XXX consecutively.
LIMC Helios/Sol 274; Gundel 1992, 45 fig. 17, 228 nr. 69; Lehoux 2007, 168-70 B.i.

-6. Pl. 71.2
Trier, Rheinisches Landesmus. S.T. 14726
Unknown
Terracotta
Undated
Mould of a parapegma depicting the seven planetary deities (from Saturn to Venus).
LIMC Helios/Sol 286 (with refs.); Lehoux 2007, 176-7 B.x.

K5b ... image of Sol lost

-1. Stuttgart, Württembergisches Landesmuseum R 171.55
Rottweil
Terracotta (Terra Sigillata, probably Rheinzabern prod.)
2nd-3rd c. AD (Gundel)
Two fragments of a parapegma. Reconstructed as consisting of a double row with signs of the zodiac (part of Gemini and Capricorn preserved), a single row of planetary deities (lower right-hand corner with Jupiter and Venus preserved), and a row of thirty holes along the bottom.
Gundel 1992, 216 nr. 36 (with refs); Meyboom 1978, 785; LIMC Helios/Sol 286; Lehoux 2007, 178-9 B.xiii.

-2. Épinal, Mus. Dep. des Vosges
Soulosse
Limestone
Undated
Fragment of a parapegma; preserved are the busts of Mars, Mercury, Jupiter and Venus.
Meyboom 1978, 785; Sadurska 1979, 74, 1:7; Lehoux 2007, 177 B.x1.

K5c ... no images

-1. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Arch. Coll. 5384 a/b
Posilippo
Marble
1st c. BC
Fragment of a parapegma; preserved are holes with accompanying inscriptions for four planetary deities (Saturn to Mars); below a row of geographical names, also
accompanied by holes: ROMAE CAPVAE CALATIAE BENEV...

Unknown
Marble
Undated
Fragment of a parapegma; only a small part of the accompanying inscriptions are preserved: mer]CVRI IOVIS V[eneris..
Meyboom 1978, 786 & n. 22; Sadurska 1979, 75, 1:10; Lehoux 2007, 173 B.v.

-3. Augst, Römermuseum 68.8167
Augst
stone
Undated
Parapegma
Sadurska 1979, 1:14

K6. Pyxides, chests, and the like
-1 Budapest, National Museum 20.1902, 2-3
Császár
Bronze
3rd-4th c. AD
Bronze fittings of a chest, discovered in a tomb in 1902. The precise position of the elements of the fittings is not certain (for a reasonable proposal cf. Buschhausen 1971 pl. 86). The following figures were part of the overall scheme: A. An arcaded row of the planetary deities; Sol, second from the left, is radiate, nude but for a chlamys, holds a globe in his left hand and has his right hand raised.393 B. Four roundels, grouped two and two, with the Good Shepherd (above) and Daniel in the Lion’s den (below) forming one group, and the Sermon on the Mount (?) (above) and the sacrifice of Isaac (below) forming the other group. C. Two groups of two arcaded figures, primarily dancing women; possibly the seasons, but Buschhausen rejects and speaks of a thiasos.
Buschhausen 1971, A69 (pp. 140-144), pls. 86-89, with lit.

86-89, with lit.

Budapest, National Museum Inv. 64/1903
19, 20, 21, 23, 24 and Intercisa museum.
Intercisa
Bronze
2nd quarter 4th c. AD
Bronze fittings of a box or chest. The fittings consisted of three vertical bands, one along each side and a slightly broader one in the middle, connected with a decorative lattice-work of bronze strips. The side-bands each consist of four rectangles each containing a standing figure. The top figure was attached to the front side of the lid, the other three to the actual chest. The central band, more poorly preserved, consisted of two rows of smaller, vertical figures (six survive) on the chest itself, and one large figure in a roundel on the corresponding part of the side of lid. The figures on the left side, from top to bottom, are: Mars, Mars, Sol, and Mars, and on the right they are Jupiter, Jupiter, Minerva (seated) and Sol. Identical figures are from the same matrix. Sol is standing, frontal, head facing right, radiate (?), nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised and a whip in his left hand. The whip has previously been taken for a caduceus, leading to the erroneous identification of this figure as Mercury.

The central panel on the side of the lid consists of a large roundel with Orpheus; in the four corners are small roundels with the bust of Sol (upper left-hand corner), radiate, facing right; Luna (upper right-hand corner); Chi-Rho (lower left-hand corner), and eagle (lower right-hand corner). (Buschhausen (1971, 134) reverses the lower roundels.)

The corresponding central band on the front of the box depicts Lazarus (upper left), Moses striking the rock (upper right), the Good Shepherd (middle left), the sacrifice of Isaac (middle right, rather unclear), Jonah (lower left), and the healing of the blind (lower right). Above the upper figures, the bottom portion of a second impression of the Orpheus roundel has been preserved.

Buschhausen 1971, A65 (pp. 132-136) and pls. 79-82, with lit.
The fittings currently in the National Museum in Budapest were discovered in

393 Buschhausen suggests that Sol holds a whip in his right hand, but I see no sign of this in the photograph.
1903 in a tomb. This tomb was not fully excavated until 1961 when the additional fittings were discovered. These are currently in the Intercisa museum.

-3. Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlung, Inv. nr. 514
Athens, environs of the Parliament (former Royal Palace), discovered in a shallow grave.
Silver
The tomb contained a small bronze coin of Constantius II, giving a terminus post quem of at least AD 324 for the tomb.
A small, hexagonal silver pyxis with lid. On the six sides, busts in profile of six of the seven planetary deities: Luna, Mars, Mercury, Venus, Saturn, and Sol. Sol is radiate. Other finds from the tomb, now lost, are reported to have been an “elegant” silver vase and a silver sistrum.
Buschhausen 1971, B2 (pp. 179-181), pl. 6, with lit.

-4. Budapest, National Museum
Csázár
Bronze
Roman Imperial
Bronze fitting for the front of a box or chest, decorated primarily with intercolumnar reliefs of deities. In the lower right hand corner Sol on a frontal chariot, two horses jumping left and two right. Sol is radiate and has raised his right hand and holds a whip (?) in his left. The other figures are: top row Diana, Minerva, and Fortuna; flanking the keyhole Bacchus (?) and Victoria; below the keyhole Victoria, Diana, Minerva, and Fortuna (same moulds); bottom row Hercules and Cerynian Hind, Mars (or Minerva, from a different mould) and Sol.
Buschhausen 1971, A39 (pp. 83-86) and Pls. 42-44, with lit.

-5. Budapest, National Museum, 40/1903, 2-3
Intercisa
Bronze
Roman Imperial
The four fragments of bronze fitting listed under this inventory number are said to include one that preserves the head, nimbate, and upper body of Sol with traces of a whip.
Buschhausen 1971, A97 (pp. 164-5), with lit.

-6. Budapest, National Museum
Intercisa
Bronze
Roman Imperial
Various fragments of bronze fittings of a chest. They include fragments of a tondo with Sol on a frontal chariot; preserved are Sol’s head with radiate nimbus, traces of a whip, and the head of the most right-hand horse.
Buschhausen 1971, A102 (pp. 167-8), pl. 101, with lit.

-7. Cairo, Museum Inv. 9037
Achmim?
Bronze
Roman Imperial
Small wooden box covered with bronze fittings decorated in relief. On the front, these include the bust of Sol (top left), radiate, and the bust of Luna (top right) with crescent.
Buschhausen 1971, A31 (pp. 69-72) and pl. 34, with lit.

-8. Mainz, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Inv. 0 4652
Intercisa
Bronze
Roman Imperial
Small rectangular bronze relief, used as the fitting of a chest. Preserved are four figures above a floral motif. They are (from left to right) Mars, Sol, Dea Roma, and Jupiter. The figures iconographically closely resemble those of the chest from Intercisa described above (K6.2)
Buschhausen 1971, A94 (pp. 162-3), fig. 5 & pl 98, with lit.

Unknown, probably produced in Metz
Ivory and copper
9th-10th c. AD
Small box with carved ivory panels on sides and gabled lid. The lid panel above a side-panel with scene of the crucifixion depicts
two Victories and a Hand of God holding a wreath, between Sol (left) in quadriga going right, right hand raised, and Luna (right) in biga.


K7. Weights
-1. Pl. 72.1
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 1972.79
Reputedly from Istanbul
Bronze
Ad 150-250
Bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, atop mount Argaisos. At the foot of the mountain, a dish of fruit.

Arles
Bronze
Undated (too heavily corroded)
Bust of Sol (?), radiate (5 rays).
Rolland 1965, 163 nr. 369.

K8. Mirrors
-1. Pl. 72.2
Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 95.72
Cosenza
Bronze
3rd c. BC
Bronze mirror with incised decoration.
Profile head of Sol, l., within a radiate circle.
R. D. De Puma, CSE, USA 2, 19, 23, 25-26 (no. 4), 72-75, figs. 4a-d; Carpino 2003, 17, 108, n. 50; 28, 113, n. 118.

K9. Other
-1. Boston, MFA 97.318 - 97.323
Eretria, tomb of the Erotes
Terracotta, painted and gilded
310-240 BC
Small roundel in the shape of a round shield, frontal bust of Sol, radiate (13 rays).
LIMC Helios 150-1; Matern 2002, 250 B42.
A number of similar/identical shields, both round and oblong, are reported to have come from the same tomb.

-2. St Petersburg, Hermitage Inv. N 1091/5070
Oxus, temple (Bactria/Tajikistan)
Silver with traces of gilding
3rd c. BC
Silver foil with relief bust of Sol, frontal, radiate (12 rays).
Litvinsky 2000.

-3. Pl. 72.3
London, British Museum, 1824.4-5.3.
Paramythia (Epirus)
Bronze
2nd c. BC
Decorative attachment; frontal head of Sol, radiate (7 rays).
Walters 1899, 273

-4. Athens, Agora Mus. SS 11830
Athens, Agora
Terracotta
2nd c. BC
Amphora stamp from Rhodes. Helios, radiate, in chiton and chlamys, on a quadriga to the right, whip in r. hand, reins in l.
Moreno 1995, 185 fig. 4.26.4; Matern 2002, 61-2, 213 Q37 (with lit. and references to similar stamps on Rhodes and Delos).

-5. Istanbul, Arch. Mus. 356
Pergamum
Marble
2nd c. BC
Richly decorated support of a table; decoration includes a small head of Sol, radiate.
Mendel 1912, 573-578 nr. 251 (esp. p. 575); Matern 2002, 168, 252 B52

-6. Rhodes, Mus.
Rhodes
Terracotta
ca. 100 BC
Amphora stamp; Sol standing, radiate
LIMC Helios 333 (with ref.).

-7. Athens Epigraphical Museum 2526
Athens, Theatre of Dionysus
Marble
1st c. BC - 1st c. AD
Stone sphere with relief-decoration and magical inscriptions. On one side: Helios on a throne holding a long three-pronged staff in his left hand and a whip (?) in his right hand; between a dog and a lion. On the other
side a lion, a snake and inscriptions
LIMC Helios 371

-8. Chaireneia, Mus.
Livadia
Limestone
Late 1st c. BC - early 1st c. AD (?) Stone sphere with bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays), on one side and bust of Luna on the other side.
LIMC Helios 295; Matern 2002, 91 n. 532, 168, 251 B47, fig. 74

Unknown
Bronze
1st-2nd c. AD?
Small oval bronze disc with profile bust of Sol (r.), radiate, in relief.
Marshall 1908, nr 1643

-10. Vatican, Medagliere
Rome, environs of Circus Maximus
Bronze
2nd c. AD Bronze disc or phalera. Within a zodiac circle, Sol in quadriga ascends r., reins in l. hand, r. hand lowered. The horses jump up over clouds above which Lucifer flies with torch. Below, Tellus. In exergue:
INVENTORI LVCIS SOLI INVICTO
AVGVSTO.
Guarducci 1957/9; Bergmann 1998, 247-8 pl. 46.4.

-11. Lausanne, Mus. Rom. de Vidy
Vidy
Bronze
Ca. AD 100-150 Bronze disc depicting the fall of Icarus. Below the bust of Sol (radiate, 6 rays), flies Daedalus. Icarus, below, has fallen; to the left lies Oceanus.
Bérard & Hofstetter 1979

-12. Pl. 72.4
Nancy, Mus.
Grand
Ivory
Mid 2nd c. AD (terminus ante quem AD 170) Ivory Maritimadiptych with engraved astrological figures. In centre: frontal busts of Sol and Luna (Sol is not radiate) within concentric circles containing the signs of the zodiac and related letters and images. Abry 1993; Gundel 1992, 232-3 nr. 82.

-13. Unknown
Unknown
Bronze
2nd c. AD Upper part of a statuette or decorative element. Sol, radiate (7 rays) is dressed in a short chiton and chlamys, has his right hand raised and holds a globe in his l. hand.
Matern 2002, 117, 239 I38, fig. 55.

-14. Unknown
Unknown
Bronze
2nd c. AD Upper part of a statuette or decorative element. Sol, radiate (7 rays) is dressed in a chiton and chlamys, and holds a globe in his l. hand. His right arm is broken off at the shoulder.
Matern 2002, 117, 239 I39, fig. 55.

-15. Pl. 72.5
Paris, Louvre MA 540
Rome
Marble
2nd-3rd c. AD "Tabula Bianchini"; fragments of a marble tablet engraved with astrological table; star signs in the centre, enclosed within concentric circles, containing astrological and planetary symbols and images, including Sol.
LIMC Helios 294; Gundel 1992, 111 fig. 51; 226 nr. 63.

-16. Pl. 72.6
St.-Germain-en-Laye, Mus. Ant. Nat. MAN 52835
Mathay
Bronze
2nd-3rd c. AD Rectangular fragment of a relief in bronze foil depicting 3 of the 7 planetary deities; Sol, not radiate, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand; Luna (small crescent above her forehead) and Mars
-17. Brugg, Vindinossa Museum V80/1.73
Windisch
Bronze
3rd c. AD

-18. Eichstatt, Museum des Eichstätter historischen Vereins
Pfünz, Dolichenum
bronze
Severan
Strip of bronze foil to which a medallion depicting the busts of Sol, radiate, and Luna, crescent, within a dotted circle is attached. Höring & Schwertheim 1987, 483.c

-19. Kingscote, Gloucestershire
Roman Villa
Copper alloy
Late 3rd c. AD
Small cube with scenes in intaglio on all six sides: Bust of Sol, radiate, right, inscribed SOL INVICTVS; Sol in frontal chariot, left hand raised, whip in right hand; seated Roma; Mars; clasped hands; hunting scene. LIMC Helios/Sol 78.

-20. Pl. 73.1
Darmstadt, Hessisches Landesmus, A 1956: 943,2
Butzbach
Silver, gilded
Ca. AD 250
Open worked rectangular decorative element: Sol, radiate (3 rays), nude but for chlamys, r. hand raised, whip (?) in l. hand, ascending quadriga jumping to the right. LIMC Helios/Sol 153; Matern 2002, 66, 217 Q63 (with refs.)

-21. Çanakkale, Mus. 33-236
Troy
Marble
3rd c. AD
Small tablet decorated in relief; preserved is the breast of a man on which (lower right) is depicted a bust of Sol, radiate. LIMC Helios 156.

-22. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum
Qanawat (Kanatha), Syria
basalt
3rd c. AD
A shrine that originally supported a lamp; the shrine had reliefs on three sides and a door frame (open) on the fourth. On the right side, bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), chlamys and on the left side a bust of Luna. On the rear an acanthus leaf and an inscription: Λύχνος Μαλεχάθιου, Budde & Nicholls 1964, 78-9 nr. 126, pl. 42.

-23. Columbia, Univ. of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology 84.53
Syria
Bronze
3rd c. AD (?)
Globe on a square base - originally a Victory on the globe. On one side of base, incised busts of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys, and Luna. Lane 1989/90

-24. Private Collection
Caesarea Maritima
Wood
3rd c. AD?
Part of a wooden object, found at Caesarea Maritima in the mid 1980s. Within a zodiac circle, a solar deity, radiate, chlamys, body armor, right hand raised, left arm lost. On other side, remnants of a personal horoscope. Ovadia & Mucznik 1996.
Not Sol, but Near Eastern solar deity. He is not wearing a cap, as Ovadia & Kucznik believe.

Unknown
Silver
3rd c. AD
Relief in silver foil. A goddess on horseback and a woman in a peplos between the busts
of Jupiter (l.) and Sol (r.), with eagle. Matern 2002, 264 B136 (with ref.).

-26. Pl. 73.2
London, British Museum 57.10 - 13.1
Italy (Rome?)
Ivory
2nd quarter 4th c. AD
Diptych leaf depicting the apotheosis of an emperor. In the upper right-hand corner, behind a partial zodiac, bust of Sol, radiate. LIMC Helios/Sol 169; Gundel 1992, 140 fig. 59 & 260 nr. 191.

-27. Pl. 73.3
Paris, Louvre OA 9062
Unknown
Ivory
Ca. AD 400
Diptych showing imperial priest as donor of animal games. Above the priest, on both leaves, busts of Sol (left) and Luna (right). Sol, radiate, chlamys, has 5 rays on the right-hand leaf; on the left-hand leaf the number of rays is indistinguishable. LIMC Helios/Sol 399.

-28. Budapest, National Museum Inv. 64/1903-18
Intercisa
Silver
Roman Imperial
Silver relief of uncertain function, reused as a metal fitting with a keyhole. In the centre, a roundel with Sol on a frontal chariot, two horses to the left, and two to the right. Sol is radiate, has his r. hand raised, holds a globe in his left, and is dressed in a chiton and billowing chlamys. In the background a crescent moon and three stars. The lower right-hand portion of the central scene is pierced by a large, horizontal keyhole. The central scene is between two Corinthian spiral columns, secondary additions that damage and partially cover four small roundels that originally occupied the four corners around the central scene. The scene in these four roundels are difficult to make out. Buschhausen identifies a leaf (upper left), a hand (lower left), a hippocamp (lower right); nothing can be made of the scene in the upper right-hand roundel. The left-hand column is set on a normal base, but the right-hand column rests on an inverted corinthian capital. Above Sol and the pillars is a narrow frieze with hunting scenes between trees. One complete scene (winged putto and leopard) has been preserved (left), followed (right) by a scene with two animals (a lion and his prey) the latter of which was largely cut away when the relief was reused. Below Sol and the columns is a single, wavy vine. The fitting was fastened over the keyhole with Medusa-headed bosses. Buschhausen 1971, A14 (pp. 41-44) and Pl. 15, with lit.

-29. Vatican, Bibliotheca Apostolica Cod. Vat. Gr. 1291
Manuscript illumination
9th c. copy of original of mid 3rd c. AD
Sol, radiate, chiton and chlamys, right hand raised, globe and whip in left hand, in frontal chariot in central tondo surrounded by five concentric rings with the hours (personified), their names (in Greek), the months (personified), their names, and the signs of the zodiac. LIMC Helios/Sol 293; Gundel 1992, 132, 318 nr. 417, pl. 6.

Manuscript illumination
9th c. copy of original of mid 4th c. AD
Sol standing, radiate, chiton and chlamys, right hand raised, globe and whip in left hand. LIMC Helios/Sol 92. In the same ms., fo. 7, frontal bust, nimbate, sleeved tunica and chlamys, right hand raised, globe and phoenix in left hand, between two Victoriae, of - according to the LIMC, emperor/Sol (LIMC Helios/Sol 427).

-31. Ostia, Mus. Inv. 4151-4157
Ostia
Bronze
Undated
Seven rectangular plaques, of which five each bear a sign of the zodiac, one Mars, and one Sol, radiate, nude but for a chlamys, right hand raised, whip in left hand.
-32. Rome, Mus. Cap. 75
Rome
Marble, *giallo antico*
Undated
Relief, fragment, with scenes from the shield of Achilles, including Sol, in quadriga (left) and Luna.
LIMC Helios/Sol 405

-33. Private Collection
“Eastern Mediterranean”
Gold
Undated
Gold foil reliefs from a tomb: 1. Decorative plaques of a headband depicting the 7 planetary deities; bust of Sol, radiate (7 rays), chlamys. 2. Relief of the head of Sol. 3. Relief of the head of Sol.
Matern 2002, 264 B141 (with ref.).

-34. Pl. 73.4
Columbia, Univ. of Missouri, Museum of Art and Archaeology 90.7
Unknown
Bronze
Undated
Roundel: above, centre, bearded male bust *velificans*, below left, bust of Sol, radiate (4 rays), chlamys, and right Luna on upturned crescent; 7 stars in field.
Unpublished.

-35. Pl. 74.1
London, British Museum PR B 1856.7-1.33
Unknown
Bronze
Undated
Castration tongs, decorated with busts of various deities: left (from back to front): Tyche with mural crown, protome of a horse, Mercurius, Jupiter, Venus (?), Venus (?), goddess (Venus again?), protome of a bull, lion's head; right: Goddess (?) behind protome of a horse, Mars, Luna, Sol (6 rays), Saturn, Bull, lion.

-36. Trier, Rheinisches Landesmuseum G 105
Unknown
Bronze
Undated
Bronze disc with scene in relief (rough, worn) depicting Sol (Radiate?), nude (except for chlamys?) in quadriga to the right above reclining Oceanus (left) and Tellus (right).
LIMC Helios/Sol 154 (with ref.); Matern 2002, 72-3, 225 Q112

-37. Private Collection
Unknown
Copper
Roman imperial
Oval disc, obverse convex, depicting the seven planetary deities and magical inscriptions. From left to right: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sol, Venus, Mercurius, and Luna. Sol is in a frontal quadriga, two horses jumping to the left, and two to the right. He holds a whip in his raised right hand. For the long magical inscription see Keil 1946, 136. LIMC Helios/Sol 236; Keil 1946.
The planets are depicted according to their distance from earth in the geocentric system.

-38. Pl. 74.4
London BM 1899, 1201.2
Pessinus
Silver
3rd c. AD
Leaf disc in silver foil. On the disc, frontal bust of Sol, radiate (11 rays), chlamys. Behind each shoulder the protome of a horse.
Walters 1921, nr. 227.

-39. Pl. 74.3
London BM 2003, 0901.18
Baldock, Ashwell, metal detector find.
Silver
Undated
A leaf-shaped votive (?) plaque depicting Roma seated on a pile of shields, facing left, helmeted, upright spear in l. hand, statuette of Victory on her outstretched r. hand. At the lower left, facing Roma, a small suppliant figure, damaged. Above the main scene a frontal bust of Sol, radiate (9 rays), draped, whip behind left shoulder. In the apex a small upturned crescent and star (?).
Unpublished
K. Minor objects

This section of the catalogue presents a wide array of objects and will conclude our survey, leaving only coins and medallions to be discussed in section L. It contains few surprises, but gives a further impression of the wide reach of the image types [sol] and the long period of time during which they were current.

The appliques gathered under K1 are depictions of Sol of various types and materials gathered here because they were originally attached to, or part of some other object, the nature of which can no longer be established. Some of the bronze appliques may be the heads of bronze statuettes, others may be parts of vessels (terracotta, bronze, or silver), decorative elements of furniture, and the like. All objects gathered in this section are typical of the image type [sol], but it cannot be excluded that lost elements or context originally modified this. A beardless, radiate bronze head may originally have been part of a cuirassed statuette for instance, or one with some other attribute or attributes incompatible with the image types [sol].

In section K2a we find a number of statues of Roman generals with images of Sol on their breastplates. The majority of these are Julio-Claudian, including the most famous one, the statue of Augustus from Primaporta. The loricae come from as far afield as Cartagena, but are mostly from Italy itself. Sol also occurs as decorative element on other parts of Roman military attire, such as helmets and a cingulum, as well as the parade harness of a horse. The decorative elements of chariots listed under K3 may also be from a military context although this is by no means certain. The image type [sol] is not a common element but clearly not an anomaly either in this context. The early dates of these depictions - over half date to the first century AD - is interesting. In view of these dates, it seems likely that the pole of the signum carried by Flavianus, the signifer of the ala Petriana in Britain, on his funerary stele was surmounted by the radiate head of Sol, rather than the radiate head of the emperor as is sometimes suggested (K2b.1).

Sol would seem a logical decorative element for sundials (K4.1), but this was apparently not the case. On parapegmata, peg-calendars with holes for pegs to mark the correct day, depictions of Sol and the other planetary gods could be included whenever the calendar incorporated the seven-day week (K5a and b). This was not necessary of course, and section K5c lists parapegmata incorporating the seven-day week, but without images. The early date of the parapegma from Posilippo (first century BC) shows that the concept of a seven-day week was part of public life in the Roman world by the reign of Augustus, if not earlier.

It is difficult to evaluate the data in the next section, K6. The metal fittings of boxes and chests gathered here come predominantly from Hungary, four sets from Intercisa along the Eastern Danube frontier South of Aquincum, and two sets from Császár, West of Aquincum and also close to the Danube. Whether this means very much is hard to say, for to what extent it is simply chance that such fittings were preserved at Császár and Intercisa (at least partially in tombs) and found their way into museum collections is not clear. 394 There is nothing to indicate that the imagery is specifically local. The other figures depicted are either Graeco-Roman or, interestingly, Christian (K6.1-2), and aside from generic compositions such as Sol and Luna or

---

394 Metal fittings of this type have not received much attention and do not loom large in the visible sections of museum collections. It is worth noting that both Letta (in the LIMC) and Matern (2002) have overlooked the fittings published by Buschhausen (1971).
the planetary deities there are no indications that the figures were combined with special care or had a significance much beyond the decorative. This is particularly clear in the case of the fittings from Intercisa listed under K6.2, with its corner strips decorated with repeated, identical figures of Mars, Jupiter and Sol. This repetitive depiction of these pagan deities is meaningless, but striking nonetheless in view of the main scenes, which are, in part at least, Christian. The central band on the front of the box depicts Lazarus, Moses striking the rock, the Good Shepherd, the sacrifice of Isaac, Jonah, and the healing of the blind. The corresponding section of the lid, on the other hand, is decorated with a roundel depicting Orpheus, and with four smaller roundels at the four corners of the scene in which Sol (upper left), Luna (upper right), the chi-rho (lower left) and an eagle (lower right) are depicted. Without attempting an exegesis of the iconography of this chest as a whole, it seems to me that we need not ascribe any particularly profound meaning to the haphazardly placed, repeated figures of Sol, Mars, and Jupiter along the corner strips.

This apparently random use of these figures suggests that they were generic to the point of being meaningless in this decorative context. That in turn suggests that they were common enough not to attract notice as decorative components of chests or boxes. One would then assume that chests decorated in this fashion were common, but that they have a very low survival rate in the archaeological record. Wood decays and the fittings, of course, are easily melted down and reused. It is well possible, therefore, that the fittings listed in K6 are only the tip of an iceberg with two factors contributing to their low number and misleadingly regional character in this catalogue: a poor rate of preservation in the archaeological record and a low profile in museum collections. The final entry in this section, a tenth century copper box with ivory panels in Braunschweig (K6.9), is listed to illustrate the continuing popularity of the image type [sol & luna] long after the end of antiquity.

Little need be said about the weights in section K7. The late Etruscan mirror reputedly discovered in or near Cosenza and now in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (K8.1) is listed here only exempli gratia. Similar Etruscan mirrors can be found in Rome and I have included this one as illustration of the iconographical context within which Rome’s own imagery of Sol evolved. The final section (K9) illustrates again how far flung the standard images in Graeco-Roman style of Helios and Sol were. There are no specific groups in this section and I will not comment on the objects individually, with one exception: a bronze disc in the Vatican.

**Inventor Lucis Sol, and the emperor in the guise of Sol (again).**

The disc or votive phalera in the Vatican listed under K9.10 is our prime document for an apparently important iconographic composition of the Antonine and early Severan era. Within a zodiac circle, Sol ascends to the right in his quadriga, holding the reins in his left hand and with his right hand lowered. The horses are jumping upwards over a bank of clouds above which Lucifer flies ahead holding a torch. Below the clouds Tellus reclines and surveys the scene. In the exergue an inscription reads: *Inventori lucis Soli Invicto Augusto.*

Guarducci argues that this object, which was found near the Circus Maximus, may have been a votive dedicated to Sol in his temple in the Circus Maximus. She also suggests that the

---

395 Mars, Jupiter and Sol have in common that they are planetary gods, but with the other four planets missing completely, nay connection with days of the week or planets strikes me as tenuous.
image may echo a major, well-known depiction of Sol, perhaps on the temple pediment or inside the temple. Medallions and coins of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus and Septimius Severus with a nearly identical composition, as well as a terracotta relief fragment in Lyons (Flb.11) which may also preserve part of this scene, all suggest that Guarducci may be correct that this *phalera* is inspired by a more famous image that has been lost. At the very least they indicate that this image type was well-known. Given the geographical distribution of these parallels - the medallion of M. Aurelius was produced in Nicaea, and the terracotta plaque was found in the environs of Lyon - this was the case throughout the empire.

The inscription on the Vatican *phalera* clearly identifies the charioteer as Sol Invictus. The added epithet *Augustus* does not change or modify that in any way. It is not a common epithet for Sol, but not without precedent either. More to the point, *Augustus* is a normal divine epithet for numerous Roman deities, including Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Mars, Venus, Mercurius, Apollo, Diana, Saturnus, etc. In short, the iconography of the *phalera* is standard for Sol, and the inscription confirms it. The identity of the charioteer is thus straightforward. Nonetheless various scholars have argued that on the nearly identical medallions of Commodus and Septimius Severus the charioteer is not Sol but the emperor in the guise of Sol. They base this on slight traces by the chin of the charioteer on these two medallions which they interpret as a beard. It is certainly true that a bearded figure cannot be Sol, but the suggestion that on these two issues the charioteer is Commodus/Sol and Severus/Sol respectively rather than simply Sol untenable. It simply cannot be reconciled with Roman viewing practice. The evidence is clear: besides the *phalera*, virtually identical medallions or gold multiples were struck in the names of at least four emperors: Antoninus Pius, M. Aurelius, Commodus and Septimius Severus. These medallions are rare, but they indicate that the image type they depict had currency for at least two or three (if not more) generations. There is no reason to assume that the circulation of this image type was limited to coins and medallions. On the contrary. It is much more likely that these small images adapt and reflect a larger image or image type, now lost. That is also implied by the terracotta relief fragment (Flb.11). One can easily imagine a famous image inspiring these medallions, the *phalera*, and the terracotta plaque, which is what Guarducci argues.

The iconography is unambiguously that of Sol on at least some of the medallions and the *phalera*, and in the latter case explicitly confirmed by the inscription below the image. Thus iconography and inscription establish what must be the default identity of this ascending radiate charioteer with clouds, Lucifer and Tellus and encircling zodiac: he is the cosmic Sol rising. Roman viewing, geared to image *types*, took such a default identity as starting point for the analysis of any particular image that reproduced or drew on that image type. A Roman viewer’s initial reaction upon seeing the medallion of Commodus or Severus, then, will have been that the

---

396 For excellent images of all these objects, cf. Bergmann 1998, 248 fig. 4, pl. 46.1-5 and pl. 52.3.


image replicates an established type depicting the rising Sol.

This does not mean that the artist could not introduce meaningful changes or variations, but such variations must be clear to be effective. A good example is the image type [sol] clothed in armor like a Syrian solar deity to create an ambiguous Romano-Syrian Sol. But was something similar the case with the two medallions of Commodus and Septimius Severus? The fact is that the minute traces that scholars since Strack have identified as a pointed “beard” are simply not clear enough on the surviving medallions to carry conviction. It seems unlikely that a Roman artist would depict such a significant change of identity only through the addition of what at best can have been no more than a minuscule beard on the tiny head of the emperor-Sol in his chariot on the reverse of these medallions. Surely for the sake of clarity he would have opted for additional iconographic pointers that not Sol, but the emperor in Sol’s guise was meant.

In theory it is possible, of course, that the medallions of Commodus and Severus echo some larger image - now lost - which depicted “Sol” not only with a beard, but also with the distinct portrait features of the emperor. A targeted audience, receiving the medallions at a carefully chosen time and place (e.g. in the presence of the hypothetical larger monument) would in that case have been left in no doubt as to the identity of the solar charioteer on the medallion. But there is simply no evidence for this. No such larger image survives, nor is any mentioned in the extant sources. Of the images that do survive, the largest and clearest is the Vatican phalera. There can be no doubt that Sol is clean-shaven here, and his identity is unambiguously confirmed by the inscription. The zodiac along the border also reinforces the cosmic character of the charioteer.

The other images lack the zodiac and the inscription but in all other respects are iconographically identical with the phalera, with the exception of the aureus of Septimius Severus, on which Sol is portrayed with his trademark gesture of the raised right hand. He is definitely clean-shaven on the medallions of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius, as well as on at least one of the extant medallions of Commodus (in the latter case, Bergmann suggests that this particular piece was so thoroughly cleaned or reworked that the beard was polished away\(^\text{399}\)). Whether he is really bearded on the other extant examples of Commodus’ medallion and the single surviving aureus of Septimius Severus is at the very least open to doubt. On the (excellent) photographs in Bergmann’s study the traces are too indistinct to be persuasive, and are certainly not unequivocal.

The evidence in favor of identifying the charioteer as the emperor in the guise of Sol - no more than the minute traces taken to denote a beard - is thus weak and goes against basic Roman viewing practice. The evidence against, as outlined above, is much stronger. It is further strengthened by a final, important point: the lack of parallels. I am not aware of any surviving images that depict the emperor in the same guise as Sol in every respect except the beard. The emperor is regularly depicted radiate, but portrait features as well as the nature of the radiate crown, the context of the image and the regular recurrence of that image type all combine to leave the viewer in no doubt as to his identity.\(^\text{400}\) There are no images of the emperor that are

\(^{399}\) Bergmann 1998, 247 n. 1492.

\(^{400}\) See chapter x.
even remotely similar to the medallions under discussion here.

In short, we cannot accept that the charioteer on the reverse of the medallions of Commodus and Septimius Severus is not Sol but the emperor. One cannot postulate a unique and unparalleled interpretation for an image on the basis of such weak and indistinct evidence, particularly when it is incompatible with the interpretation of other, nearly identical depictions of the same type. That the interpretation of this charioteer as the emperor in the guise of Sol arose at all should be understood in the context of the tenacious notion that the imperial radiate crown identifies the emperor with Sol. For scholars like Bergmann and Berrens the lack of non-numismatic parallel depictions of the emperor in the guise of Sol is a problem, which images such as these could mitigate. But if one abandons the notion that the imperial radiate crown was a solar symbol - and as we will see in chapter 6 that is what we must do - the lack of such parallels becomes logical and there is no need to interpret these images as anything other than Sol.

L. Coins (selection)

L1. Sol Coins of the Roman Republic

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/rsc/anonymous/Syd_0096.1.jpg

-2. Obv.: head of Roma, helmeted. Rev.: Sol radiate, wearing chiton and chlamys, driving a quadriga r., holding whip in his raised r. hand and reins in his l. RRC 280 no. 250, pl. XXXVII. 250/1 (M. Aburius, Rome, 132 BC).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0127.html
3. Obv.: head of Roma, helmeted. Rev.: Sol radiate, wearing chiton (?), head turned r., standing in facing quadriga; on either side of the horses a star; an X on the l. side of Sol, a crescent on the r.; clouds or waves below the horses. RRC 318 no. 309, pl. XLI. 309/1 (A. Manlius, Rome, 118-107 BC).

4. Obv.: head of Roma, helmeted. Rev.: Jupiter in quadriga r., holding thunderbolt in r. hand and scepter in l. Above horses, radiate head of Sol facing Jupiter and a crescent. Star behind Jupiter and in front of horses. Below horses’ hooves an anguiped giant with thunderbolt in r. hand and l. hand raised. It also appears as though there is a serpent (?) on r. side of giant. RRC 318 no. 310, pl. XLI. 310/1 (Cn. Cornelius Sisena, Rome, 118-107 BC).

5. Obv.: head of Sol r., radiate crown, X in front of neck. Rev.: Luna in biga r., holding reins in both hands, crescent above her head, three stars above horses and one below. RRC 314 no. 303, pl. XLI. 303/1 (Mn. Aquilius, Rome, 109 or 108 BC). Images-

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0321.html


http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/rsc/coelia/coelia5.jpg


RRC II, pl. LIV.463/4b
-9. Obv.: Radiate head of Sol r., behind his head is an acisculus. Rev.: Luna in a biga r., whip in l., crescent above her head. RRC 484 no. 474.5, pl. LVI. 474/5 (L. Valerius Acisculus, Rome, 45 BC).
  
  [Image]
  
  http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0473.html


  [Image]
  
  http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0495.html


  [Image]
  
  http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0491.html


I.2. Roman Imperial Coins
Note: all images of Sol are on the reverse unless otherwise stated. The corresponding obverse image is a bust or head of the emperor unless otherwise stated.

Augustus, 27 BC – AD 14


- RIC II 18 no. 28, pl. I.2 (Vespasian, Rome, 69-71).

-3. Aeternitas draped and veiled, stg. l., holding head of Sol in r. and head of Luna in l, extended over a lighted altar which sits at her feet. RIC II 28 no. 121 (Vespasian, Rome, 75-79).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/vespasian/RIC_0121a,Aureus.jpg

-4. Radiate figure (Augustus, not Sol) standing facing on rostral column, holding spear. RIC II 28 nos. 119-120 (Vespasian, Rome, 79).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2311.html

Titus, 79-81

-5. See L2.4. RIC II 117-118 nos. 4, 10, and 16. (Titus, Rome, 79)

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/titus/RIC_0004cf.jpg

-6. Aeternitas stg. l. before lighted altar, holding heads of Sol and Luna in her outstretched hands. RIC 856, 866. (Titus, Rome, 75-9).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/titus/RIC_0856[vesp].jpg

Domitian, 81-96

-7. Aeternitas stg. l., holding head of Sol raised in r. hand and head of Luna in l. RIC II 191 no. 289 (Domitian, Rome, 85).
Trajan, r. 98-117

-8 Head of Sol radiate r.; behind a spiked hammer. Restored coin of Trajan, copying L1.9 (45 BC). RIC II 309 no. 803 (Trajan, Rome, 107).
-10. Aeternitas stg. l., holding heads of Sol and. RIC II 250 nos. 91-92 (Trajan, Rome, 103-111).

-11. Aeternitas stg. r., holding head of Sol raised in r. and head of Luna in l. RIC II 259 no. 229 (Trajan, Rome, 111).

Hadrian, r. 117-138

-12a. Bust of Sol radiate r., chlamys draped over shoulders. RIC II 340-341 nos. 16 and 20, pl. XII. 218 (Hadrian, Rome, 117).
- Bust of Sol radiate r. RIC II 345 nos. 43a-b (Hadrian, Rome, 118).
- Bust of Sol radiate r. RIC II 357 no. 145 (Hadrian, Rome, 123).
- Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC II 426 no. 661 (Hadrian, Rome, 126-128).
-13. Sol radiate, stepping into (?) quadriga r., holding reins in r. hand. RIC II 360 no. 167, pl. XIII.244 (Hadrian, Rome, 125-128).

-13a As L2.13 but quadiga l. RIC II 360 no. 168 (Hadrian, Rome, 125-128).

-14. Aeternitas stg. l., holding head of Sol raised in r. and head of Luna in l. RIC II 344 no. 38 (Hadrian, Rome, 118).
   - RIC II 346 no. 48 (Hadrian, Rome, 118).
   - RIC II 350 no. 81 (Hadrian, Rome, 119-122).

-15. Aeternitas stg. to front, holding heads of Sol and Luna in raised hands. RIC II 417 nos. 597a-d, pl. XV.308 (Hadrian, Rome, 119-121).
- RIC II 436 no. 744 (Hadrian, Rome, 134-138).

16. Roma seated l. on cuirass, holding heads of Sol and Luna and spear, behind shield. RIC II 370 no. 263 (Hadrian, Rome, 134-138).

Antoninus Pius, 138-161
- 17. (Dubious). Faustina stg. in a quadriga, holding a scepter; she is accompanied by a figure decribed as Sol (?), bending forward. RIC III 73 nos. 383a-c, pl. III. 65 (Antoninus Pius, Rome, ca. 141).

Commodus, r. 180-192

Septimius Severus, r. 193-211
- 19. Sol radiate, stg. l., raising r. hand and holding whip in l. RIC IV.1 103 no. 101 (Septimius Severus, Rome, 197).
  - RIC IV.1 157 no. 489 (Septimius Severus, Laodicea, 196-197).
  - RIC IV.1 158 no. 492, pl. 8. 15 (Septimius Severus, Laodicea, 197).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/septimius_severus/RIC_0492.jpg

- RIC IV.1 105 no. 117, pl. 6.5 (Septimus Severus, Rome, 197-198).
- RIC IV.1 192 no. 742, 744, (Septimius Severus, Rome, 197-198).
- RIC IV.1 119, no. 217 (Septimius Severus, Rome, 208).


Caracalla and Geta under Septimius Severus
- 21. (Dubious). Sol (?) radiate (?), stg. front, head l., naked, holding globe and spear. RIC IV.1 217 nos. 30a-b (Caracalla, Rome, 199-200). Whether the reverse figure is really Sol, as is widely assumed, cannot be certain. He does not appear to be radiate, and a spear is not a normal attribute for Sol.
  - RIC IV.1 218 nos. 39a – 40 (Caracalla, Rome, 199-200);

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s6881.html

- RIC IV.1 277f nos. 407, 408a-b, 410, 412 (Caracalla, Rome, 199-201).
- RIC IV.1 220 no. 55a (Caracalla, Rome, 201).
RIC IV.1 233 no. 141 (Caracalla, Rome, 201-206). Images-

22. Bust of Sol radiate r., draped. RIC IV.1 126 no. 282, pl. VII. 12 (Septimius Severus, Rome, 201-210).

RIC IV.1 289 no. 474 (Caracalla, Rome, 202-210).


Geta, co-emperor 211

-24. Sol stg. l., raising r. hand and holding whip. RIC IV.1 329 no. 108 (Geta, Laodicea, 211).

Caracalla, 211-217

-25. Sol radiate stg. l., raising r. hand and holding globe. RIC IV.1 246 no. 245 (Caracalla, Rome, 214).

RIC IV.1 306 no. 563 (Caracalla, Rome, 216).
-26. Sol radiate stg. front, head l., raising r. hand and holding globe. RIC IV.1 250 nos. 264a-e (Caracalla, Rome, 215).
  - RIC IV.1 253f nos. 281a-d (Caracalla, Rome, 216).

-27. Sol radiate, mounting quadriga, l., r. hand holding reigns (?). RIC IV.1 250f nos. 265a-h, 302 nos. 543a-b (Caracalla, Rome, 215).
  - RIC IV.1 254 nos. 282a-f (Caracalla, Rome, 216).
  - RIC IV.1 304, no. 551 (Caracalla, Rome, 215).
  - RIC IV.1 305, no. 556 (Caracalla, Rome, 215).
  - RIC IV.1 306, no. 562 (Caracalla, Rome, 216).
  - RIC IV.1 306, 566; 307, no. 570 (Caracalla, Rome, 217).
  - RIC IV.1 256 nos. 294a-c, pl. 12.20 (Caracalla, Rome, 217).

-28. Sol radiate stg. l., raising r. hand and holding whip. RIC IV.1 256 nos. 293a-f (Caracalla, Rome, 217).
Elagabalus, 218-222

-29. Sol radiate, walking r., cloak flowing over l. arm, holding thunderbolt in raised r. hand. RIC IV.2 44 no. 198 (Elagabalus, Antioch, 218-222).

-30. Sol radiate, stg. l., raising r. hand and holding whip. RIC IV.2 29 no. 17 (Elagabalus, Rome, 219)

-31. Sol radiate advancing. l., raising r. hand and holding whip; in field, star. RIC IV.2 30 no. 28, pl. 2.6 (Elagabalus, Rome, 220).
- RIC IV.2 32 no. 63 (Elagabalus, Rome, 220).
- RIC IV.2 53 no. 300-302, pl. 6.5 (Elagabalus, Rome, 220).

- RIC IV.2 52 no. 289 (Elagabalus, Rome, 219).

- RIC IV.2 53 no. 303 [but stg. l.] (Elagabalus, Rome, 220).
-32. Sol radiate stg. front, head turned r., holding whip; in field, star. RIC IV.2 31 no. 37 and 38, 39 [head turned l.] (Elagabalus, Rome, 221).

-33. Sol radiate, half draped, with cloak flying, advancing l., raising r. hand and holding whip; in field, star. RIC IV.2 31 nos. 40-41 (Elagabalus, Rome, 221).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/elagabalus/RIC_0040.1.jpg

- RIC IV.2 54 nos. 318-320 (Elagabalus, Rome, 221).

**Severus Alexander, 222-235**

-34. Sol radiate, stg. l., raising r. hand and holding whip. RIC IV.2 71 no. 8 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 222).

- RIC IV.2 78 nos. 100-101, 106, pl. 4.10 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 230).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s7910.html

-35. Sol stg. r., r. hand raised, holding globe in l. RIC IV.2 109 no. 491 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 229).


- RIC IV.2 111 nos. 511-514 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 231).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/severus_alexander/RIC_0511.jpg;

- RIC IV.2 112 no. 525-527 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 232).
- RIC IV.2 148 no. 101 (Severus Alexander, Rome, undated).
- 37. Sol radiate, walking l., raising r. hand, holding whip in left, chlamys draped over left arm and flying behind. RIC IV.2 111 no. 517 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 231).
- RIC IV.2 112 nos. 531-532 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 232).
- RIC IV.2 80 nos. 119-120 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 233).
- RIC IV.2 112 nos. 535-537 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 233).
- RIC IV.2 80 nos. 122-124 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 234).
- RIC IV.2 113 nos. 538-540 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 234).
- RIC IV.2 80 no. 125 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 235).
- RIC IV.2 113 nos. 541-543 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 235).
- 38. Sol stg. r., head turned l., raising r. hand and holding globe. RIC IV.2 78 no. 102 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 230).
- 39. Sol stg. front, head l., raising r. hand and l. holding globe. RIC IV.2 110, nos. 503-4, pl. 8.3 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 230).
- 40. Sol radiate stg. front, head l., raising r. hand and l. holding globe. RIC IV.2 79 nos. 109, 111-113 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 231-2).
- 42. Sol radiate, walking l., holding whip. RIC IV.2 nos. 110 (Severus Alexander, Rome, 231-2).

Gordian III, 238-244
- 43. Sol stg. front, head l., raising r. hand and holding globe in l. hand. Chlamys draped over l. shoulder and arm. RIC IV.3 33 no. 168 (Gordian III, Antioch, 238-239).
  - RIC IV.3 18 no. 31 (Gordian III, Rome, 239-240).
  - RIC IV.3 37 no. 213, pl. 3.14 (Gordian III, Antioch, 242-244).

- 44. Sol stg. front, head l., raising r. hand and holding globe in l. hand. RIC IV.3 p. 26 nos. 97, 109 and 111; p. 27 no. 117, p. 48 nos. 297a-c [same as RIC IV.3 p. 24 no. 83] (Gordian III, Rome, 241-243).

  http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear/s2444.html

- 45. Sol stg. front, head l., globe in r. hand and whip in l. RIC IV.3 p. 26 no. 98 (Gordian III, Rome, 241-243).

  http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear/s2482.html

Philip I, 244-249
- 46. Sol radiate stg. l., raising r. hand and globe. RIC IV.3 85 no. 137 (Philip I, Antioch, 244-249).
- 47. Sol stg. front, head r., raising r. hand and holding globe. RIC IV.3 79 no. 90 (Philip I, Antioch, 249).

Philip II, 247-249

  http://ettuantiquities.com/Philip_1/Philip2-list.htm

- RIC IV.3 81 no. 112 (Philip II, Antioch, 249).
Valerian, co-ruler with Gallienus, r. 253-260

-49. Sol or the emperor Valerian (boots!) radiate, walking r., r. hand raised, l. hand holding a globe. RIC V.1 55 no. 220, pl. I. 6 (Valerian, Mediolanum, 253-254).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/valerian_I/RIC_0220.1.jpg

-50. Sol stg. or walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip or globe. RIC V.1 47 no. 106 (Valerian, Rome, 257).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/valerian_I/RIC_0106.1.jpg

- RIC V.1 39 no. 13, Sol holding globe. (Valerian, Lugdunum, 258-259).


-51. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. Chlamys draped over left arm and shoulder and flowing behind. RIC V.1 39 nos. 10-12, (Valerian, Lugdunum, 257-259).;
**Gallienus, 253-268**

- 52. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 79 nos. 119-120 (Gallienus, Rome, 256).
  - RIC V.1 135 no. 62 [sometimes stg.] (Gallienus, Rome, 259).
  - RIC V.1 152 nos. 248-250 (Gallienus, Rome, 259).

- 53. Sol stg. or walking l., r. hand raised, holding whip in l.. Chlamys draped over left arm and shoulder and flying behind. RIC V.1 140 nos. 113-114 (Gallienus, Rome, 259).

- 54. Sol walking l., holding whip. RIC V.1 161 no. 354 (Gallienus, Rome, ca. 260).
- 55. Sol running l., holding whip. RIC V.1 187 no. 639 (Gallienus, Asia, ca. 260).
- 56. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. Chlamys draped over left arm and shoulder and flying behind. RIC V.1 170 no. 448, 451 (Gallienus, Mediolanum, 260).
  - RIC V.1 174 no. 494 (Gallienus, Mediolanum, 260).
- RIC V.1 187 no. 640 (Gallienus, Asia, undated).
- RIC V.1 189 no. 658 (Gallienus, Asia, undated).
- RIC V.1 193 no. 18 (Gallienus, Rome, 253-68?).
- RIC V.1 629-630 (Gallienus, Asia, undated).
- RIC V.1 161 no. 348 (Gallienus, Rome, undated).
- RIC V.1 174 nos. 495, 496, 496a (Gallienus, Mediolanum, undated).
- RIC V.1 187 nos. 629-630 (Gallienus, Asia, undated).

-57. Sol stg. l. r. hand raised, l. holding globe. Chlamys draped over l. shoulder and arm. RIC V.1 186, no. 620 (Gallienus, Asia, 266-267).

-58. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand in mantle/chlamys. RIC V.1 86 no. 230 (Gallienus, Rome, 257-258).
-59. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe. Chlamys draped over l. shoulder and arm. RIC V.1 86 no. 229 (Gallienus, Rome, 257-258).
- RIC V.1 132 no. 24, 139 no. 99; 140 no. 119; 144 no. 160; 153 no. 251; 160, no. 340 (Gallienus, Rome, ca. 259).
- RIC V.1 171 nos. 465, 465a, 466 (Gallienus, Mediolanum, undated).

- RIC V.1 180 no. 555 (Gallienus, Siscia, undated).
-60. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe, dressed in chiton and chlamys. RIC V.1 185 no. 611 (Gallienus, Asia, 267).
-61. Sol in quadriga galloping l. RIC V.1 174 nos. 497-498 (Gallienus, Mediolanum, ca. 260).

Regalianus, usurper in Austria 260
-62. Sol stg. facing, head l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 587 nos. 6-7, pl. XX. 7 (Regalianus, Carnuntum, 260).

Macrianus the Younger, 260-261
-63. Sol stg. l., head r., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. Chlamys draped over l. shoulder and arm. RIC V.2 581 no. 12 note 4, pl. XX. 4 (Macrianus the Younger, Antioch, 260-1).

-64. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 583 no. 10 (Fulvius Julius Quietus, Antioch, 260-1).

Quietus, brother of Macrianus, 260-261
-65. Sol entering quadriga l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding whip. RIC V.2 350 no. 152 (Postumus, Lugdunum, 259-268).
-66. Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC V.2 362 no. 317 (Postumus, Cologne, 259-268).
-67. Jugate busts of Sol radiate and Luna on crescent with crescent on hair. RIC V.2 358 no. 260 (Postumus, Cologne, 259-268).

-68. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 343 no. 77 (Postumus, Lugdunum, 259-268).

Claudius II Gothicus, 268-270
-69. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe. Chlamys draped over shoulders and falling behind. RIC V.1 213 nos. 16-17; 217 nos. 76-78; 220 nos. 115-116 (Claudius Gothicus, Rome, 268-270).
  - RIC V.1 223 nos. 153-155 (Claudius Gothicus, Mediolanum, 268-270).
  - RIC V.1 234 no. 279 (Claudius Gothicus, Cyzicus, 268-270).
-70. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 230 no. 221 (Claudius Gothicus, Antioch, 268-270).
-71. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 235 no. 281 (Claudius Gothicus, Cyzicus, ca. 270).
-72. Diana stg. l., holding torch, facing Sol stg. r., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 228 no. 198 (Claudius Gothicus, Antioch, 268-270).

Quintillus, brother of Claudius II Gothicus, 270
-73. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe. RIC V.1 240 no. 7 (Quintillius, Rome, ca. 270).
  - RIC V.1 243 no. 40 (Quintillius, Mediolanum, ca. 270).
-74. Sol running l., raising r. hand and holding whip; in field l., star. RIC V.1 244 no. 56 (Quintillius, Mediolanum, ca. 270).

Victorinus, usurper in Gaul, 268-271
-75. Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC V.2 395 no. 96, pl. XIV. 10 (Victorinus, Cologne, 268-270).
-76. Busts of Emperor Victorinus laureate and Sol radiate, jugate l. RIC V.2 389 no. 25, pl. XIV. 8 (Victorinus, southern mint, 268-270).
- RIC V.2 388 nos. 12-13 (Victorinus, southern mint, 268-270).
- RIC V.2 389 no. 21 (Victorinus, southern mint, 268-270).
-77. Diademed bust of Sol r., facing like bust of Diana, with bow, l. RIC V.2 390 no. 33 (Victorinus, southern mint, 268-70).
-78. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 395 no. 97 (Victorinus, Cologne, 268-270).


Aurelian, 270-275
-79. Sol radiate, r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe and whip, stg. in facing quadriga, two horses turn l., and two r. RIC V.1 274 no. 78 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
-80. Sol in quadriga r., holding globe. RIC V.1 274 no. 77 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).

RIC V.1, pl. VII.110

-82. Radiate bust of Sol r. with four horses going r. (obverse). RIC V.1 301 nos. 320 (Aurelian, Rome, 274).
-83. Draped bare-headed bust of Sol r. with long hair. RIC V.1 301 no. 319 (Aurelian, Rome, 274).
-84. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe. RIC V.1 267 no. 18; 268, no. 20; 270, no. 44; 271 no. 54; 273 no. 67 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 280 no. 136 (Aurelian, Mediolanum, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 286 no. 188 (Aurelian, Siscia 270-275).
- RIC V.1 310 no. 397 (Aurelian, uncertain mint, 270-275).
-85. Sol walking r., trophy and globe surmounted by crescent. RIC V.1 272 no. 65 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
-86. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe; at foot l., a captive. RIC V.1 280 nos. 134-135 (Aurelian, Mediolanum, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 293 nos. 249-250 [with recumbent captive with outstretched hand]. (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 272 no. 66 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 285 no. 185 (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 294 no. 257 (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 296 nos. 276-277 (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 305f nos. 360-362 (Aurelian, Cyzicus, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 308 no. 383, but holding sword in r. hand (?) (Aurelian, Antioch, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 309 no. 390 (Aurelian, Tripolis, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 308 nos. 384-385 (Aurelian, Antioch, 270-275).

-87. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe, treading down one of two captives. RIC V.1 271-2 nos. 61-62 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 280 no. 137 (Aurelian, Mediolanum, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 299 no. 307-310 (Aurelian, Serdica, 270-275).

- RIC V.1 267 no. 17 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 281 no. 150, pl. VIII.123 (Aurelian, Mediolanum, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 281 no. 151, pl. VIII.127 (Aurelian, Ticinum, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 286, no. 187 (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 296 nos. 278-281 (Aurelian, Serdica, 270-275).
- RIC V.1 272 no. 63 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).

-88. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip, treading down one of two captives. RIC V.1 300 no. 311 (Aurelian, Cyzicus, 270-275).
-89. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip, treading down one of two captives. RIC V.1 293, nos. 254-255 (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).

-90. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 290 no. 230 (Aurelian, Siscia, 270-275).

-91. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 265 nos. 6-7, pl. VIII. 114 (Aurelian, Lugdunum, 270-275).

-92. Sol walking r., chlamys draped over l. shoulder, holding laurel branch in r. hand and bow in l., and treading down an enemy. RIC V.1 272 no. 64, pl. VIII.116 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).


-94. Emperor stg. r., holding spear, receiving globe from Sol, holding whip and treading down captive seated at foot between them. RIC V.1 300 nos. 312-315 (Aurelian, Serdica, 270-275).

-95. Emperor stg. r., holding spear, receiving globe from Sol, holding whip; sometimes at foot, two captives. RIC V.1 305 no. 353 (Aurelian, Cyzicus, 270-275).

-96. Emperor stg. r., holding globe and Sol stg. l., holding whip and treading down captive. RIC V.1 297 no. 283 (Aurelian, Serdica, 270-275).


-98. Fides stg. r., holding two ensigns, facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.1 281 nos. 152-153 (Aurelian, Ticinum, 270-275).

-100. Mars stg. r., holding spear and receiving globe from Sol, stg. l., and holding whip. RIC V.1 305 nos. 357 (Aurelian, Cyzicus, 270-275).
-101. Mars stg. r., holding spear and receiving globe from Sol, stg. l., and holding whip. Sol’s r. foot treads on a captive. RIC V.1 305 no. 358 (Aurelian, Cyzicus, 270-275).
-102. Emperor and empress stg. facing each other and clasping hands, in field above them, radiate bust of Sol r. RIC V.1 274 nos. 79-82 (Aurelian, Rome, 270-275).
-103. Sol stg. r. RIC V.2 407 no. 64 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-274).
-104. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 409 no. 99 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-274).
-105. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 406 no. 54 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-275).

Tetricus I, usurper in Gaul, 271-274
-106. Sol stg. r. RIC V.2 414 no. 182 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-274).
-107. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 406 no. 54 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-275).
-108. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 408 nos. 82-84 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-275).
RIC V.2 409 no. 98 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-275).
RIC V.2 413 nos. 162-163 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-275).
RIC V.2 414 no. 183 (Tetricus I, Cologne, 270-275).

Tetricus II, Gaul, 273-274
- 106. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe. RIC V.2 422 no. 245 (Tetricus II, Cologne, ca. 271).
- 107. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 421 no. 234 (Tetricus II, Cologne, ca. 270-275).
- RIC V.2 422 no. 246 (Tetricus II, Cologne, ca. 270-275).

Vabalathus, Palmyra, 271-272
- 108. Sol stg. r. looking l., raising r. hand, l. hand holding globe or disk. RIC V.2 585 no. 2 (Vabalathus, Antioch, 270).

Tacitus, 275-276
- 109. Providentia stg. r., with two ensigns, facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.1 331 nos. 52-53 (Tacitus, Gaul, 275-276).
- RIC V.1 345 nos. 195-197 (Tacitus, Serdica, 275-276).

Florian, 276
- 110. Sol in quadriga l., holding whip. RIC V.1 351 nos. 17-18 (Florian, Rome, 276).
- 111. Sol in quadriga galloping l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding whip. RIC V.1 360 nos. 114-115 (Florian, Cyzicus, 276).
- 112. Sol running l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.1 350 nos. 7-9 (Florian, Lugdunum, 276).
- RIC V.1 355 no. 52 [but Sol walking l.] (Florian, Rome, 276).
-113. Providentia stg. r., with two ensigns, facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.1 359f nos. 110-113 (Florian, Serdica, 276).

Probus, 276-282
-114. Sol in quadriga l., holding whip, sometimes globe. RIC V.1 63 nos. 421-2, (Probus, Ticinum, 276-82).
- Sol in quadriga l., holding whip. RIC V.2 100f nos. 767-774 (Probus, Siscia, 276-82).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/probus/RIC_0767,S.jpg

- RIC V.2 102 nos. 783-785 (Probus, Siscia, 276-82).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/probus/RIC_0783.jpg

- Sol in quadriga l., holding whip. RIC V.2 113 nos. 871-874 (Probus, Serdica, 276-82).
- Sol in quadriga galloping l. RIC V.2 45 no. 267 (Probus, Rome, 276-82).
-115. Sol radiate, r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe and whip, stg. in facing quadriga, two horses turn l., and two r. RIC V.2 39 nos. 204-208 (Probus, Rome, 276-82).
- Sol radiate, r. hand raised, l. hand holding reigns(?) or globe and whip(?), stg. in facing quadriga, two horses turn l., and two r. RIC V.2 112 nos. 861-869, pl. V.1; 118 no. 911, pl. V. 9, 10 (Probus, Serdica, 276-82).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/probus/RIC_0861,B.jpg
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- Sol in facing quadriga. RIC V.2 50, no. 311, 63 nos. 418-420, (Probus, Ticinum, 276-82).
- RIC V.2 101f nos. 776-782 (Probus, Siscia, 276-82).

- RIC V.2 113 no. 870 (Probus, Serdica, 276-82).

-116. Sol radiate, wearing chlamys, in chariot riding l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe and whip. RIC V.2 38 nos. 199-203, pl. II. 9 (Probus, Rome, 276-82).

-117. Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC V.2 32, no. 138, pl. II. 2 (Probus, Rome, 276-82).
- RIC V.2 80 no. 597 (Probus, Siscia, 276-82).
- Bust of Sol radiate and draped l. RIC V.2 40 no. 209 (Probus, Rome, 276-82).

-118. Jugate busts of emperor laureate and Sol radiate. RIC V.2 80 no. 596 (Probus, Siscia, 276-82).
- Jugate busts of emperor helmeted, cuirassed, with spear and shield, and Sol radiate. RIC V.2 108 no. 829 (Probus, Serdica, 276-82).
- RIC V.2 109 no. 835 (Probus, Serdica, 279).
  - RIC V.2 49 nos. 307-309, pl. II.11 and 12; 54 nos. 347-353, pl. III. 1 and 2 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-280).

- RIC V.2 115 no. 891 (Probus, Cyzicus, 276-280).
- Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 60 no. 392 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-280).
- Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 79 nos. 589-590; 89 nos. 669-672 (Probus, Siscia, 276-280).
- Sol stg. facing, r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 no. 915 (Probus, Antioch, 276-280).

- 120. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. Chlamys draped over left shoulder, flying behind. RIC V.2 47 nos. 293-294 (Probus, Rome, 276-282).
  - RIC V.2 90 no. 673 (Probus, Siscia, 276-282).

- RIC V.2 92 no. 700 (Probus, Siscia, 276-282).
-121. Probus stg., foot on captive, holding Victory and parazonium, crowned by Sol, holding whip. RIC V.2 67 no. 456 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).
-122. Emperor stg. l., holding globe and spear, treading down enemy, and crowned by Sol holding a whip. RIC V.2 61 nos. 404-406 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).
-123. Providentia stg. r., with two ensigns, facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 110 nos. 844-850, pl. IV.18 (Probus, Serdica, 276-282).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/probus/RIC_0849cf.jpg

-124. Concordia stg. r., holding two ensigns and facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 51 nos. 323-324, pl. II.15, 16 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/probus/RIC_0323.jpg

- RIC V.2 54 nos. 343-344 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).
-125. Sol stg. l. in temple. RIC V.2 55 no. 354 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).
- RIC V.2 62f nos. 414-417 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).
- RIC V.2 74 nos. 536-538 (Probus, Ticinum, 276-282).

[Image of coin with obverse side showing busts of Sol and Carus facing each other, and the reverse side showing a temple.]

http://probvs.net/probvs/rev-reverses.html

**Carus, 282-283**

-126. Busts of Sol and Carus face to face (obv.). RIC V.2 146 no. 99, pl. VI. 13 (Carus, Siscia, 282-283).

[Image of coin with obverse side showing bust of Carus, r. hand raised, l. holding whip, and the reverse side showing a temple.]


-127. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 139 nos. 35-36, pl. VI. 4 (Carus, Rome, 282-283).

[Image of coin with obverse side showing bust of Carus, r. hand raised, l. holding whip, and the reverse side showing a temple.]

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear/s3399.4.jpg
Carinus, 283-285
-128. Sol stg. looking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 176 no. 310 (Carinus, Siscia, 282-285).


-129. Sol stg. or walking r. or l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip or globe. RIC V.2 171 no. 262 (Carinus, Rome, 282-285).

Numerianus, r. 283-284
-131. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 190 no. 373 (Numerianus, Antioch, 282-285).
- RIC V.2 192 no. 381 (Numerianus, Lugdunum, 282-285).
- RIC V.2 200 no. 454 (Numerianus, Ticinum, 282-285).

http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/numerian/RIC_0355v.jpg [obv slightly different]

-133. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 195 nos. 411-412 (Numerianus, Rome, 283-4).

Diocletian, 284-305
-134. Jugate busts of emperor laureate and cuirassed, with spear and shield, and Sol radiate, holding whip. RIC V.2 239 no. 189 (Diocletian, Rome, 286).
-135. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 238 no. 174 (Diocletian, Rome, 285).
- RIC V.2 252 no. 302 (Diocletian, Cyzicus, 284-294?).
-136. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 226 no. 60 (Diocletian, Lugdunum, 284-294).
-137. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 235 nos. 147-148 (Diocletian, Rome, 284-294).
- RIC V.2 241f nos. 206-207 (Diocletian, Ticinum, 284-294).
-138. Sol radiate, stg. 1., chlamys on l. shoulder, r. raised, l. holding globe. RIC VI 423 no. 9, pl. 8. 9 (Diocletian, Carthago, ca. 294-305).
  - RIC VI 458 no. 30 (Diocletian, Siscia, ca. 294-305).
-139. Sol stg. 1., r. hand raised, l. holding globe; at foot captive. RIC V.2 231 nos. 116-117 (Diocletian, Treveri, 295).

Carausius, Britain, 286/7-293
-140. Sol in quadriga, galloping l., r. hand raised. RIC V.2 478 no. 170 (Carausius, Londinium, 287-93).
  - Sol in quadriga galloping l. RIC V.2 498 nos. 408-409 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-93).
  - Sol in quadriga. RIC V.2 531 no. 806 (Carausius, unattributed, 287-93).
-141. Bust of Sol radiate and draped l. RIC V.2 535 nos. 872-874 (Carausius, unattributed, 287-93).
-142. Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC V.2 509 no. 542 (Carausius, London(?), 287-93).
-143. Busts of Emperor Carausius and Sol jugate r., emperor in imperial mantle, r. hand uplifted, Sol holding whip (obv). RIC V.2 493 no. 341 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-93).
  - Jugate busts of Emperor Carausius and Sol l., both radiate and cuirassed. RIC V.2 484 nos. 233-234 (Carausius, Camulodunum 287-93).
  - RIC V.2 490 no. 304 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-93).
  - RIC V.2 529 no. 788 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-93).
  - Jugate busts of emperor and Sol, Sol sometimes holding whip. RIC V.2 507 no. 527 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-93).
  - Radiate draped busts of Carausius and Sol jugate with Sol holding whip. RIC V.2 545 no. 1044 (Carausius, uncertain mint, 287-93).
-144. Sol stg. or walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe and whip. RIC V.2 489 nos. 293-297 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 284-294?).
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  - Sol stg. or walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 503 no. 473 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 284-294?).
  - RIC V.2 512 nos. 569-570 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 284-294?).
  - RIC V.2 515 no. 611 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 284-294?).
  - RIC V.2 531 no. 807, sometimes with star in l. field (Carausius, Camulodunum, 284-294?).
  - RIC V.2 471 nos. 94-95 (Carausius, Londinium, 287-293).
-145. Sol stg. 1., r. hand raised, l. holding globe or whip, between two captives. RIC V.2 489 no. 299 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-293).
-146. Sol walking r. between two captives, r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 498 no. 407 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-293).
-147. Sol stg. or walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe or whip; at foot captive. RIC V.2 489 no. 298 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-293).
  - RIC V.2 534 nos. 869-870, but sometimes two captives. (Carausius, uncertain mint, 287-293).
-148. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 471 no. 96 (Carausius, Londinium, 284-294).
  - RIC V.2 535 no. 871 (Carausius, uncertain mint, 284-294).
149. Sol walking rapidly r. RIC V.2 534 no. 868 (Carausius, unattributed, 287-293).
150. Providentia stg. r., with two ensigns, facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC V.2 496 no. 380 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-293).
151. Fides stg. r., between two ensigns, facing Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, holding globe. RIC V.2 500 no. 434 (Carausius, Camulodunum, 287-293).

Allectus, Britain, 293-296/7
151. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe or whip, between two captives seated at feet. RIC V.2 558 no. 4, pl. XIX. 3 (Allectus, Londinium, 294-297).
   - RIC V.2 566 no. 84 (Allectus, Camulodunum, 294-297).

Constantius I Chlorus, Caesar r. 293-305, joint emperor r. 305-306
153. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe; at foot captive. RIC V.2 231 nos. 116-117 (Constantius I, Lugdunum, 295).
154. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 297 no. 631 (Constantius I, Lugdunum, 294-305).
   - RIC VI 458 nos. 28a, 31a, pl. 9. 31a (Constantius I, Siscia, 294-305).

Maximianus, 286-305 and 307-308
155. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe, between two captives. RIC V.2 266 no. 394a (Maximianus, Lugdunum, 287-293).
156. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe; at foot, captive. RIC V.2 274 nos. 472-474, pl. XI.5 (Maximianus, Rome, 295-296).
157. Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC VI 173 no. 83 (Maximianus, Treveri, 295-305).
   - RIC VI 615 no. 26 (Maximianus, Antiochia, 295-305).
158. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC VI 458 nos. 28b, 31b (Maximianus, Siscia, 302-305).

Galerius Maximianus, Caesar r. 293-305, emperor r. 305-311
159. Sol radiate, stg. l., chlamys on l. shoulder, r. hand raised, l. holding globe and whip. RIC VI 554 no. 7 (Galerius Maximianus, Nicomedia, ca. 294).


160. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe; sometimes at foot, one or two captives. RIC V.2 304 nos. 682-683 (Galerius Maximianus, Lugdunum, 294/6).
   - RIC V.2 305 no. 685- without captives. (Galerius Maximianus, Lugdunum, 294/6).
   - RIC VI 660 no. 2, pl. 16.2 (Galerius Maximianus, Alexandria, 294/6).
161. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe; at foot captive. RIC V.2 306 no. 694. (Galerius Maximianus, Treveri, 295).
162. Sol walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC V.2 305 no. 684 (Galerius Maximianus, Lugdunum, 295).
163. Sol radiate, in long robe, stg. facing, head l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe, in facing quadriga; two horses turn l., and two r. RIC VI 638 nos. 145a, pl. 15. 145a (Galerius Maximianus, Antiochia, 310).
Severus II, 306-307
-164. Sol stg. facing, head l., chlamys draped over l. shoulder, r. raised, l. holding up globe. RIC VI 202 no. 616; 204 no. 630a-632 (except chlamys over r. shoulder). (Severus II, Treveri, 305-307).

Maximinus II Daia, Caesar 305-309/310, joint emperor 310-313
-165. Sol stg. facing, head r., chlamys hanging behind, r. hand raised, l. holding whip and globe close to body. RIC VI 558 nos. 35-36 (Maximinus, Nicomedia, 305-306).
  - RIC VI 560 no. 43, pl. 13. 43 (Maximinus, Nicomedia, 306-307).
  - RIC VI 560 no. 46, (Maximinus, Nicomedia, 307-308).
-166. Sol radiate, stg. l., chlamys on l. shoulder, r. hand raised, l. holding whip and globe. RIC VI 478 nos. 191-192 (Maximinus, Siscia, ca. 308-309).
-167. Sol radiate, in long robe, stg. facing, head l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe, in facing quadriga; two horses turn l., and two r. RIC VI 638 nos. 144-145b (Maximinus, Antiochia, 310).


- RIC VI 637f nos. 140-1 (Maximinus, Antiochia, 310).
- RIC VI 637 no. 142 (Maximinus, Antiochia, 310).
-168. Sol radiate, stg. l. in long robe, r. hand raised, l. hand holding head of Serapis. RIC VI 677 no. 96, pl. 16. 96; 677 no. 94a (Maximinus, Alexandria, 308-311).
  - RIC VI 640 nos. 154a-d (Maximinus, Antiochia, 308-311).
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- RIC VI 592 no. 92, pl. 14. 92 (Maximinus, Cyzicus, 311-313).
- RIC VI 681 no. 132, pl. 16. 132 (Maximinus, Alexandria, 311-313).
- RIC VI 542 no. 78 (Maximinus, Heraclea, 311-313).
- RIC VI 566 nos. 73a-c, 77a-c (Maximinus, Licinius and Constantine, Nicomedia, 311-313).
- RIC VI 593 nos. 98-99; 594 no. 106, 110 (Maximinus, Licinius, Cyzicus, 311-313).
- RIC VI 641 nos. 159 (Maximinus, Antiochia, 311-313).
- RIC VI 644 nos. 167a-c, 168 (Maximinus, Licinius, and Constantine, Antiochia, 311-313).

- 169. Sol radiate, stg. l. in long robe, r. hand raised, l. hand holding Victoriola. RIC VI 641 no. 160 (Maximinus, Antiochia, 311-313).
- 170. Sol, radiate, naked to waist, stg. with head l. in facing quadriga, right hand raised, left hand holding globe and whip. RIC VI 224 no. 826 (Maximinus, Treveri, 312).

- 171. Sol advancing r., head l., chlamys hanging behind, r. raised, l. holding up globe; l. foot on captive. RIC VI 390 no. 344 (Maximinus, Rome, 312-313).
- 172. Sol radiate, stg. l., head r. chlamys spread, raising r. hand, l. holding whip and globe. RIC VI 139 no. 244 (Maximinus, Londinium, 312-313).
- 173. Genius stg l., holding head of Sol and Cornucopiae. RIC 164 (Maximinus, Antioch, 312)
Licinius, 308-324

- 174. Sol radiate, stg. l., chlamys on shoulder, r. hand raised, l. holding globe and whip. RIC VI 478 no. 191 (Licinius, Siscia, ca. 308-309).
- 175. Sol radiate and in long robe, r. hand raised, stg. in quadriga galloping r. RIC VI 638 no. 143 (Licinius, Antiochia, 310).
- 176. Sol radiate, stg l., chlamys on l. shoulder, r. hand raised, l. holding whip and globe. RIC VI 482 no. 217 (Licinius, Siscia, 311-313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 4, 9-10, 17, 22 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 217 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).

  - RIC VII 360 no. 34 (Licinius, Ticinum, 313).
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- RIC VII 240f nos. 74, 82-83, 91; 76-77, 86-88, 94-95 [but stg. r., looking l.] (Licinius, Arles, 316).
- RIC VII 366f no. 46 (Licinius, Ticinum, 316).

-178. Sol radiate, stg. l., raising r. hand, globe in l., chlamys across r. shoulder. RIC VII 296 nos. 3-4 (Licinius, Rome, 313).
-179. Plan of Roman camp, Sol stg. in the middle, raising r. hand, holding globe in l., chlamys across l. shoulder. RIC VII 507 no. 68 (Licinius, Thessalonica, 319).

**Constantine I, 306-337**

-180. Sol radiate, stg. l., head r. chlamys spread, raising r. hand, l. holding whip and globe. RIC VI 139 no. 243 (Constantine, Londinium, 312-313).
-181. Sol radiate, stg r., head l., chlamys on l. shoulder, r. hand raised, l. holding whip and globe (close to body). RIC VI 298 nos. 134-136 (Constantine, Ticinum, 312-313).
-182. Sol radiate, advancing/walking l., r. hand raised, l. holding whip, chlamys flying. RIC VI 265 no. 312 (Constantine, Lugdunum, 309-310).
- RIC VII 303 no. 59 (Constantine, Rome, 317).
- RIC VII 307 no. 80 (Constantine, Rome, 317).
- RIC VII 394 no. 14 (Constantine, Aquileia, 317-318).

-183. Sol stg. facing, head l., r. hand raised, l. holding globe. RIC VI 265 nos. 307-311 (Constantine, Lugdunum, 308-311). Images-
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- 184. Sol radiate, chlamys on l. shoulder, stg. l., r. raised, l. holding globe. RIC VI 677 no. 97 (Constantine, Alexandria, 308-311).
- 185. Sol stg. l., r. hand raised, l. hand holding up globe. RIC VI 132 nos. 113-115 (Constantine, Londinium, 310).
- 186. Sol stg. l., chlamys falling from l. shoulder, r. raised, l. holding up globe. RIC VI 133 nos. 120, 121a-c, 122-127, pl. 1. 122 (Constantine, Londinium, 310).
  - RIC VI 136 no. 193; 137 nos. 234-240 (Constantine, Londinium, 310-313).
  - RIC VI 226 nos. 865-876 (Constantine, Treveri, 310-313).
  - RIC VI 227 nos. 898-900 (Constantine, Treveri, 310-313).

- 187. Sol radiate, chlamys on l. shoulder, stg. l., r. raised, l. holding globe. RIC VI 227 nos. 898-900 (Constantine, Treveri, 310-313).

- 188. Sol radiate, l. hand holding up globe. RIC VI 281 nos. 368-374 (Constantine, Rome, 310-313).
- 189. Sol radiate, l. hand holding up globe. RIC VI 281 nos. 368-374 (Constantine, Ostia, 312-313).
188. Sol stg l., chlamys falling from l. shoulder, r. hand holding up globe, l. holding whip. RIC VI 131 no. 101-102 (Constantine, Londinium, 307-312).

- RIC VI 135ff nos. 146a-192 (Constantine, Londinium, 310-312).

189. Sol stg l., r. hand holding whip, l. globe. RIC VI 132 no. 116; 133 no. 128. (Constantine, Londinium, 310)

190. Sol stg. r. head l., chlamys hanging behind, r. hand raised, l. holding globe across body. RIC VI 389 nos. 339-340 (Constantine, Rome, 312-313).

191. Sol stg. facing, head facing, chlamys over l. shoulder and hanging behind, r. hand raised, l. holding up globe. RIC VI 298 no. 133 (Constantine, Ticinum, 312-313).

192. Sol advancing l., chlamys hanging behind, r. raised, l. holding up globe, trampling on fallen enemy. RIC VI 409 no. 93 (Constantine, Ostia, 312-313).

193. Bust of Sol radiate and draped r. RIC VI 227 nos. 886-895, pl. 2. 890 (Constantine, Treveri, 310-313).

Images-
-194. Sol radiate, stg. facing in facing quadriga with r. hand raised; behind Victory stg. facing, r. hand holding wreath, l. hand holding palm. RIC VI 297 no.113 (Constantine, Ticinum, 312-3).

-195. Sol stg. r., head l., chlamys hanging behind, r. hand raised, l. holding globe close to body. RIC VI 392 nos. 375-377 (Constantine, Rome, 312-313).

-196. Sol stg. L., head L., chlamys hanging behind, r. hand raised, l. holding globe close to body. RIC VI 409 nos. 83-88 (Constantine, Ostia, 311-313).


-198. Sol radiate, chlamys spread, stg. r., presenting Victory on globe to Emperor in military dress, cloak spread, stg l., between them a suppliant. RIC VII 368 no. 56 (Constantine, Tircinum, 316).
  - RIC VII 500 no. 10, pl. 15.10 (Constantine, Thessalonica, 317).
  - RIC VII 245 no. 114, pl. 6.114 (Constantine, Arles, 317).
  - RIC VII 397 no. 35, pl. 11.35 (Constantine, Aquileia, 320).
  - RIC VII 375 no. 108, pl. 10.108 (Constantine, Ticinum, 320-321).
  - RIC VII 468 no. 8, pl. 14.8 (Constantine, Sirmium, 320-321).
  - RIC VII 685 no. 49, pl. 23.49 (Constantine, Antioch, 324-325).

-199. Sol radiate stg. l., raising r. hand, Victory on globe in l., chlamys across l. shoulder. Star in l. field, crescent in r. field. RIC VII 301f nos. 45, 48-50, pl. 7, 45 and 49 (Constantine, Rome, 316).
- 200. Sol stg. l., raising r. hand, globe in l. at hip-level, turned inwards, chlamys across l. shoulder. RIC VII 172 nos. 92-94 (Constantine, Trier, 316).
- 201. Sol stg. l., looking r., raising r. hand, globe in l., chlamys spread, captive on ground to l. RIC VII 168 no. 48 (Constantine, Trier, 313-315).
- 202. Sol stg. l., raising r. hand, globe in l., chlamys across l. shoulder, captive on ground to l. wearing a Phrygian cap. RIC VII 302f nos. 51-55, pl. 7.52 (Constantine, Rome, 316-317).

RIC VII, pl. 7.52

- RIC VII 392 nos. 1-2 [captive without Phrygian cap?] (Constantine, Aquileia, 316-317).
- 203. Sol stg. l., wearing chlamys across l. shoulder, raising r. hand, globe in left. RIC VII 103 no. 102, pl. 1. 103 (Constantine, London, 317).
- 204. Sol stg. l., chlamys across l. shoulder, raising r. hand, globe in l.; at feet, kneeling barbarian. RIC VII 500 nos. 8-9, pl. 15.8 (Constantine, Thessalonica, 317).
- 205. Sol stg. l., chlamys across l. shoulder, raising r. hand, globe and whip in l.; captive at feet seated on ground. RIC VII 426f nos. 24-25, pl. 12. 24 (Constantine, Siscia, 317).
- 206. Sol radiate stg. l., chlamys across l. shoulder, raising r. hand, holding Victory on a globe in l. hand. Star in l. field, crescent in r. RIC 7 301 nos. 45, 49, pl. 7.45 (Constantine, Rome, 316).
- 207. Sol radiate stg. l., chlamys across l. shoulder, raising r. hand, globe in l. RIC VII 97-98 nos. 5-18, pl. 1. 17 (Constantine, London, 313-314).

- RIC VII 122 nos. 1-9 (Constantine, Lyons, 313-314).
- RIC VII 168 nos. 39-47, pl. 3.39 (Constantine, Trier, 313-315).
- RIC VII 360 nos. 1-3, 7-8, 14-16, 20-21 (Constantine, Ticinum, 313).
- RIC VII 480 no. 4, pl. 15. 4 (Constantine, Serdica, 313-314).
- RIC VII 123 nos. 15-25, pl. 2.22 (Constantine, Lyons, 314-315).
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- RIC VII 298f nos. 18-20, 27-28, 31 and 37 [but stg. r., looking l., chlamys spread], 33-34, 39-41, pl. 7. 33, 40 (Constantine, Rome, 314-315).
- RIC VII 124 nos. 30-47 (Constantine, Lyons, 315-316).
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- RIC VII 170 nos. 70-76 (Constantine, Trier, 315-316).
- RIC VII 238f nos. 56-58, 62-66 [but stg. r. looking l.], pl. 6.65 (Constantine, Arles, 315-316).
- RIC VII 240f nos. 71-73, 79-81, 89-90, 96-97, 99-101; 75 and 84-85, 92-93, 98, 102-103 [but stg. r. looking l.] (Constantine, Arles, 316).
- RIC VII 100f nos. 53-59, 62 [but stg. r., looking l], 68-78 (Constantine, London, 316).
- RIC VII 125f nos. 51-61, 62 [but stg. r., looking l] (Constantine, Lyons, 316).
- RIC VII 172 nos. 95-107 (Constantine, Trier, 316).

- RIC VII 366 nos. 43-45, pl. 9.45 (Constantine, Ticinum, 316).
- RIC VII 370 no. 61, pl. 10.61 (Constantine, Ticinum, 316).

- RIC VII 303 nos. 56-58 (Constantine, Rome, 316-317).
- RIC VII 244 no. 112 (Constantine, Arles, 317).
- RIC VII 174f nos. 127-135 (Constantine, Trier, 317).
- RIC VII 370 no. 62-63, 64 [but Sol stg. r., looking l.] (Constantine, Ticinum, 317).
- RIC VII 392f nos. 3-5, pl. 11.4 (Constantine, Aquileia, 317).
- RIC VII 428 nos. 31-35, pl. 12.31 (Constantine, Siscia, 317).
- RIC VII 176 nos. 157-162, 164-167 (Constantine, Trier, 317-318).
- RIC VII 248f nos. 144-146, 149-152 [but Sol stg. r., looking l.] (Constantine, Arles, 317-318).
- RIC VII 309 no. 97 (Constantine, Rome, 317-318).
- RIC VII 371 nos. 67-69 (Constantine, Ticinum, 317-318).
- RIC VII 250f nos. 164-165, 169, 170 [but Sol stg. r., looking l.] (Constantine, Arles, 318).
- RIC VII 313 no. 136 (Constantine, Rome, 318).
- RIC VII 253 no. 180, 184, pl. 6.184 (Constantine, Arles, 318-319).
- RIC VII 296 nos. 1-2, 5, pl. 7.2 (Constantine, Rome, 313).
- RIC VII 235 no. 20, 21 [but Sol stg. r.] (Constantine, Arles, 313).
- RIC VII 123 no. 27 (Constantine, Lyons, 314-315).
- RIC VII 388 nos. 313-315 (Constantine, Rome, 312-313).
- RIC VII 123 no. 26 (Constantine, Lyons, 314-315).
- RIC VII 363 no. 32 (Constantine, Ticinum, 315).
- RIC VII 507 nos. 66-67 (Constantine, Thessalonica, 319).
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- 209. Sol stg. l., globe in l. hand, chlamys flying under l. arm. RIC VII 235 no. 20, 21 [but Sol stg. r.] (Constantine, Arles, 313).
- 210. Sol advancing l., looking r., r. hand raised, chlamys flying, holding globe. RIC VII 123 no. 27 (Constantine, Lyons, 314-315).
- 211. Sol stg l., chlamys hanging behind, r. hand raised, l. holding whip. RIC VI 388 nos. 313-315 (Constantine, Rome, 312-313).
- RIC VII 123 no. 26 (Constantine, Lyons, 314-315).
- 213. Bust of Constantine laureate, draped and cuirassed and bust of Sol radiate, jugate l. Constantine has r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe. (hard to distinguish from plate). RIC VII 363 no. 32, pl. 9. 32 (Constantine, Ticinum, 315).
- RIC VII 368 no. 53, pl. 10. 53 (Constantine, Ticinum, 315).
- 214. Sol radiate, r. hand raised, l. hand holding globe and whip, stg in facing quadriga, two horses turn l., and two r. RIC VII 102 nos. 81-84, pl. 1. 83 (Constantine, London, 316).
- 215. Plan of Roman camp, Sol stg. in the middle, raising r. hand, holding globe in l., chlamys across l. shoulder. RIC VII 507 nos. 66-67 (Constantine, Thessalonica, 319).
-218. Sol stg l., chlamys across l. shoulder, crowning emperor stg. l. facing in military dress, and holding standard in r. hand. RIC VII 472 no. 31 (Constantine, Sirmium, 322).

**Constantine II, Caesar 317-337, emperor 337-340**

  - RIC VII 174f nos. 137, 147-149, 153-155, pl. 3.153, 154 (Constantine II, Trier, 317).
  - RIC VII 428 nos. 36-37, pl. 12.37 (Constantine II, Siscia, 317).
  - RIC VII 502 no. 23 (Constantine II, Thessalonica, 317-318).
  - RIC VII 250f nos. 156-158, 166, 171 (Constantine II, Arles, 318).
  - RIC VII 253 nos. 181-182 (Constantine II, Arles, 318-319).
-220. Plan of Roman camp, Sol stg. in the middle, raising r. hand, holding globe in l., chlamys across l. shoulder. RIC VII 507 no. 71, pl. 16.71 (Constantine II, Thessalonica, 319).
-221. Sol radiate, advancing l., globe and whip in l. hand, flying chlamys. RIC VII 173 nos. 125-126 (Constantine II, Trier, 316).
-222. Sol radiate, advancing l., raising r. hand, globe and whip in l. hand, flying chlamys. RIC VII 307 no. 85 (Constantine II, Rome 317).
  - RIC VII 394 no. 19 (Constantine II, Aquileia 317).
  - RIC VII 309 no. 98 (Constantine II, Rome, 317-318).
  - RIC VII 312 no. 130 (Constantine II, Rome, 318).
-223. Sol radiate, advancing/walking l., raising r. hand, l. holding whip, chlamys flying. RIC VII 307 no. 84 (Constantine II, Rome, 317).
RIC VII 372 nos. 80-81 (Constantine II, Ticinum, 317-318).
- RIC VII 394 nos. 15-18 (Constantine II, Aquileia, 317).
- RIC VII 370 no. 66 [but advancing r.] (Constantine II, Ticinum, 317).
- RIC VII 312 no. 129 [but advancing r.] (Constantine II, Rome, 318).

-224. Sol running l., chlamys across l. arm, raising r. hand, l. holding globe and whip. RIC VII 246 no. 122 (Constantine II, Arles, 317).

Crispus, Caesar 317-326


- RIC VII 174f nos. 136, 146, 150-152; 156 [but holding globe low, turned inward] (Crispus, Trier, 317).
- RIC VII 177 nos. 175-178; 182 [but Sol stg. r., looking l.] (Crispus, Trier, 317-318).

-227. Plan of Roman camp, Sol stg. in the middle, raising r. hand, holding globe in l., chlamys across l. shoulder. RIC VII 507 nos. 69 (Crispus, Thessalonica, 319).

-228. Sol radiate, stg. l., in long robe, raising r. hand, holding globe in l. hand. RIC VII 603 no. 22, pl. 20. 22 (Crispus, Nicomedia, 319).

-229. Sol radiate, advancing l., globe and whip in l. hand, flying chlamys. RIC VII 173 no. 124 (Crispus, Trier, 316).

-230. Sol radiate, stg. r., looking l., raising r. hand, globe in l. hand, flying chlamys. RIC VII 175 nos. 147-149 (Crispus, Trier, 317).


- RIC VII 372 no. 79 (Crispus, Ticinum, 317-318).

Licinius II, Caesar 317-324

L. Coins, Medallions and Contorniates

The catalogue lists the main coins depicting Sol issued by Roman mints in the Republic and Empire. It is presented here only for indicative purposes. The list of official Roman coins is not exhaustive, issues by provincial and autonomous mints have not been included at all, and it is not my aim to discuss these coins here in any detail. For that one should turn to Berrens (2004), who offers an extensive discussion of Roman coins depicting Sol in a useful study that is far more detailed than what I could offer here, although his interpretations and conclusions should be treated with care. The lack of a clear theoretical framework renders his analysis of the numismatic evidence problematical, but to a significant extent this reflects problems in Roman numismatics in general rather than Berrens’ study specifically - problems that cannot be resolved in this study or even in a monograph that focuses solely on numismatic material, such as that of Berrens. In short, although the deployment of the image types [sol] on Roman coins has the potential of being highly informative, we still lack a great deal of basic information as a result of which that potential cannot yet be fully tapped.

Coin imagery was meaningful to Romans. The sheer variety of images as well as the large numbers of different coins issued make this abundantly clear. It is no chance, for instance, that Sol dominated the coinage of Aurelian. His government intended to convey certain meanings with those repeated depictions of Sol and the intended audiences could no doubt readily read the intended messages. The problem is that we cannot presume to know a priori who the intended audiences were, nor can we expect to decipher the intended messages if we view a given coin in isolation. To a significant degree these problems can be resolved with the evidence available, but only labouriously. Denomination, precise date, and mint location may reveal some information about the intended audience; gold multiples minted in Rome were not meant for the average soldier, and silver-plated antoniniani minted in a temporary mint near a military crisis were not intended to address the imperial elite in the capital. Common types issued more or less concurrently at various imperial mints were presumably intended for a wide audience, while rare types, issued at one mint only, may have been directed to a more specific group. As to the intended meanings, a large number of factors could play a role. Coins were often issued as part of a series with complementary images, for example. They could also be issued as one element in a concerted campaign deploying a wide range of visual means, such as statues and other large scale imagery, ceremonial events, and the like. Vespasian’s coinage depicting Augustan themes are a good example of this. We should always bear in mind that coin images address the visual memory of the intended audience. This means that they can play on associations with other, large-scale images which the intended audience could be expected to know and understand, but which we do not. Nonetheless, a great deal of information concerning the nature, size, and location of the intended audience of a given coin, as well as the broader context of its imagery, can be gleaned from the extant information in principle. In practice, however, such information is often not yet attainable due to the lack of sufficiently detailed publications of the coins ans

---

401 Matern (2001, 285-301) provides an extensive, but by no means exhaustive list of local issues.
This is not to say that all coins issued were part of an elaborate, image-based program extending beyond the coins themselves. Many issues were generic and straightforward, propagating standard religious themes or fundamental imperial virtues, achievements, and the like. But here too, care must be taken. The very standardization of such types allows them in principle to acquire derivative meanings which may be only indirectly related to the original. The various meanings of the radiate crown of the emperors, discussed in chapter six, are a good example. A closer look at one of Berrens’ case-studies may serve as an illustration of the potential as well as the pitfalls of exploring such derivative meanings.

Neos Helios: Sol and the emperor (yet again)
Berrens’ suggests that Sol may sometimes be depicted on coins as herald of the dawn of a new imperial era with the accession of a new emperor, notably in the case of Gordian III and to a lesser extent Philip II. In arguing this, he draws an analogy with the practice to hail the emperor as neos Helios. Berrens enumerates a substantial list of Roman and provincial coins minted under Gordian III on which Sol is depicted. These coins, together with literary and epigraphic evidence suggest to him that under Gordian III a close connection was forged between Solar cult and the emperor.

While his line of reasoning may appear straightforward, there are a number of pitfalls. Some are hard to avoid. He almost invariably discusses the many coins he lists in isolation, without detailing their numismatic context. Thus Berrens acknowledges that of the coins issued by the 170 or so autonomous mints in the Roman East under Gordian III, only a minute percentage depicted Helios/Sol, but he does not explore what common themes (if any) emerge from the coinage of those many cities that did not depict Sol at this time. That would be a major undertaking and Berrens can hardly be blamed for not doing so, but it leaves him essentially empty-handed. Without knowing to which series the Sol-coins that were minted belonged, and without knowing what themes or scenes were more popular under Gordian III, we cannot begin to establish the significance of those relatively rare provincial Sol-issues. Nonetheless, this lack of essential information ultimately does not deter Berrens from adducing those rare coins to support his general argument.

Berrens, then, fails to offer firm proof of any connection between these provincial Sol-issues and a specific imperial policy promoting a particular connection between the emperor and Sol. Nor does the other evidence Berrens adduces change this. He stresses the fact that Gordian III was hailed as Neos Helios in Ephesus, claiming: “Bezeichnenderweise ist dieser Titel auf Inschriften im 3. Jh. n. Chr. erstmals für Gordian III. gesichert”, adding in a footnote

402 The excellent volumes of the Moneta Imperii Romani series are a good step in the right direction. Until Göbl’s volume on the coinage of Aurelian in that series, for example, most of Aurelian’s coins were simply dated to his reign, without further information of sequence, series, or even, at times, mint. Unfortunately, the MIR to date covers only a (small) portion of the whole sequence of Roman imperial coinage. Likewise the excellent Roman Provincial Coinage is still far from complete.


that the only other to receive it was Philip II. In fact, the practice of hailing the Roman emperor as *Neos Helios* was more widespread and is epigraphically attested for Caligula, Nero, Hadrian, Septimius Severus, Caracalla, Gordian III, Philip II, and an emperor whose name has been lost. The notion of the “dawn” of a new era brought by a “new” sun, the emperor, thus reaches back to the first century AD. There is no suggestion that the emperor is Sol, or even that Sol is somehow involved. All we have here is a vivid verbal metaphor. Such metaphors are clear and easily understood, but very difficult to translate from the verbal to the visual. There is hence no reason to assume that the fact that Gordian III was hailed as *neos Helios* in Ephesos has any relevance for our understanding of either the Roman or the provincial coins depicting Sol that Berrens discusses. Even weaker is the literary evidence he quotes, a passage from the notoriously unreliable *Historia Augusta*. The text simply states that there was a very dark eclipse of the sun, a portent that the reign of Gordian would not last long, but Berrens feels that this “Konkret auf eine Verbindung der Herrschaft des Gordian mit dem Sonnenkult deutet”. In fact, of course, reading a solar eclipse as a bad omen is not necessarily an indication of solar cult at all.

In short, Berrens’ interpretation of the Sol-coinage under Gordian III cannot carry conviction as it is built on quicksand. Closer analysis of the coinage involved, focusing on date, location, denomination, context, and intended audience is needed and may help, but that alone is not enough. A more fundamental problem are the unspoken assumptions that underlie Berrens’ analysis. He assumes that the image types [sol] on Roman coins denote the sun god and indicate a predilection for solar cult on the part of the issuing authority. Both assumptions are by no means a given. Time and again in our discussion of the image types [sol] in their varying contexts we have seen that the cosmic rather than the theic aspects of the sun take priority and that connections between the images and solar cult are tenuous at best. Depictions of the image type [sol] can be directly related to the cult of Sol, but that is the exception rather than the rule. Berrens’ fundamental equation [Sol-image = Sun god = Cult of Sol], though not impossible, is therefore not the most likely equation when set in the context of non-numismatic solar imagery in the Roman Empire. Preferable would be a basic analysis along roughly the following lines:

1. Image type [sol] \(\rightarrow\) range of potential visual meanings in the symbolic, cosmic, and/or religious spheres.
2. Context \(^{409}\) of the specific image type [sol] \(\rightarrow\) information narrowing down the range of potential visual meanings and elaboration of the particular visual meanings the specific image is meant to evoke.
3. General minting policies and practices \(\rightarrow\) information further limiting the range of

---

\(^{405}\) Berrens 2004, 64.

\(^{406}\) Tantillo 2003a, 162-3 n.13.

\(^{407}\) Against the pervasive but untenable notion that Nero attempted to set himself up as some sort of “solar monarch” cf. Moormann 1998; Griffin (2000, 215-6).

\(^{408}\) HA Gord. XXIII.2, Berrens 2004, 64.

\(^{409}\) The term is used loosely. Pertinent context can range from coins issued in the same series to monuments or events evoked by the coin, not to mention previous, comparable images and the like.
To manage such an analysis is - to put it mildly - a tall order. It would be clearly unreasonable to fault Berrens for not doing so. But the fact that a sound analysis of the numismatic evidence is at present still too massive an undertaking for a single study by a single scholar cannot serve to justify an analysis that is fundamentally unsound. Berrens has done us a great service in bringing together such a significant amount of numismatic evidence for the image type [sol]. Unfortunately the fundamental methodological flaws in his analyses of those images means that his interpretations do not shed new light on sol, but simply add to the confusion that already permeates modern scholarship on the Roman sun.

Concluding Remarks

The old paradigm for the history and development of the cult of Sol in Rome and the Roman Empire is untenable in light of the extensive archaeological, iconographic, epigraphic, numismatic, and literary evidence that documents the continuous presence in Rome of the sun-god from as far back in history as we can trace Roman religion at all. As we have seen, literary sources place Sol (and Luna) among the gods introduced by Tatius; Sol was already portrayed on one of the earliest coins minted by Rome and he continued to appear on Roman state coins for the next 500 years - sporadically until the late second century AD, and almost annually, often with multiple issues in one year, from the reign of Commodus until the reign of Constantine.

---

410 Varro, L 5,74..

411 An Uncia minted between 217 and 215 BC (L1.1). Various comparable coins were minted outside Rome in this period, and there is some discussion whether this coin was minted by Rome itself, or elsewhere under Roman jurisdiction. Cf. Thomson 1961, II, 229-231; Crawford 1974, 150 39/5.

412 This presence of Sol on Roman Imperial coins is itself sufficient evidence of the fact that Sol was not deemed to be “foreign” or Syrian. The Romans adopted many deities of non-Roman origin of course, and many gained a significant degree of popularity (Isis and Sarapis, Jupiter Dolichenus, and Mithras are ranked among the 14 deities most mentioned in Latin inscriptions; cf. MacMullen 1981, 5-7). However, these non-Roman deities were rarely - if ever - depicted on official, imperial Roman coins. Sol, by contrast, is depicted on well over 1500 issues, summarized in L1 and L2. During the Republic and the earlier period of the Empire, emissions were sporadic, but from Commodus to Constantine all emperors minted at least some coins depicting Sol, with the exception of the five who ruled briefly between 249 and 253 (Trajanus Decius, Herennius Etruscus, Trebonianus Gallus, Volusianus, and Aemilianus). Clearly, the image of Sol was well established on Roman coins long before the arrival of Elagabalus and never disappeared after his death. It is impossible to maintain that his cult was somehow reintroduced by Aurelian, given the fact that he has a very significant presence in the coinage of, inter alia, Gordian III (238-242, annual emissions), Gallienus (253-268, probably annually, often multiple emissions per year), and Claudius Gothicus (268-270). The number of emissions under Aurelian is strikingly high, but the coin types themselves are by no means unprecedented. Following his reign, the number of issues is quite uneven; high under Florianus (276), Probus (276-282), Numerianus (283-284), Maximinus Daia (305-313) and to a lesser extent Galerius Maximianus (293-311), but insignificant under Tacitus (275-6), Carinus (282), Carus (282-3), Diocletian (284-305), Maximianus Herculius (286-305), Constantius Chlorus (293-306) and Severus II (305-307). Constantine, finally, minted very significant numbers of coins until about 317, after which the number of emissions declines drastically until, ca. 323,
art the iconography of the Roman Sol was firmly established well before the destruction of Pompeii, and includes such early identifiably Roman examples as the Calenian ware produced almost three centuries before; the iconography remained essentially unchanged in subsequent centuries; likewise in inscriptions Sol occurs regularly through the centuries, without any break or hiatus, nor with any indication of a sudden or radical change in his nature; there is evidence for the continuous presence of temples or shrines of Sol in Rome from the mid Republic to the fourth century AD. It is therefore obvious that we cannot take any arguments or theories about Sol that are grounded in the old paradigm at face value.

Meanings
The most important conclusion to emerge at this point of our study is the clear confirmation of a principle we affirmed in chapter 2:

\[
\neq SOL \neq \text{Sun god}
\]

The anthropomorph nature of the image type \([\text{sol}]\) is clearly a matter of convention and in no way iconic. This was the way one depicted the sun in Roman art, but it does not reflect the way Romans imagined the sun to be. Indeed, so fixed was this convention that Jews and Christians also availed themselves of the anthropomorph image types \([\text{sol}]\) to depict the sun. Such usage constitutes unequivocal evidence that the image type \([\text{sol}]\) cannot be equated with the Sun god, and this is confirmed by its general usage as illustrated and discussed in this catalogue. The Sun god as the object of religious cult is but one of a range of possible meanings for the image type, and not a very common one.

The large majority of the images here appear to deploy the image types \([\text{sol}]\) in more abstract or conventionalized ways. In semiotic terms the image types are indexical or even symbolic signs, rather than iconic ones. They evoke concepts derived from \text{sol} or even arbitrarily attached to the image types but unconnected with \text{sol}. One such concept is that of cosmic stability and permanence, generally evoked by pairing an image type \([\text{sol}]\) with an image type Luna. I have posited the possibility that the image type \([\text{sol}]\) was also used to evoke the Roman Empire as the earthly counterpart of cosmic stability in the sense of peace and order. This latter suggestion is as yet tentative and requires further analysis, as do other such meanings that I have tentatively proposed for the image types \([\text{sol}]\), but what is clear is that the concepts evoked by these image types were not necessarily synonymous with the Latin word \text{Sol}. Certainly the image types cannot be equated with it.

This means that the deployment of image types \([\text{sol}]\) can evoke visual meanings that we do not correctly translate into words if we use \text{Sun god} for the image. And if that is the case with the image types \([\text{sol}]\), it is even more so with elements of the image types. An image borrowing elements of the iconography of the image type \([\text{sol}]\) does not necessarily assimilate the figure to the last Roman coin of Sol was minted.
the Sun god Sol, but attaches elements of the visual meanings of the image type [sol]. We have not explored hybrid images to any great degree in the catalogue, but I stress this point here as it follows methodologically from the basic conclusion outlined above. If borrowing visual elements from the iconography of the image type [sol] automatically assimilates a figure to Sol, then the image type [sol] must equal Sol, which is not the case. Consequently, iconographic borrowings from the image type [sol] carry connotations associated with the visual meanings of that image type, not the verbal meanings of Sol, far less Sun god. They may associate the borrowing image with Rome’s solar deity, but normally one should assume that the visual meanings of the image type [sol] in the cosmic-symbolic range, and the like, are the ones being transferred.

Part of the issue is the nature of Sol. We tend to equate Sol with sun god, Sonnengott, dieu Solaire and the like. The Romans too regularly spoke of deus Sol, but that does not mean that they conceptualized Sol as an anthropomorph god on a chariot. This mythical image was part of their heritage - ancient, by the end of the Republic - but not of their contemporary understanding. The deployment of the anthropomorph image as symbol rather than as actor, which emerged again and again as a characteristic of the representations reviewed in our catalogue, clearly demonstrates this. Indeed, when Sol is depicted as an actor - almost invariably in myths - his iconography changes and the context is not religious but one of culture or paideia. When it came to the sun itself, the Romans thought of it as a cosmic body, of a higher order and hence divine, with powerful symbolic potential, regularly exploited. Of course the sun had a long tradition of cult in Rome, which was scrupulously maintained - consonant with the Romans’ powerful pride in their religio - but Roman cults did not define their deities. Knowledge of the divine was attained through philosophy, not ritual. Ritual, hallowed by tradition, constructed identity and the associated order and served as a conduit for experiencing the ineffable of the divine, but was not a matter of faith in or knowledge of the gods.

An anecdote may clarify this. At an ecumenical conference in Rome, around the time of the second Vatican Council, the participant representatives of the various churches alternated their discussions with visits to early Christian sites in the city. One such site was the Mamertine prison, where a spring of fresh water is said to have appeared miraculously so that St. Peter could baptize his guards whom he had converted during his imprisonment. A small pool still marks the spot of that miracle today, and nearby a pillar is displayed to which, it is claimed, St Peter had been chained. It so happened that on this visit the representative of one of the Orthodox churches was the first to enter. He immediately dipped his hand in the pool, made a sign of the cross, and kissed the column. A Protestant delegate, who was next in line, somewhat hesitantly followed his example, after which the other scholars and delegates also, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, dipped their hands in the miraculous pool, made a sign of the cross, and kissed the sacred column. Later, the Orthodox professor who had led the way in this ritual, reflected on what they had done. He recognized the clearly apparent hesitation and self-consciousness he had witnessed as doubt about the veracity of the legend. Had a spring really appeared miraculously on this spot? Was there really any evidence at all that St. Peter had been chained to that very column? Surely not! He then chided the doubters for completely missing the point. The sacredness of that spot did not depend on the literal truth of those legends, but arose from the fact that for sixteen centuries or more Christian pilgrims had visited it to connect with and reflect on their Christian roots. What made the Mamertine prison important to Christians was, in his view,
the fact that it connected them across centuries and borders.413

If Roman ritual did not define the deity and was itself defined (and hallowed) by tradition
and practice rather than religious dogma and theology, it becomes easier to understand how the
sun, in the Roman world, could evoke such a wide array of connotations, ranging from cosmic
symbol used as emblem or metaphor to divine power and object of cult. Many of these
connotations or meanings of both the image type [sol] and the Latin word sol are obscured if we
use the term Sun god for sol because they fall outside the scope of what we consider to be divine.
This does not mean that the Romans felt the same degree of contradiction. Indeed, one could
equally well assume that the complex nature of Sol sheds an interesting light on Roman concepts
of divinity. Certainly the range of meanings associated with the image type [sol] or the Latin
word sol is such that we will have to look closely at what we mean with god (and the Romans
meant with deus) in the context of sol before we can safely speak of him as the sun god. A few
first steps have been taken here, but further research is needed.

Thus the image type [sol] and the Latin word sol are not synonymous as a matter of
principle; visual meanings and verbal meanings cannot coincide. Furthermore, neither the Roman
image type nor the Latin word can be readily rendered as Sun god in modern English. This is not
just a matter of principle but also one of culture. Our notions of divinity - however diffuse and
varied - differ fundamentally from those of the Romans. We must move away from the term Sun
god both for the image type [sol] and the word sol. A new definition is needed. A significant
portion of the evidence for the (re)definition of the nature of sun in Roman consciousness will
have to come from close analysis of the pertinent imagery. The discussion of the images
presented in this section of the present study is a first step toward such analyses.

Chronology
The chronology of the images presented in this catalogue has not played a major role in the
discussions above. In part this is because for many of the objects, simply establishing a reliable
date is still a major problem, especially in view of a tendency to give later rather than earlier
dates to depictions of Sol on the assumption that the sun god was a latecomer in Roman imperial
religion. Accepting such dates uncritically obviously gives rise to circular arguments with regards
to the chronology of usage of the image types [sol]. Evaluating shifts in iconography, usage and
meanings of these image types thus depends in part upon improving the accuracy of the dating
and requires a closer analysis than we can offer in this preliminary study.

That does not preclude us from formulating certain general conclusions at this point. In
the first place it is clear that the anthropomorph image types [sol] were derived from Greek and
Etruscan predecessors and were routinely deployed in the Roman world from at least the mid
Republican era (earliest Roman coinage, Calenian ware) until the early Middle Ages (Central
Greek lamps, Visigoth art in Spain). Naturally the visual meanings and connotations of these
image types changed and evolved in the course of those eight centuries or so, but so far our
analyses of specific groups and images have been too tentative and preliminary to shed light on
these shifts or to take them fully into account. As we study the various categories of images more
closely, chronology will have a greater role to play.

413 I have this story from the late Josefa Koet VvB, of the Foyer Unitas in Rome.
In the second place it is apparent that we cannot base our chronologies on one particular group of material, such as coins or terracotta lamps, if our aim is to extrapolate broad conclusions about the rise and decline of popularity of the image types [sol] in general. This is particularly the case with Roman imperial coins, as there is absolutely no correlation between the depiction of the image types [sol] on imperial coins and the use of these image types in general in Rome and the Empire. In the case of Roman coins we find that after a scattering of issues during the Republic depicting Sol, the image type all but disappears between the end of the first century BC and the end of the second century AD. In marked contrast, significant numbers of accurately dated lamps of the first and second centuries AD depict Sol, as do many glass pastes and engraved gems of that period, clearly showing that the absence of Sol on imperial coins does not mirror an absence of Sol from Roman life in general. This is further indicated by the substantial numbers of reliefs and other images as well as inscriptions that can be dated to the first and second centuries AD. Consequently the virtual absence of Sol from imperial coinage in this period is the result of the manner in which coin-imagery was chosen, and demonstrates that we may not correlate the popularity of a figure on Roman coins with popularity of that figure in Rome.

Why Sol was largely absent from Roman coins in the first and second centuries AD is difficult to say, but various factors may have been at play. One factor could be class. In the next chapter we shall see that what little we know of the Roman cult of Sol in the first and second centuries AD suggests that it was a lower class cult, and that it was only in the third century AD that we find priests of Sol in the senatorial class. A second factor may have been that issues of continuity and empire that were later addressed by the image of Sol were visualized in a different way in the earlier part of the Empire. One can think of the importance of imperial cult, and of symbolic figures such as Aeternitas (who is depicted with the heads of Sol and Luna on Flavian and early Antonine coins). Personal preference of the emperor could certainly play a role, as the coinage of Aurelian illustrates, but was not necessarily a factor. We should be very skeptical of any attempt to determine the religious preferences of an emperor on the basis of coin imagery alone.

**Iconography**

In general, the iconographic rules for the image types [sol] were carefully adhered to in the depictions gathered in this catalogue. The main exception are the depictions of Sol in mythological scenes, where Sol is depicted much more loosely, as active participant in the scene. As grieving father after the fall of Phaethon, for instance, Sol can be depicted seated, nude, holding his head in his hand, and without even a single of the standard attributes of the image types [sol]. This indicates a degree of correlation between iconography and meaning, though not necessarily an intentional one. The iconographic differences may simply have been the inevitable result of the differences in meaning between the mythological Sol and the image types [sol]. We have, however, also found some evidence for differentiation of meaning between the three basic image types. On intaglios, as we have seen, the full-length figure of Sol is far more likely to be depicted in mirror image (i.e. for use as seal) than Sol driving a chariot. This shows a
different pattern of usage which extends beyond glyptic art only. Both the image type [sol] as bust and as charioteer can be found routinely as “framing” figure, but this is rarely the case with the full-length, standing Sol. This suggests that the three basic image types [sol] were not wholly interchangeable, but carried with them different connotations and shades of meaning, further indication of just how detailed and intricate visual conventions could be in Roman art. What those different flavours of meaning were is at this point still hard to say. Perhaps the bust tended to be used more for symbolic imagery, the charioteer referred more to the cyclical and cosmic aspects of the sun (obviously closely related to the symbolic) while the standing figure presented the sun more as a divine power. This would allow for a significant degree of overlap between the use of the bust and the charioteer as images, while setting the standing figure more apart, and this appears to be what we actually see happening, but further research is needed to establish how strong and significant these differences were and how well they were maintained. What is clear, however, is that we should be careful not to presume that the three basic image types [sol] had identical force of meaning and that it was simply the whim of the artist or the available space in the art work that determined which image type was used.

**Beginnings**

This presentation of images of Sol, and the accompanying preliminary analysis of the various image groups, has provided the material and paved the way for new approaches to the study of Roman attitudes towards the sun. The following chapters offer a closer analysis of certain disparate topics relevant to Sol and issues pertinent to his cult, iconography, and potential meanings. They are not intended to give a balanced, rounded picture of the Roman sun, but serve as case studies illustrating some of the types of research that can fruitfully build on the material presented and discussed here.