



Universiteit  
Leiden

The Netherlands

## **Moving statues: the agency and impact of Greek statuary in the city of Rome**

Velde, S.M. van de

### **Citation**

Velde, S. M. van de. (2023, December 19). *Moving statues: the agency and impact of Greek statuary in the city of Rome*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3674679>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3674679>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

---

# MOVING STATUES



THE AGENCY AND IMPACT OF GREEK STATUARY  
IN THE CITY OF ROME

---

Suzan M. van de Velde



Moving Statues  
The Agency and Impact of Greek Statuary in the City of Rome

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl,  
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties  
te verdedigen op dinsdag 19 december 2023  
klokke 13.45 uur  
door  
Suzan Melanie van de Velde  
geboren te Rotterdam  
in 1991

Promotores: Prof. dr. M.J. Versluys  
Prof. dr. E.M. Moormann

Promotiecommissie: Prof. dr. J.C.A. Kolen (voorzitter)  
Prof. dr. P.J. ter Keurs (secretaris, Universiteit Leiden)  
Dr. J. Fejfer (University of Copenhagen)  
Prof. dr. C. Vout (University of Cambridge/Universiteit Leiden)  
Prof. dr. S.P.M. Bussels (Universiteit Leiden)

This PhD research was conducted within the framework of Anchoring Innovation, the Gravitation Grant research agenda of the Dutch National Research School in Classical Studies, OIKOS. It is financially supported by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (NWO project number 024.003.012). For more information about the research programme and its results, see the website [www.anchoringinnovation.nl](http://www.anchoringinnovation.nl).

Provided by thesis specialist Ridderprint, [ridderprint.nl](http://ridderprint.nl)

Printing: Ridderprint

Cover: Drawing of the Theseus/Apollo of the Amazonomachy by Suzan van de Velde.

Layout: Timo Wolf Kamp, [persoonlijkproefschrift.nl](http://persoonlijkproefschrift.nl)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

As my PhD journey almost comes to its conclusion, I reflect on five years that on the one hand feel like an eternity and on the other have flown by. The statues at the centre of this dissertation, and the years I have spent researching them, have deeply affected and shaped me. I look back on a truly transformative period in my life that at times was challenging, but mostly a tremendous adventure and a great joy.

First and foremost I want to express my gratitude to my promotor Miguel John Versluys for his unfailing enthusiasm, guidance and confidence ever since that first thesis meeting under the obelisk in Rome many years ago. I could not and would not have written this dissertation without his thought-provoking ideas, critical feedback and our many inspiring discussions. Furthermore, I wish to thank my second promotor, Eric Moormann who has been extremely generous with his time, knowledge and feedback. I look back fondly at our many conversations on Rome, sculpture, and academia. Both of them have been better and more committed supervisors than I could have ever wished for.

My PhD research was conducted as part of the gravitation programme Anchoring Innovation, to which I am greatly indebted. My research benefitted much from the opportunities and the interdisciplinary, academic environment this project has provided. I would like to thank the many members of the team for their input and ideas, in particular the directors Ineke Sluiter and André Lardinois and coordinator Suzanne van de Liefvoort.

At the Faculty of Archaeology, I have been fortunate to have been part of a close-knit research group with many members over the years: Eleni Fragaki, Stefan Riedel, Sander Muskens, Cécile Harlaut, Rebecca Henzel, Merlijn Veltman, Nicky Schreuder and Rishika Dhumal. I am grateful to Marike van Aerde for her kindness and support throughout my PhD years. A special thank you is in order for Lennart Kruijer with whom I have shared not only an office but also the many highs and lows of the PhD adventure; thank you for being the most critical, supportive and fun colleague. Our discussions have always inspired and lifted up my work, and I look forward to future collaborations and drinks.

Over the years, I have had the pleasure of meeting and working together with many amazing colleagues at Leiden University and far beyond, who have supported me and inspired my ideas and parts of my research. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Maarten van Deventer, Annemarieke Willemsen, Paul Meyboom, Josephine Say, Anouk Everts, Roderick Geerts, Michael McGabe III, Ana Maspoli, Sam Heijnen, Sven Betjes, Mirte Liebregts, Dennis Jussen, Ketty Iannantuono, Glyn Mijtjens, Luuk Huitink, Michael Kerschner, Koen Ottenheym, Rens Tacoma, Irene de Jong, Jeremiah Pelgrom, Olivier Hekster, Stijn Bussels, Gianfranco Adornato, Nathalie de Haan, Martijn Eickhoff, and Caroline Vout. Special thanks to Ruurd Halbertsma for his input and support in the early phases of my PhD, and to Caroline van Eck and Pieter ter Keurs whose work and ideas have always greatly motivated my research. Furthermore, I thank Fedor van Rijn for correcting my English in this dissertation.

This research could not have been executed without the generous support and the facilities of the Royal Netherlands Institute in Rome (KNIR) that has allowed me to spend many months of my PhD in the libraries and museums of Rome. I am very grateful to the entire KNIR-community and staff, in particular to Agnieszka Konkol, Fernando Maggi, Janet Mente, Angelo Coccarelli, Asker Pelgrom, Arnold Witte, Harald Hendrix and Tesse Stek. A part of my research travels to Italy has been made possible by a grant from the Prof. A.W. Byvanck Fund (LUF), and the NIA has granted me a short research stay in Athens.

In the final year of my PhD, I was fortunate to spend some time at the Saxo Institute at the University of Copenhagen. I am beyond grateful to Jane Fejfer for welcoming me so warmly, for her valuable input in my research and for sharing her extensive knowledge of Roman sculpture with me. I also wish to thank Gabriella Cirucci for her very kind hospitality and our stimulating discussions on Greek originals. Tim Flohr Sørensen, Jan Stubbe Østergaard and Rune Frederiksen have all kindly made time to discuss various parts of my research with me.

I would not have been able to finish this dissertation without the support and much-needed distractions provided by my friends and family. I am very thankful for the best paranympths and friends one can have: Bibi Beekman and Svenja Kerkhof, who have been there for me through thick and thin since our early student days and throughout all the many adventures that followed. Furthermore, I want to thank Willem Baetsen, Vivian van Heekeren, Sam Botan, Kirsten Grothe and Lara Wegdam for their long-lasting friendship, their encouragement, and for sticking around even though I was very preoccupied with my dissertation at times. Special thanks to Leanne Jansen for

her much-appreciated feedback and classicist perspective, to Mink van IJzendoorn for always being there and for his invaluable support, especially in the challenging final phase of my PhD journey, and to my feathered friend Martini. Finally and above all, I would like to thank my parents, Anja and Theo van de Velde; words can not do justice to the unconditional love and support you give me. You have been my role models in many ways and I wish to thank you for showing me the world, sparking my curiosity and encouraging me to always follow my wildest dreams.





*“The objects, as it happens, are not new, but they are radical, which is to say that they appear literally and figuratively at the root level of the civilization that unearths them and provide a fundamental alternative that must be encountered.”*

Leonard Barkan 1999, xxi

*“So schritt das Alte einher, verkleidet als das Neue, aber in seinem Triumphzug führte es das Neue mit sich und es wurde vorgeführt als das Alte”*

Bertolt Brecht 1939 (Parade des alten Neuen)

*“For just as every actor makes his entrance as one character at one time and at another as another, so likewise your statues assume different roles at different times and stand almost as if they were acting a part. For instance, one and the same statue, they say, is at one time a Greek, at another time a Roman, and later on, if it so happens, a Macedonian or a Persian.”*

Dio Chrysostom 31.155



## Table of Contents

<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION</b>	17
<b>1.1 GREEK STATUES, ROMAN WORLD?</b>	19
1.1.1 Setting the scene: The Roman Republic in the Greek world	20
1.1.2 Rome during the Roman conquests	22
1.1.3 The problem with 'Greek'	25
<b>1.2 STATUS QUAESTIONIS: Greek statues in Rome from 'illustrations' to 'instigators'</b>	28
1.2.1 Previous research on Greek statuary in Rome	28
1.2.2 Recent approaches to 'objects in motion' in the Roman world	35
<b>1.3 RESEARCH AIM AND SET-UP</b>	39
1.3.1 Objectives and outline of the research	40
1.3.2 Scope and challenges of the research	42
<b>CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b>	47
<b>2.1 INTRODUCTION</b>	47
<b>2.2 (A-)SYMMETRICAL ARCHAEOLOGY?</b>	48
2.2.1 Turning towards things: symmetrical archaeology and new materialism	49
<b>2.3 MOVING STATUES: AGENCY AND AFFECTIVE OBJECTS</b>	54
2.3.1 The affective capacities of statues	57
2.3.1.1 <i>Affect, encounters, and intra-action</i>	58
2.3.1.2 <i>Affect as a potential and a force</i>	60
2.3.1.3 <i>Affect and representationalism</i>	61
<b>2.4 MOVING STATUES: OBJECTS IN MOTION</b>	62
2.4.1 Biographies and itineraries	63
2.4.2 Methodology: object biographies of moving statues	67
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
<b>BEFORE THE TRIUMPH: STATUES IN MOTION IN THE HELLENISTIC MEDITERRANEAN</b>	71
<b>3.1 MOVING STATUARY IN THE 'GREEK' WORLD</b>	72
3.1.1 Reorganizing statuary in Roman Greece	74
3.1.2 To Rome	79
<b>3.2 STATUES IN THE 'OBJECTSCAPE' OF REPUBLICAN ROME</b>	80
3.2.1 The statuary of early Republican Rome	81
3.2.2 From the outside in: the Roman triumph and the introduction of Greek statues	85
3.2.2.1 <i>The affective triumph</i>	88
3.2.3 After the triumph: two examples of the impact of spoils on Rome	90
3.2.3.1 <i>The spoils of Syracuse and the temple of Honos and Virtus</i>	91
3.2.3.2 <i>Roman architecture and the impact of triumph</i>	94

<b>CHAPTER 4 THE CAPITOLINE HORSE</b>	99
<b>4.1 THE OBJECT</b>	99
<b>4.2 GREEK PHASE</b>	102
4.2.1 Introduction	102
4.2.2 The equine in Greek art	104
<b>4.3 ROMAN PHASE</b>	109
4.3.1 Equestrian statues in Rome	110
4.3.2 Grooming the Horse: reuse and reworking	115
4.3.3 A branded horse in a herd of statues: Roman object inventories and inventory numbers	121
4.3.3.1 <i>Greek statues and the necessity for order</i>	121
4.3.3.2 <i>The numbered horse</i>	125
4.3.3.3 <i>'Listenwissenschaft' and the impact of inventories</i>	128
4.3.3.4 <i>Engraving numbers</i>	129
4.3.4 A Greek original in late antiquity	131
<b>4.4 MODERN PHASE</b>	134
4.4.1 The horse in the alley	134
<b>4.5 CONCLUSION</b>	137
<b>CHAPTER 5 THE LUDOVISI ACROLITH</b>	141
<b>5.1 THE OBJECT</b>	141
<b>5.2 GREEK PHASE</b>	142
5.2.1 Introduction	142
5.2.2 Acroliths in the Greek world	143
<b>5.3 ROMAN PHASE</b>	147
5.3.1 The cult of Venus Erycina in Rome	147
5.3.2 Transferring statues, transferring cults	148
5.3.3 Acroliths in the Roman world	151
<b>5.4 MODERN PHASE</b>	155
5.4.1 Introduction	155
5.4.2 Museo Boncompagni Ludovisi	156
5.4.3 The Ludovisi collection in the Museo Nazionale Romano	161
<b>5.5 CONCLUSION</b>	164

<b>CHAPTER 6 THE AMAZONOMACHY</b>	169
<b>6.1 THE OBJECTS</b>	169
<b>6.2 GREEK PHASE</b>	174
6.2.1 Introduction	174
6.2.2 A quest for provenance	174
6.2.3 The Amazonomachy: a classical pediment group	180
6.2.3.1 <i>Metal attachments</i>	181
6.2.3.2 <i>The impact of a pediment</i>	182
6.2.3.3 <i>The Amazonomachy in context: pediments of the Greek world</i>	185
<b>6.3 ROMAN PHASE</b>	191
6.3.1 The Temple of Apollo Sosianus	191
6.3.1.1 <i>Description of architecture and exterior</i>	193
6.3.1.2 <i>The sculptural programme of the temple</i>	194
6.3.1.3 <i>Ad Circum Flaminium</i>	198
6.3.2 Becoming Roman	204
6.3.2.1 <i>Roman pediment sculpture</i>	204
6.3.2.2 <i>From pediment to pediment?</i>	210
6.3.2.3 <i>Restoring, reassembling, reappropriating</i>	213
6.3.2.4 <i>The Amazonomachy in an Augustan context</i>	217
<b>6.4 MODERN PHASE</b>	220
6.4.1 Excavations	220
6.4.2 Amazonomachia: the 1985 exhibition and Centrale Montemartini	223
<b>6.5 CONCLUSION</b>	226

<b>CHAPTER 7 THE HORTI SALLUSTIANI NIOBIDS</b>	229
<b>7.1 THE OBJECTS</b>	229
<b>7.2 GREEK PHASE</b>	233
7.2.1 Introduction	233
7.2.2 The Niobids in the Greek world	235
7.2.2.1 <i>Niobids and Niobe in Greek literature and art</i>	236
7.2.2.2 <i>Material and metal attachments</i>	239
7.2.3 Niobids and the classical style	242
7.2.4 To Rome: transfer and transformation	248
<b>7.3 ROMAN PHASE</b>	251
7.3.1 The Horti Sallustiani	251
7.3.1.1 <i>The sculptures of the Horti Sallustiani</i>	253
7.3.1.2 <i>Horti and the viewer</i>	257
7.3.2 A 'Roman' Myth	260
7.3.2.1 <i>Niobe, Augustus, and Ovid</i>	260
7.3.2.2 <i>Roman Niobid sculpture</i>	265
7.3.3 Staging the Niobids	279
<b>7.4 MODERN PHASE</b>	282
7.4.1 The Niobids in the twentieth century	282
7.4.2 The Niobid war	284
<b>7.5 CONCLUSION</b>	292
<b>CHAPTER 8</b>	
<b>MOVING STATUES AND THE PROCESS OF ANCHORING: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS</b>	295
<b>8.1 OBJECT BIOGRAPHIES: A critical trans-historical comparison</b>	295
<b>8.2 THE SHOCK OF THE OLD AND THE NEW</b>	300
<b>8.3 RESEARCH OUTLOOK: From statues as innovators to cultural innovation?</b>	306
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	313
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE</b>	341
<b>DUTCH SUMMARY – NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING</b>	343





