

NADEŽDA GAVRILOVIĆ VITAS, Institute of Archaeology, Belgrade

## MONUMENTAL ALTAR FROM SINGIDUNUM WITH SCENES OF A SACRIFICIAL PROCESSION – *POMPA ET IMMOLATIO*

e-mail: nadia011@yahoo.com

*Abstract.* – A monumental altar was found in the very centre of Belgrade, ancient Singidunum, in 1932, with iconographic scenes of the sacrificial procession for a ritual animal sacrifice – immolatio. The scenes depict the procession of sacrificial animals to the altar known as pompa, by the victimarii, but also represent priests of a lower rank (flamines minores), with ritual utensils like a wine-pitcher, patera and acerra, used for the ritus of purification which precedes the sacrifice and for ritual acts during the sacrifice. The altar from Singidunum represents a unique monument with the described iconography in the territory of Moesia Superior and it has only been published in catalogue form to date, never fully analysed or interpreted. Through the analysis of its iconography, typology, function, geographically closest analogies and possible context of its finding, new conclusions regarding the praxis of public ritual sacrifice are brought to light related to the period from the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century to the first decades of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century in Singidunum, one of the main centres of Moesia Superior.

*Key words.* – Monumental altar, Singidunum, sacrificial procession, animal sacrifice, tutulati

### History and topography of the find

In 1932, during construction works in the centre of Belgrade,<sup>1</sup> which was also the centre of antique Singidunum, an imposing Roman monument was found (Fig. 1, 7).<sup>2</sup> The exact place of its finding was very near the presumed Roman forum, where votive monuments dedicated mostly to the supreme Roman god Jupiter, were found. It was immediately transferred to the National Museum in Belgrade and, today, it is situated in the *lapidarium* of the museum.<sup>3</sup>

### Architectural scheme of the monument

The altar is cuboid and its dimensions are: height 1.20 m, width 1.18 m and depth 0.73 m. Originally, it probably had a base and crowning elements on the top. On three sides of the altar, scenes with different iconography are presented, while the fourth side is badly damaged. However, it can be recognised that there was an inscription on it, since there are traces of an inscription frame and ornaments. The monument is

made of a white coarse-grained marble and the upper and lower parts of the altar's sides are damaged in such a way that in some areas small parts of the altar are even missing. The upper surface of the monument

<sup>1</sup> The monument was found on the corner of Uskočka and Delijska Street (on the depth of 2 m), where other Roman monuments have also been found. It can be presumed, judging by the find spot of the altar, that a temple dedicated to a specific Roman deity (in our opinion most probably to god Jupiter or Capitoline triad) was built there or in the vicinity, Вулић 1933, 5–8, no. 3; Петровић 1933, 313–317, fig. 1–6; Гарашанин 1954, 73–74, fig. 51, 51a, 51b; Нинковић 2018, 4; Нинковић 2019, 161, n. 146, Pl. XLVII, 146a–c.

<sup>2</sup> In the previous bibliography, the altar was defined also just simply as a monument in the shape of a cube. However, it is very clear that not only by the dimensions, which are typical for an altar, but also by the typology of the monument, the monument found on the corner of Uskočka and Delijska Street is an altar, Вулић 1933, 5–8, no. 3; Петровић 1933, 313–317, fig. 1–6.

<sup>3</sup> The altar is today situated in the *lapidarium* of the National Museum in Belgrade, inv. no. 22\_128.



Figs. 1 and 2. Roman funerary altar from Singidunum (photo documentation of the National Museum in Belgrade)

Сл. 1 и 2. Римски фунерарни олтјар из Синјидунума (фото-документација Народној музеја у Београду)

is intact and without any holes or sockets.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, the inscription of the altar is unrecognisable, so we cannot even presume its content and there are no other elements on which we could judge with any certainty the function of the monument (whether it was of a votive or funerary nature).<sup>5</sup>

#### Iconography: description

The most interesting iconographical scenes presented on three sides of the monument show very important and significant elements of the sacrificial procession and the *ritus* of animal sacrifice in Roman Singidunum. The iconographical scenes (presented in fields 1.13 m high) on three sides of the monument have a double frame (its height is 7 cm), made of a narrow fillet and kyma. On the fourth side of the monument, where the inscription was, the surface of the inscription field, the inscription itself and its frame with vegetal decoration are damaged to the point of being unrecognisable (at the bottom of this side of the monument, a part of the frame for the inscription is visible).

The side of the monument where the inscription was represents one of the two wider sides. The rear of the monument contains a figural scene with two male standing figures (0.75 m high). Both figures are standing on rectangular bases, facing the viewer frontally (Fig. 2).<sup>6</sup> There are two laurel garlands above the head

of each man bound with a ribbon in the middle and on the corners of the interior of the frame of the scene. Both men are wearing a belted tunic with sandals on their feet and ribbons for lacing caps around their necks. The male figure on the left is holding a jug in his right hand and a *patera* in his left hand and there is a cloth like object over his left shoulder. The male fig-

<sup>4</sup> Kleiner 1987, 31. Votive and funerary altars can be mutually distinguished by the fact that the surface of funerary monuments is usually without any holes or sockets. They can also be distinguished by their size, because in the Imperial period funerary altars were usually between 1 m and 1.2 m high while votive altars were about 0.8 m high. Also, this monument may have had crowning elements with cornices, Maršić 2013, 394–395.

<sup>5</sup> My sincere thankfulness goes to dr Gabrielle Kremer, prof. dr Martin Henig and prof. dr Bojan Đurić, for their valuable and constructive suggestions regarding the monument

<sup>6</sup> I would like to express my sincere gratitude to dear colleague museum counsellor Veselinka Ninković from the National Museum in Belgrade, and to the colleagues from the same institution, for allowing me to use the photographs from the photo documentation of the National Museum in Belgrade.

<sup>7</sup> J. Petrović thinks that perhaps the she-wolf suckling the two brothers, Romulus and Remus, is presented on *acerra* from the Singidunum monument, Петровић 1933, 315–316. Since the presentation is barely recognisable (it can be presumed that some large, four footed animal, with two figures beside and under it are presented), it can be presumed that analogous to other known figural presentations from *acerrae*, the scene could also depict a bull led by a *victimarius* and a *togatus*, Torelli 1992, 45.

ure to the right is holding in both of his hands an open *acerra* (a box for incense), with a figural composition representing a she-wolf with Romulus and Remus,<sup>7</sup> It looks as though both figures are wearing caps on their heads. Unfortunately, the details of the faces of both figures are not recognisable.

On the right, narrower side, a double frame made of a narrow fillet with an ivy tendril with leaves and clusters of berries encloses a representation of a male figure with a bull (Fig. 3). The man is standing behind the bull on a rectangular base. He is dressed in a short belted tunic, with sandals on his feet. He is leading the bull by a rope with his left hand, he has a cape over his left shoulder and in his right hand he is holding a long upraised axe. The details of the man's face are preserved and it can be seen that his face was very carefully modelled. He has short curly hair, oval eyes, a straight nose and small lips. Over the bull's back

there is a ritual ribbon known as a *dorsuale*. It seems as if there is a rope around the bull's neck (?), which was used for guiding him during the procession towards the sacrificial place. The head of the bull is turned to the viewer, while his body is presented in profile and, although his horns are not so clearly visible, there is an adornment represented between his horns. The same ornament in the shape of two laurel garlands, bound with ribbons in the middle and in the corners of the interior frame of the scene, can be seen above the whole scene.

On the left, narrower side, inside a double frame filled with vegetal ornaments as the ones in the previously described side of the cuboid, there is a scene of a man and a ram (Fig. 4). The inner frame of this side of the altar is filled with acanthus leaves. In the middle of this side of the altar, a male figure is standing behind a ram with his left hand on its left horn, while



Figs. 3 and 4. Roman funerary altar from Singidunum, left and right lateral side of the monument (photo documentation of the National Museum in Belgrade)

Сл. 3 и 4. Римски фунерарни олтaр из Синїдунума, лева и десна бочна сїрана сїоменика (фото-документација Народної музеја у Београду)



in his right hand he holds a sacrificial knife. The man is standing on a rectangular base, he is dressed in a short tunic and, unfortunately, his face is badly damaged and unrecognisable. The central part of the ram's back is decorated with the ritual *dorsuale* ribbon. Above the man with the ram, there is the same ornament in the shape of two laurel garlands bound with ribbons in the middle and in the corners of the interior frame of the scene.

### Interpretation

It is quite clear that the figural scenes shown on three sides of this significant monument present scenes of the sacrificial procession, known as *pompa*, which would precede an animal sacrifice, known as the *immolatio*. Animal sacrifice and its offering to the gods represented the central part of a Roman ritual. Although, in this monument, only some of the scenes from the sacrificial procession are presented, we are able to fully reconstruct and visualize what this sacrificial procession and the *ritus* of animal sacrificing looked like. However, it is first necessary to clearly identify the persons presented on the three sides of the Singidunum monument. We will begin with two male figures represented leading a bull and a ram on the two narrower sides of the altar. Both male figures were clearly sacrificial attendants, known as *victimarii*, who, during the animal sacrifice, had the task of leading the animal to the altar where it was killed, burnt and sacrificed. They were also responsible for controlling the sacrificial animals and their behaviour, and for the slaughter and post-sacrificial dissection of the animals.<sup>8</sup> On both sides of the monument, the sacrificial attendants are dressed in a short girded tunic, rather than in their usual dress, known as a *limus*, a kind of a kiltlike cloth, which covered only the lower part of their body, leaving them stripped to the waist (because of the practical reasons of not soiling their clothes with the animal's blood while killing the animal).<sup>9</sup> The *victimarius* who is leading the bull is presented with one of the main sacrificial weapons of the *victimarii* – the axe.<sup>10</sup> It was a sacrificial weapon for a large animal, like a bull or oxen, since it took not only a lot of physical strength to kill such a forceful animal, but also a very sharp weapon. There are around 17 scenes showing the moment of killing the bull, in which a *victimarius* is presented standing beside the animal holding the axe, ready to hit the bull on the head, while kneeling beside the animal's head there is another person shown, a *cultrarius*, who was a sacrifi-

cial assistant who held the knife (*culter*), ready to slit the bull's throat once the animal received the axe blow.<sup>11</sup> Because of the danger and dirtiness of their task, *victimarii* were usually people of very low social status, most often slaves or freedmen.<sup>12</sup> However, their role was a very important one, since they performed their sacrificial duties in three areas: on behalf of the state, on behalf of the Roman emperor and within the army. Also, their life was in constant danger, since they were responsible for controlling the animal, which could demonstrate different behaviour during the procession towards the sacrificial place or during the moments just before the sacrifice: the animal could either stumble or escape during the procession or even hurt the *victimarius*, as a result of being agitated.<sup>13</sup> Of course, on the relief and statuary representations of animal sacrifices from the Roman period, nothing of that can be seen, because the relief represents an ideal depiction of the sacrificial *ritus* and not the real situation during the sacrificial procession.

On the back of the bull who is led by *victimarius* on the Singidunum monument, there is a ritual ribbon known as a *dorsuale*.<sup>14</sup> This ritual ornament was usu-

<sup>8</sup> Lennon 2015, 65 (with further bibliography).

<sup>9</sup> I. S. Ryberg's definition of *limus* is that it was "an apron-like loincloth girt about the waist which regularly distinguished the attendants of sacrificial animals", Ryberg 1955, 21.

<sup>10</sup> Usual sacrificial weapons used by *victimarii* were an axe and a hammer. From around 56 sculptural reliefs and scenes of animal sacrifices on which a hammer or an axe are presented (dated from the 7<sup>th</sup> century BC to the 4<sup>th</sup> century A. D.), on 41 reliefs an axe is presented, while on 15 reliefs a hammer is depicted. On three monuments (Trajan's Column, the Arch of Beneventum and the Ince Blundell Hall relief), both sacrificial weapons are represented, but not in the same scene, Aldrete 2014, 32–33.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 33; Lennon 2015, 68. The sacrificial knife – *culter*, was a knife with one edge, curved back and was pointed. It was used mainly for killing animals, slaughtering or dismembering them, a typical butcher device. It was frequently represented on the funerary monuments as a sign that deceased was a butcher, but represented with *patera* and *gutus*, it was connected to the sacrificial and ritual practices, Siebert 1999, 88.

<sup>12</sup> However, although the *victimarii* were people who were regarded as people of lower status and a social class condemned by the elite, they were organized in a *collegium* – an inscription found in Rome (dated in 129. year) confirms the existence of the *collegium victimariorum*, *CIL* 6, 971.

<sup>13</sup> It is well known that how the sacrificial animal behaved during the preparations for its sacrifice, was very important, because the animal was expected to consent to her or his sacrifice. If something different would happen (if the animal would show signs of fear or panic), it was considered an unfavourable omen, Lennon 2015, 69; Aldrete 2014, 30–31.

ally made of wool and often presented in the way it is presented on the Singidunum monument: as a band strapped around the back and the belly of the bull. Otherwise, it can be presented draped over the animal's back, hanging down on both sides. It is not only presented in reliefs and statuary compositions of sacrificial animals, but it can also be frequently seen in the iconography of Jupiter Dolichenus and in Mithraic reliefs, again as an adornment on the bull's back.<sup>15</sup> The ritual *dorsuale* ribbon represents a sign of the consecration of the animal in question and it emphasises its ritual and sacrificial role. Besides the presence of the *dorsuale* on a bull's back, there is a visible rope around the bull's neck, by which the *victimarius* could lead the animal, but he could also pull it, to bring the animal's head down to the floor at the moment of its killing (to ensure the precision of the blow to the animal's head). Unlike the figural scenes on other two sides of the monument, this figural scene is the most preserved and it allows us to perceive the detail and excellent knowledge of perspective and anatomy with which the artisan presented the bull's head (eyes, nostrils, horns, etc.) and the bull's body. There is also an ornament between the horns of the animal in the form of ribbons (*infula*, *tainia*) which was a frequent ornament on the sacrificial bull.<sup>16</sup> The face of the *victimarius* leading the bull is the only preserved face of all four male figures' faces on the altar and the attention and skilfulness with which it was modelled confirms the high quality of the Singidunum monument.

On the opposite side of the monument, there is a similar presentation of a male figure leading a ram. The male figure is also a sacrificial attendant, but since he is carrying a sacrificial knife (*culter*), we can conclude that he was a *cultrarius*. The task of the *cultrarius* was to kneel beside the sacrificial animal and to hold its head, while the *victimarius* would hit the animal in the head with a sacrificial weapon. This means that the *cultrarius*' own head was very close to the head of the animal and a poorly aimed blow by the *victimarius* could endanger the life of the *cultrarius*.<sup>17</sup> After the sacrificial animal received the fatal blow to the head, the *cultrarius* would slit the animal's throat with the sacrificial knife and, later on, dismember its body. The *cultrarius* on the Singidunum monument is dressed in a short tunic, which is, as we said previously, in the context of the *victimarius* leading a bull from the opposite side of the altar, quite unusual. While unfortunately the details of the *victimarius*' face leading the ram are completely erased, the figure of the ram is

preserved and beautifully modelled, with carefully carved details of its head (eyes, mouth, horns, etc.) and body. Again, we see the ritual band or *dorsuale* over the ram's back, as a sign of the animal's consecration.

On the third side of the monument, there is an iconographical representation of two male figures, standing on rectangular bases and holding different objects in their hands. Both figures are dressed in short, above the knee *tunicae* girded at the waist. The identification of the objects that the figures carry in their hands and their posture and images, would make us, at first look, presume that they were the assistants to the main priest and sacrificers in a ritual sacrifice, known as *camilli*.<sup>18</sup> By the terms of *camillus* or *camilla*, Romans presumed a youth of a certain age, up to seventeen years of age, from a noble family, of pleasant appearance and of chaste and pure character.<sup>19</sup> As acolytes of a priest, *camilli* carried *acerra* (incense box) and other sacrificial vessels and are usually presented standing beside the sacrificer and/or the altar.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> As R. Mowat states, the term *dorsuale* was mentioned in the excerpt of Trebellius Pollion, in his description of ritual celebrations by emperor Gallienus. *Dorsuale* was a wide band which was more or less decorated and put over the back of sacrificial animal, which was led to the place of sacrifice, Mowat 1892, 387.

<sup>15</sup> Beside on the presentations of ritual animal sacrifice, *dorsuale* is presented on Mithraic reliefs depicting *tauroctony*, like on reliefs from Bologna, CIMRM 693, Sarmizegetusa CIMRM 2063 and 2084, Oltenia in Dacia, CIMRM 2180 and Transilvania CIMRM 2223, Mastrocinque 2017, 38. Also, in the cult of Isis and Sarapis, some Pompeian depicts Apis' bull with the *dorsuale* on his back, Ibid 163.

<sup>16</sup> The animal victim was washed and dressed with ribbons and bands of wool (in white or scarlet color), like the horns of the animal victims were sometimes gilded and decorated with a disc, Scheid 2007, 264.

<sup>17</sup> The life of *cultrarius* was even more endangered than the safety of *victimarius*, because if *victimarius* would make a mistake, he could hit the head, neck or back of the *cultrarius*, Aldrete 2014, 37.

<sup>18</sup> *Camillus* or *camilla* was a boy or a girl, from a decent family, who was mentioned in historical sources (by Festus, Plutarch, Macrobius, Servius etc.), as an acolyte of a priest or even an assistant of a god. The earliest representation of a *camillus* is known from a bronze *cista* from Praeneste, dated to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B. C., Spaulding 1911, 3–8; Mantle 2002, 91.

<sup>19</sup> Ancient writers as Dionysius state that a boy must be “of the age to serve in the temples”, while a girl must be unmarried. Servius used the term *adulescens* to suggest an older boy over seventeen years old, Spaulding 1911, 8–9.

<sup>20</sup> Besides *acerra*, *camilli* usually carried a dish, tray or basket of fruit (*lanx*), a jug with wine for the libation (*guttus*), a ladle, a *patera*, an *aspergillum* for sprinkling water and sacred ribbons (*infulae*), Mantle 2002, 94.

However, if we look carefully at the images of the two male figures from the Singidunum altar, we will notice a kind of conical cap that they are both wearing on their heads, which is usually tied under the chin with narrow strings made of leather known as *offendices*.<sup>21</sup> This kind of cap, known as *tutulatus*, was worn by an inferior priest known as a *flamen minor* or *tutulatus*.<sup>22</sup> According to Roman writers, like Servius and Varro, inferior priests wore close-fitting spike-less caps (unlike the tall, conical cap known as a *pileus*, *galerus* or *albogalerus* with an apex made of a spike of olivewood, worn by the *flamen dialis*),<sup>23</sup> which were a unique insignia of those priests of a lower order. Besides helping the principal priest in religious rituals, judging by Festus, *tutulati* were also in charge (together with bakers) of baking the cakes for sacred rituals.<sup>24</sup> Inferior priests wearing this particular kind of headgear (presented among priestly emblems on the third side of the Minerva altar in the Capitoline) tied under the chin with *offendices*, are known from monuments such as the Ara Pacis Augustae (representations of *flamines*), the marble head in Madrid, the Payne Knight head in the British Museum and from The Louvre (portrait of a *flamen*).<sup>25</sup>

On the monument from Singidunum, the first *tutulatus* is helping the *flamen maior* by holding a jug for the wine and a *patera*. Wine was poured from the wine-pitcher into the *patera* or the offerings for the altar were placed in it.<sup>26</sup> In this case, since the inferior priest *tutulatus* is carrying the wine jug, the *patera* was used to receive the liquid from the jug and to pour wine onto the altar during the sacrifice. The *patera* is presented in the simplest way, as an *umbilicate patera* turned toward the spectator, as on the frieze of the Arch of Susa.<sup>27</sup> Representations of the *tutulatus* holding a *patera* and a jug for wine are quite common. For example, on the Louvre relief a veiled priest is presented holding a *patera*, into which an inferior priest pours wine from the jug, while on a fragmented relief from the National Museum in Rome, two priest's attendants carry a wine pitcher in one hand and a *patera* in other hand. In that context, the scene from the Singidunum monument is no different, apart from one detail that is sometimes present in this kind of presentation of *tutulatus* who is holding a wine jug and a *patera*. On the left shoulder of the inferior priest from the Singidunum altar, there is a cloth like object with fringes, which falls over his shoulder. This cloth-like object actually represents a towel called a *mantele* (when it is used in a sacrificial context) or a *mappa*

(when used in domestic context), which was carried by the main priest's attendant who stood close to the priest and gave it to him to wipe his hands.<sup>28</sup> The other *flamen minor* holds with both hands an open *acerra*, a box for the incense. *Acerrae* could be of different shapes and sizes, without ornaments or ornamented and, if ornamented with figural scenes, they would sometimes allude to the relationship between the incense (the content of the *acerra*) and the sacrificial animal.<sup>29</sup> This *acerra* contains a figural scene which is not, unfortunately, well preserved, but it can be presumed that a she-wolf with Romulus and Remus was probably presented on it. The *acerra* is actually a typical attribute of a *camillus*, *camilla* or *tutulatus* and it appears in their hands in many sacrificial scenes on Roman reliefs and sculptural compositions.<sup>30</sup>

However, the principal priest's helpers aren't always shown holding the *acerra* with both hands – sometimes, they are shown holding it in their left hand, while spreading incense with their right hand.<sup>31</sup> In ancient times, the term *acerra* could also refer to the altar where one would burn incense for the dead,

<sup>21</sup> Esdaile 1911, 213.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, 218; Ryberg 1955, 45.

<sup>23</sup> A high conical cap, known as *pileus* or *galerus*, was made from the skins of victims slain in animal sacrifices. At the top of this cap there was a spike of olivewood bound to it by a woollen thread, *apiculum*, which was made from the slain animal's fleece. This kind of cap was worn by the principal *flamines*, priests of the colleges and by the *Salii*, Ibid, 212–213.

<sup>24</sup> Glinister 2014, 222–223.

<sup>25</sup> Esdaile 1911, 213–225; Portrait of a *flamen Martialis* (previously wrongly identified as a charioteer, inv. num. MA 341) from Louvre, dated from 250–265. and iconographically very similar to the portrait of a *flamen Martialis* now in Plasencia, for more see Bell 2008, 398–400, fig. 7.

<sup>26</sup> Spaulding 1911, 28.

<sup>27</sup> Ryberg 1955, 171.

<sup>28</sup> As L. C. Spaulding notices, judging by the relief on a sarcophagus in the Lateran, where one of the *camilli* carried over his shoulder a narrow object similar to a towel, it can be concluded that it was a towel which served for the priest to whip his fingers during the sacrificial ritual, Ibid.

<sup>29</sup> The two *acerrae* shown on the north frieze of the Ara Pacis Augustae show different scenes – on the first *acerra* there is a representation of two male figures leading a cow and holding a plate, while on the other *acerra* a person dressed in a tunic with a plate is presented on the short side and on the longer side there is person in a toga playing an instrument beside a burning fire, Huet 2017, 11–12.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, 28–29.

<sup>31</sup> Huet 2017, 13.





Fig 5. A relief presentation on a slab of the quindecimviri of Ara Pacis Augustae (source: <https://romegreeceart.tumblr.com/post/125410499046/ara-pacis-augustae-slab-of-the-quindecimviri>)  
 Fig. 6. Right lateral side of the Asseria altar, representation of a victimarius leading a bull to a sacrifice (after: Giunio 2003, fig. 5)

Сл. 5. Релефна представљања на плочи quindecimviri Аре Пацис Ауџустје (извор: <https://romegreeceart.tumblr.com/post/125410499046/ara-pacis-augustae-slab-of-the-quindecimviri>)  
 Сл. 6. Десна бочна страна олџара из Асерије, представљања victimarius-а који води бика на жртвовање (према: Giunio 2003, fig. 5)

according to Festus.<sup>32</sup> The hair of the second *tutulatus* is long, falling on his shoulders under the *tutulus*, which is not tied under the chin and with *offendices* falling freely. On Roman reliefs with scenes of sacrifices it is not so unusual that the *tutulatus* is shown long-haired or with a conical cap or *tutulus*. For example, on the slab of the *quindecimviri* of Ara Pacis Augustae, a main priest's attendant is shown with a veil on his head, holding an *acerra* (Fig. 5).

It can be noticed that two *tutulati*, as two *victimarii* presented on the Singidunum monument, stand on rectangular bases, suggesting the ground on which they stand, in a similar way to the figures in the scenes from the lower friezes on the south side of the western pier of the Arch of the Argentarii in Forum Boarum.<sup>33</sup> We can possibly presume that the presentation of the *tutulati* and *victimarii* on rectangular bases on the Singidunum monument could underline the sacrificial context of the scene, while garlands and ribbons presented above the heads of the sacrificial attendants imply the exterior of the temple,<sup>34</sup> in front of which the sacrifice was made and, furthermore, the divine

sphere where the gods received the sacrifice that was to be offered in their honour. It is well known that sacrifices were performed in an open space, usually in front of a temple near an altar in a sacral space, if they were of civic importance.<sup>35</sup>

The *ritus* of Roman public sacrifice can be relatively accurately imagined and visualised with the reconstruction completed by J. Scheid. It consisted of six stages, beginning with the procession of the sacrificial

<sup>32</sup> Festus says: “*Acerra: ara, quae ante mortuum poni solebat, in qua odores incedebant. Alii dicunt arculam esse thurariam, scilicet ubi tus reponerentur*” (that the *acerra* was a small flaming vessel, an *ara* actually, used for burning incense before the dead), Festus, *De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*; Rushforth 1915, 149.

<sup>33</sup> The scenes on the lower frieze on the south side of the western pier and of the eastern side of the western pier of the Arch of the Argentarii in Rome, depict details of sacrificial processions with a *victimarius*, a *papa* (*victimarius* with a hammer) and a bull, Elsner 2005, 89, fig. 4 and fig. 5.

<sup>34</sup> Ryberg 1955, 57

<sup>35</sup> Scheid 2007, 263.

animal (called *hostia* or *victima*)<sup>36</sup> to the altar, with that kind of a procession known as a *pompa*. The sacrificial procession was followed by a preliminary offering of prayers by the main official at the sacrifice, flute music and an offering of wine and incense – *praeefatio*.<sup>37</sup> Then followed the *immolatio*, the phase before killing the animal, when a meal known as the *mola salsa* (a mixture of coarse-ground flour and salt) was sprinkled over the head of the animal, along with wine, which was also poured over the animal's head by the main sacrificer and then the animal was killed by a *victimarius*. After the killing of a sacrificial animal, an inspection of the animal's entrails, or *litatio*, followed,<sup>38</sup> after which parts of the sacrificed animal were burned at the altar and consumed during a ritual banquet by the participants.<sup>39</sup> To correctly perform the sacrificial ritual meant to satisfy the gods and to communicate with them, ensuring their good will regarding the sacrifice and their acceptance of it.

Representations of sacrificial processions of animal sacrifices appear on Roman altars and reliefs from the Ara Pacis Augustae monument onwards and the majority of them date to the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> century. However, from the 3<sup>rd</sup> and into the 4<sup>th</sup> century (definitely after the period of the Severan dynasty), they became very rare.<sup>40</sup> This was certainly due to the prevailing philosophical attitudes (like Neoplatonistic ones for example), by which pure thoughts accompanied by prayers, hymns, incense, fruit and vegetable offerings were considered much more appropriate to be offered to the gods than a blood sacrifice.<sup>41</sup> As J. Elsner notices, the corpus of votive and funerary altars with images of animal sacrifices are not so frequent, but “are persistent” until the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, after which they are very rare.<sup>42</sup> On sarcophagi, however, presentations of *pompa* form a part of the marriage ritual,<sup>43</sup> while images of sacrifice are frequently seen on Dionysiac sarcophagi from about 150 to 250.<sup>44</sup>

Although it is believed that only in Rome and other parts of Italy, scenes of the first part of the sacrificial ritual, the *pompa*, are the most frequent ones to be presented, it seems that it is a similar situation in Roman provinces as well. In Gaul, for example, only scenes of libation are more numerous, followed in number by scenes of the *pompa*.<sup>45</sup>

The monument from Singidunum is of significant importance because in the territory of Moesia Superior there is no other monument with the same or even similar iconography, depicting the sacrificial procession preceding the ritual of animal sacrifice. A far echo

can be seen on votive and funerary monuments from the localities of Jezdina, Skelani (*Municipium Malvesatium*), Vranjani, Seča Reka, Karan, Požega, Ustikolina and Rogatica, where a set of different vessels used in sacrificial rituals, like a jug and *patera*, are represented or solitary figures of male and female servants who hold the mentioned vessels in their hands.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>36</sup> The term *hostia* encompasses all sacrificial animals, while under the term *victima* one refers primarily to bovinds. A very precise terminology was used for the types of sacrifices of different animals on different occasions. Accordingly, we know about *hostia caviaris, medialis, piacularis, praecidaneae, pridiguae, propudialis*, Prescendi, Siebert, Huet 2004, 199–200.

<sup>37</sup> Public sacrifices usually began at dawn, with a procession in which a sacrificial animal (or animals) was led by a *victimarius* to the altar, accompanied by flute music, sometimes the lyre. *Mola salsa*, salted flour, was sprinkled on the back of the sacrificial animal, while some wine was poured on its head, indicating that the animal was purified for the sacrifice, Ekroth 2014, 328–329.

<sup>38</sup> After the sacrificial animal was killed and opened up, a *haruspex* inspected its internal organs (*exta*) to ensure that everything was in order and that the gods had accepted the sacrifice. If, however, some abnormalities of the sacrificial animal were detected, it meant that gods were displeased and it represented a bad omen, Weddle 2017, 110–111.

<sup>39</sup> Scheid 2005, 44–57; Scheid 2007, 263–271; Scheid 2012, 84–95; Beard, North, Price 1998, 148. There was one important difference between the Greek and Roman ritual of sacrifice, concerning the treatment of the entrails of the sacrificed animal (so called *exta*). Cicero enumerates that *exta* were: the gall bladder, liver, heart and lungs. While the Greeks inspected, cooked and ate the *exta*, the Romans would cut out the *exta*, sometimes examine it and place it on the altar, together with the animal's blood, as an offering to the gods. All other parts of the sacrificed animal (*viscera*) besides the *exta* were prepared and eaten in a communal meal, Dillon 2017, 223.

<sup>40</sup> There are only several examples from public official art dated from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century on, Elsner 2012, 126.

<sup>41</sup> Exploring the main reasons for unsuccessful revival of public blood sacrifices by emperor Julian, S. Bradbury emphasizes that they represented most resented part of religious ritual not only in the eyes of Neoplatonists, but Christians as well. In the centre of opposing to blood sacrifices of all religious groups who taught a higher pagan spirituality, was the idea that spiritual sacrifice was superior to material sacrifice, Bradbury 1995, 331–356.

<sup>42</sup> Elsner 2012, 139.

<sup>43</sup> Lawrence 1965, 69.

<sup>44</sup> Elsner 2012, 138–139.

<sup>45</sup> Huet 2008, 45, 53.

<sup>46</sup> On the left lateral side of the monument from the locality Jezdina, a jug for the wine is presented, while on the right lateral side of the monument, there is a type of a *patera* with a handle known as *malluvinum*, Јеремид 2007, 37; On the monuments from Skelani (*Municipium Malvesatium*) and Vranjani, in the scenes of funeral banquet, servants hold a jug and a *patera* and servants are also shown with these kind of vessels in the monuments from Seča Reka, Karan, Požega, Ustikolina and Rogatica. All monuments are



However, the closest iconographical and geographical analogy to the monument from Singidunum is represented on the right lateral side of an altar found in the locality of Asseria (today Podgrađe, near Benkovac) in Dalmatia, with the representation of a *victimarius* leading a bull on the left lateral side (Fig. 6), a scene of a libation on the right lateral side (a priest is presented en face, *velatio capito*, and performs the libation in the presence of a flute player) and on the frontal side of the altar there is a scene of a she-wolf with Romulus and Remus. The altar from Asseria is dated to the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.<sup>47</sup>

As for stylistic analogies, we find the scenes from the Singidunum monument to be quite similar to human and animal figures (*victimarius*, *cultrarius* and sacrificial animals) in the relief of two victims from the Louvre (MA 1098) dated to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century and in the bas-relief from the theatre in Sabratha, Libya, dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup> century (analogy in the figures of a bull and the *victimarius* who is leading the bull).<sup>48</sup> The posture and pose of the *victimarius* on the Singidunum altar is very similar to the *victimarii* from reliefs in: Ince Blundell Hall (which represents a Sacrifice to Pax), Vatican (Sacrifice to a Divus), the Louvre (relief with a presentation of a *suovetaurilia*), Vatican Museum (cast from the Column of Trajan, scenes VIII and LIII showing the lustration of a camp), Column of Trajan (Arrival in a Dacian Town, Sacrifice at Six Altars, Scenes XC–XCI) and from the sarcophagus at Mantua.<sup>49</sup> Unfortunately, as we previously stated, as the fourth side with the inscription is badly damaged, so are the faces of the *cultrarius* and inferior priests, *tutulati*, probably due to Christian violence, since the altars (particularly those with sacrificial scenes) were a target of their anger (as were pagan temples, sculptures, statues etc.) and were easily approached if one wanted to damage them.

However, the well formed figures and the details of the *victimarii* faces, which are skilfully carved, the good perspective, the somewhat stylised way of modelling and presenting the human and animal figures (although with care and accuracy in certain details of the figures' clothes and the animals' heads and bodies) on the cuboid monument from Singidunum imply that it was probably carved from the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. Furthermore, the type of decorative vegetal ornaments that are presented in the double frame on the monument's sides (ivy leaves with vines and clusters of berries) are the type of ornamenta-

tion that appears from the middle to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the first half of the 4<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>50</sup> Typologically, the monument in the shape of a cuboid represents the influence from Pannonia, as does the motive of the garland, which is very frequent on funerary monuments (particularly of the *cippi* type) in the eastern part of the Roman province of Dalmatia.<sup>51</sup> Therefore, we suggest the dating of the monument to be from the middle of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century to the first decades of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century.

Referring to the question as to whether the monument from Singidunum was made in the city, it is necessary to mention that there was probably a stonemason workshop or workshops in such a large and urban centre as Singidunum was, which produced votive and funerary monuments. On a votive altar also found in the very centre of antique Singidunum, we see a dedication to the god Jupiter Paternus from the dedicant *Aurelius Crescentius, lapidarius*.<sup>52</sup> Therefore, we can presume with some certainty that *lapidarii*, like Aurelius Crescentius, worked on and produced votive and funerary altars in Singidunum during Antiquity.

To which deity the sacrifice of a bull and a ram from the monument from Singidunum was offered, we can only guess, but the rules for animal sacrifice were quite simple in the Roman world – male deities were offered male castrated victims (except Mars, Neptune, Janus and the Genii), while goddesses received female victims. Of course, animals selected for sacrifice had to be of a certain age, sex, colour etc. and had to be pure and perfect or *optata, optima*. Animal sacrifices

---

dated to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, Зотовић 1995, 105–107, fig. 23, 23a, 32, 126–127, fig. 137, 137a–b; Петровић 1986, 27, fig. 23–24, 33; Сергејевски 1936, 7, T. I, 10, 10–11, fig. 9.

<sup>47</sup> The monumental altar with the scenes of *immolatio*, libation and the she-wolf feeding Romulus and Remus, was found in 1999, in the locality of Asseria, as a *spolia* in the late antique wall. It was concluded that it was an important monument, linked to the cult of the Roman emperor and that it was placed in one of the crucial places of the locality, Giunio 2003, 133–155.

<sup>48</sup> Huet 2005, 95, fig. 6.

<sup>49</sup> Ryberg 1955, Pl. XI – fig. 25, Pl. XXIX – fig. 45e, Pl. XXXV – fig. 54b, Pl. XXXVI – fig. 55, Pl. XXXVII – fig. 56, Pl. XLI – fig. 61a–b, P. XLII – fig. 64 and Pl. LX – fig. 96b.

<sup>50</sup> Зотовић 1995, 42–45.

<sup>51</sup> Вулић 1941–1948: 246, n. 483; 251–252, n. 491, 492.

<sup>52</sup> The votive altar dedicated to the god Jupiter was found in 1920, on the corner of Knez Lazar Street, and is now in the Lapidarium of The National Museum of Belgrade. The text of the inscription reads: *I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) P(aterno) |Aur(elius) Cre|scentio |lap(i)dariu(?)|s pro salut|e sua |et suorum, IMS I, n. 11.*



Fig. 7. Map of the find site of the monument with scenes of a sacrificial procession (after: Појовић 2006, fig. 17)

Сл. 7. Мапа места налаза споменика са сценом жртвене процесије (према: Појовић 2006, сл. 17)

to Olympian gods were performed in daylight, while sacrifices offered to chthonic gods and di Manes were performed in the night. Although there is already an established view in scholarly literature that white animals were sacrificed to the Olympian gods and animals of dark colours were offered to the chthonian deities, it is somewhat questionable whether this was really that the case in the praxis of daily sacrifices in the Roman period.<sup>53</sup> It is well known that a bull was offered to gods: Jupiter (castrated oxen), Janus and Mars, and to the Genius of the emperor.<sup>54</sup>

The fact that bulls and rams (and boars as well) were the most expensive and the most frequently sacrificed animals for prominent deities like Jupiter, Mercury, Dionysos, Saturnus or on particular festivities (like major purifications and oath-takings),<sup>55</sup> somewhat narrows the possibilities as to which god the sacrifice of a bull and a ram on the monument from Singidunum could have been offered. Since two of the most prominent and expensive animals in animal sacrifice are represented, we think that the sacrifice could have been performed for the supreme Roman god Jupiter, the Genius of the emperor or perhaps the god Saturn.

Two arguments are primarily in favour of the last proposition, that the presented scenes of the animal sacrifice phase of *immolatio* on the Singidunum monument were connected with the cult of the god Saturn and his festivities; the fact that a bull and a ram were animals offered in the sacrifice to the deity (as can be seen on an altar from the Bardo museum)<sup>56</sup> and that the sacrifices made to Saturn were performed *aperto capite*, that is in *Graeco ritu*, which points to this chthonian god, whose festivities, known as *Saturnalia*, began on 17<sup>th</sup> December and lasted several days, being enjoyed as a very entertaining and popular

<sup>53</sup> Since this view is derived from historical sources of Late Antiquity, it is doubtful whether they really pictured the real situation of the *ritus* of animal sacrifice in Antiquity. However, the animals which distinguished themselves upon birth by their beauty were those who were immediately selected as sacrificial animals. G. Ekroth mentions that some sanctuaries even raised their own animals, Ekroth 2014, 332–337.

<sup>54</sup> Beard, North, Price 1996, 325.

<sup>55</sup> Ekroth 2014, 334.

<sup>56</sup> Mantle 2010, fig. 1.

festival among common people.<sup>57</sup> The presumption that the scenes from the cuboid monument from Singidunum could perhaps be connected with the god Saturn might compel us to consider the existence and confirmation of his cult in Singidunum, which is unfortunately not the case, since none of the monuments found thus far are dedicated to this deity. However, on the other hand, the discovery of several votive monuments dedicated to the supreme Roman deity, the god Jupiter (particularly to Jupiter Paternus) in the vicinity of the site where our monument was found, in our opinion, represents a more plausible hypothesis regarding the god to whom the depicted animal sacrifice could have been offered and perhaps in whose sacred area the monument was situated.

Of course, we must not overlook the possibility that the scenes of sacrifice of a bull and a ram presented on the Singidunum monument might depict a sacrificial procession which was related to some public occasion or event.<sup>58</sup> Also, thinking about the possible function of the Singidunum monument, as far as it is known, funerary altars were very similar to votive altars in the context of their typology and decoration, which coincided with their cultic function. The iconographic scenes on funerary altars expressed the idea that obligations towards the deceased were fulfilled and respected; they celebrated the deceased's life, but could also serve in the cultic function of the altar in question.<sup>59</sup> Potentially something similar can be also presumed for the monument from Singidunum – perhaps the scenes of the sacrificial procession were in a function of the cultic dimension of the altar, which was, in that case, part of a real sacrificial praxis.

The monument from Singidunum was found in the very centre of the antique city of today's Belgrade, in the centre of its antique civil settlement, where other cult monuments, dedicated to various deities, were discovered (monuments dedicated to the god Jupiter – particularly Jupiter Paternus, a monument dedicated to Capitoline Triad, monuments dedicated to Hecate, Nemesis, Mithra and a Thracian horseman). Since as early as from Justinian's period of reign and his reconstruction of Singidunum, antique monuments and antique constructions were widely used as *spoliae*.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, nothing more definite can be said about the monument in the context of its finding or if it was found *in situ*, because there was no archaeological context except that it was found in the centre of an antique civil settlement near where more than a dozen monuments dedicated to the god Jupiter and fragments

of different mythological marble sculptures were found and where (or near by), presumably the Roman forum of the antique city of Singidunum was.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Ancient writers such as Dionysius, Varro, Cicero, Catulus, Cato the Elder and Lucius Accius (in his *Annals*) write about Saturn, his cult and his festivities, particularly mentioning the fact that during his festival slaves traded places with their masters and feasted with them, Dillon, Garland 2005, 165; Le Glay 1966, 449–478; Mantle 2010, 119–120, fig. 1.

<sup>58</sup> Major celebrations were mutual for the army and civilians, so we can presume some of the most important Roman festivals (like Vestalia, dedication of a temple, the “Birthday of Rome”, celebration which honoured the reigning emperor, his family or predecessors etc.), Beard, North, Price 1996, 325.

<sup>59</sup> Funerary altars, which started to become popular during the reign of Tiberius, also had a cultic function during the period of their usage, that is until the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century, after which they became less common. They were usually made of marble and besides figural and vegetal representations, they could also include mythological scenes, Friedland, Sobocinski, Gazda 2015, 394–395. The scenes on the funerary altars celebrated the deceased and his life, but they could also serve the function of the altar being a ritual monument – as is the case with the *ara* of L. Caltilius Stephanus and Caltilia Moschis from Ostia, where the monument served as a ritual one (probably placed in front of the monumental tomb), Maršić 2013, 389.

<sup>60</sup> The building of the walls and towers of a Byzantine *castel* erected in the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century was also possible because of the used antique fortifications of Singidunum. Unfortunately, at the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, in the period of building new middle age fortifications in the city, all visible traces of antique constructions were destroyed. Parts of Roman walls, *stelae* and altars were built into the middle age fortifications, only to be destroyed almost completely at the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, during the Baroque reconstruction of the city. The destruction of the former urban centre (the centre of the civil settlement) of Singidunum was complete with the building of new Austro-Hungarian bastion, Поповић 2014, 15.

<sup>61</sup> It is presumed, from the architectural and archaeological remains in the very centre of the antique city of Singidunum, that it coincided with the contemporary centre of today's Belgrade. Since numerous votive monuments dedicated to the god Jupiter and fragments of different marble mythological sculptures were found in that area, it is presumed by the researchers that this area represented the area of the Roman forum with the temple of Capitoline triad (today it is the area around the building of the National Bank in the King Peter's Street). Unfortunately, the fragmented marble sculptures from the mentioned area were mostly lost or could not be identified with any certainty among the preserved fragmented sculptures of unknown provenience that are today stored in the National Museum of Belgrade's lapidarium, Popović 1997, 8–11. We would like to offer our opinion about the possibility of whether the monument was found *in situ* or not. We think that it is most unlikely that such a large and massive monument would be transferred to some other place (since then, it would be used as *spolia* or for some other purpose) and that it would be logical that it was found *in situ* (the missing parts of the monument – the base and crowning elements could have been destroyed during the construction works during which the monument was discovered).



Instead of a formal conclusion, we would like, instead, to emphasise the fact that in Roman religion the sacrificial altar was the focus of public and private worship, where ceremonies, ritual acts and animal sacrifices were offered to the gods. In the monument from Singidunum the scenes of sacrificial procession, were probably performed in honour of some of the main Roman deities (such as Jupiter), for a public cause or to designate a military triumph. Because of its unique and most interesting iconography, the monument represents an important archaeological find and evidence about ritual processions in antique Singidunum in the period from the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century to the first decades of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. Although we don't know the reason for erecting the monument nor the identity of its dedicant / dedicants, what we know is that it was made from expensive, high quality, coarse white marble and that the scenes of ritual procession were carved carefully and with clear knowledge of the ritual and its details (ritual instruments, *dorsuale*, *mantele*), which indicates that its dedicant was a citizen of high social status and substantial finances. As reliefs of this kind offer a narrative synthesis of the ritual in question and represent a

memory of it, emphasising certain elements of the ritual in question, it is clear that an important occasion was marked with the sacrificial procession in which the most expensive animals were sacrificed and in which priests of lower rank took part, helping the flamen *maior*. We cannot be sure of the reason for dedicating the altar on the grounds of its iconography, but the general thought prevails that whatever the reason was, the dedicant was hoping to realize the direct communication with the god / gods and to please him / them, expecting that the prayers would be fulfilled, with him being granted divine benevolence. Since the monument was found in the very centre of ancient Singidunum where the Roman forum was presumably situated, we can suggest that it was found *in situ*, placed in a sacred area of a temple of the god Jupiter or, less likely, some other important Roman deity. Through its thorough analysis, we are more inclined to believe that it was a votive altar, very monumental in shape, iconography and decoration and very significant in the religious life of antique Singidunum. Further archaeological excavations in the area of ancient Singidunum's centre where the altar was found, could shed new light on some of these questions.

---

*Starinar* is an Open Access Journal. All articles can be downloaded free of charge and used in accordance with the licence Creative Commons – Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Serbia (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/rs/>).

Часопис *Старинар* је доступан у режиму отвореног приступа. Чланци објављени у часопису могу се бесплатно преузети са сајта часописа и користити у складу са лиценцом Creative Commons – Ауторство-Некомерцијално-Без прерада 3.0 Србија (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/rs/>).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

## Abbreviations:

CIL .....

*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Th. Mommsen, ed.,  
Berolini 1873: apud G. Reimerum

IMS .....

*Inscriptions de la Mésie Supérieure*, I–VI,  
Belgrade 1976–1995

## Literature:

**Aldrete 2014** – G. S. Aldrete, Hammers, Axes, Bulls and Blood: Some Practical Aspects of Roman Animal Sacrifice, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 104, London 2014, 28–50.

**Beard, North, Price 1996** – M. Beard, J. North, S. Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. 1, A History*, Cambridge 1996.

**Beard, North, Price 1998** – M. Beard, J. North, S. Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. 2, A Sourcebook*, Cambridge 1998.

**Bell 2008** – S. W. Bell, The Face of Victory? A Misidentified Head in Rome and the “Problem” of Charioteer Portraits, in: *Le cirque romain et son image*, ed. J. Nelis-Clément, J. M. Roddaz, Bordeaux 2008, 393–411.

**Bradbury 1995** – S. Bradbury, Julian’s Pagan Revival and the Decline of Blood Sacrifice, *Phoenix*, Vol. 49, no. 4, Toronto 1995, 331–356.

**Dillon, Garland 2005** – M. Dillon, L. Garland, *Ancient Rome: A Sourcebook*, New York 2005.

**Dillon 2017** – M. Dillon, *Omens and Oracles: Divination in Ancient Greece*, New York 2017.

**Ekroth 2014** – G. Ekroth, Animal Sacrifice in Antiquity, in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Animals*, (ed. G. L. Campbell), Oxford 2014.

**Elsner 2005** – J. Elsner, Sacrifice and Narrative on the Arch of the Argentarii at Rome, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 18, Cambridge University Press 2005, 83–98.

**Elsner 2012** – J. Elsner, Sacrifice in Late Roman Art, in *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice: Ancient Victims, Modern Observers*, (eds. C. A. Faraone, F. S. Naiden), Cambridge University Press 2012, 120–163.

**Esdaile 1911** – K. A. Esdaile, The Apex or Tutulus in Roman Art, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 1, London 1911, 212–226.

**Friedland, Sobocinski, Gazda 2015** – E. A. Friedland, M. G. Sobocinski, E. K. Gazda (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Sculpture*, Oxford University Press 2015.

**Гарашанин 1954** – Д. Гарашанин, Археолошки споменици у Београду и околини, *Годишњак музеја града Београда*, I, Београд 1954, 43–98 (D. Garašanin, Arheološki

spomenici u Beogradu i okolini, *Godišnjak muzeja grada Beograda*, I, Beograd 1954, 43–98).

**Giunio 2003** – K. A. Giunio, Monumentalni žrtvenik s prikazom vučice s Romulom i Remom i scenama žrtvovanja iz Aserije, *Asseria*, 1, Zadar 2003, 133–155.

**Glinister 2014** – F. Glinister, Festus and Ritual Foodstuffs, *Eruditio Antiqua* 6, Lyon 2014, 215–227.

**Huet 2005** – V. Huet, La mise à mort sacrificielle sur les reliefs romains: une image banalisée et ritualisée de la violence, in *La violence dans les mondes Grec et Romain*, (ed. J.-M. Bertrand), Sorbonne 2005, 91–120.

**Huet 2008** – V. Huet, Les images sacrificielles en Gaule romaine, in *Archéologie du sacrifice animal en Gaule romaine. Rituels et pratiques alimentaires*, ed. S. Lepetz, W. Van Andringa, Archéologie des Plantes et des Animaux 2, Montagnac: Monique Mergoïl 2008, 43–74.

**Huet 2017** – V. Huet, Der Weihrauch auf den römischen Reliefs mit Opferdarstellungen, *Trivium*, 27, 2017, <https://journals.openedition.org/trivium/5581> (accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> December, 2019.)

**Јеремиић 2007** – Г. Јеремиић, Представе посуда на votivnoj ari из Јездине, *Зборник радова Народног музеја (Čačak)*, 37, Čačak 2007, 35–48 (G. Jeremić, Predstave posuda na votivnoj ari iz Jezdine, *Zbornik radova Narodnog muzeja (Čačak)*, 37, Čačak 2007, 35–48).

**Kleiner 1987** – D. E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Imperial Funerary Altars with Portraits*, Rome 1987.

**Lawrence 1965** – M. Lawrence, The Velettri Sarcophagus, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 69/3, Boston 1965, 207–222.

**Le Glay 1966** – M. Le Glay, *Saturne Africain. Histoire*, Paris 1966.

**Lennon 2015** – J. J. Lennon, Victimarii in Roman Religion and Society, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 83, Rome 2015, 65–89.

**Mantle 2002** – I. C. Mantle, The Roles of Children in Roman Religion, *Greece & Rome*, 49, no. 1, Cambridge University Press 2002, 85–106.

- Mantle 2010** – I. C. Mantle, Addendum: The Religious Roles of Children in the Provinces, *Greece & Rome*, 57, no. 1, Cambridge University Press 2010, 117–121.
- Maršić 2013** – D. Maršić, Funerary altars of Roman Iader – The study of the topical character and function of funerary altars in the Roman province of Dalmatia, *Zbornik skupa „Sepulkralna skulptura Zapadnog Ilirika i susjednih oblasti u doba Rimskog carstva“*, (eds.) N. Cambi, G. Koch, Split 2013, 383–418.
- Mastrocinque 2017** – A. Mastrocinque, *The Mysteries of Mithras: A Different Account*, Mohr Siebeck Tübingen 2017.
- Mowat 1892** – R. Mowat, Dorsuale, *Darembeg-Saglio, Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, II, 1, Paris, 1892.
- Нинковић 2018** – В. Нинковић, *Лапидаријум у Великом барутином маџацину: збирка римских камених споменика Народној музеја у Београду* / V. Ninković, *Lapidarium in the Big Gunpowder Magazine: Collection of Roman Stone Monuments of National Museum in Belgrade*, Београд 2018 / Belgrade 2018.
- Нинковић 2019** – В. Нинковић, *Римски епиграфски и анепиграфски споменници из лапидаријума Народној музеја у Београду*, Београд 2019 / V. Ninković, *Roman Epigraphic and Anepigraphic Monuments from the Lapidarium of the National Museum in Belgrade*, Belgrade 2019.
- Петровић 1933** – Ј. Петровић, Прилози римској топографији града Београда, *Старинар VIII–IX*, 1933–1934, Београд 1933–1934, 313–321 (J. Petrović, Prilozi rimskoj topografiji grada Beograda, *Starinar VIII–IX*, 1933–1934, Beograd 1933–1934, 313–321).
- Петровић 1986** – П. Петровић, *Римски камени споменници из Карана*, Титово Ужице 1986 (P. Petrović, *Rimski kameni spomenici iz Karana*, Titovo Užice 1986).
- Роповић 1997** – М. Роповић, Antički Singidunum: dosadašnja otkrića i mogućnost daljih istraživanja, *Singidunum I*, Београд 1997, 1–18 / Ancient Singidunum: Discoveries and Possibilities of Further Research, *Singidunum I*, Belgrade 1997, 1–18.
- Поповић 2006** – М. Поповић, *Београдска тврђава*, Јавно предузеће „Београдска тврђава“, Београд 2006 (M. Popović, *The Fortress of Belgrade*, Јавно предузеће “Београдска тврђава”, Beograd 2006).
- Поповић 2014** – М. Поповић, Остаци античког Сингидунума у урбаном језгру савременог града, *Наслеђе*, Београд 2014, 11–24 (M. Popović, Ostaci antičkog Singidunuma u urbanom jezgru savremenog grada, *Nasleđe*, Beograd 2014, 11–24).
- Pop-Lazić 2002** – S. Pop-Lazić, Nekropole rimskog Singidunuma, *Singidunum 3*, Beograd 2002, 7–100.
- Prescendi, Siebert, Huet** – F. Prescendi, A. V. Siebert, V. Huet, Offrandes sacrificielles, in *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum (ThesCRA)*, I, Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum 2004, 199–200.
- Prescendi, Huet** – F. Prescendi, V. Huet, Phases du sacrifice, in *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum Antiquorum (ThesCRA)*, I, Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum 2004, 203–205.
- Rushforth 1915** – G. McN. Rushforth, Funeral lights in Roman Sepulchral Monuments, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 5, Cambridge 1915, 149–164.
- Ryberg 1955** – I. S. Ryberg, *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art*, American Academy in Rome 1955.
- Scheid 2005** – J. Scheid, *Quand faire, c'est croire: les rites sacrificiels des Romains*, Paris 2005.
- Scheid 2007** – J. Scheid, Sacrifices for gods and ancestors, in J. Rupke (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Religion*, Malden 2007, 263–271.
- Scheid 2012** – J. Scheid, Roman Animal Sacrifice and the System of Being, in C. Faraone, F. S. Naiden (eds.), *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice. Ancient Victims, Modern Observers*, Cambridge 2012, 84–95.
- Сергејевски 1936** – Д. Сергејевски, Нови камени споменници из Устиколине и Рогатице, *Гласник Земалској музеја XLVIII*, Сарајево 1936, 3–14 (D. Sergejevski, Novi kameni spomenici iz Ustikoline i Rogatice, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja XLVIII*, Sarajevo 1936, 3–14).
- Siebert 1999** – A. V. Siebert, *Instrumenta Sacra: Untersuchungen zu römischen Opfer-, Kult- und Priestergeräten*, Berlin – New York 1999.
- Spaulding 1911** – L. C. Spaulding, *The “Camillus” Type in Sculpture*, University of California 1911.
- Torelli 1992** – M. Torelli, *Typology & Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs*, University of Michigan Press 1992.
- Вулић 1933** – Н. Вулић, Антички споменници наше земље, *Споменик Српске Краљевске Академије LXXV*, Београд 1933 (N. Vulić, Antički spomenici naše zemlje, *Spomenik Srpske Kraljevske Akademije LXXV*, Beograd 1933).
- Weddle 2017** – C. Weddle, Blood, Fire and Feasting, the Role of Touch and Taste in Graeco-Roman Animal Sacrifice, in: *Senses of the Empire. Multisensory Approaches to Roman Culture*, London 2017, 105–119.
- Зотовић 1995** – Р. Зотовић, *Римски надгробни споменници источног дела провинције Далмације*, Ужице 1995 (R. Zotović, *Rimski nadgrobnici istočnog dela provincije Dalmacije*, Užice 1995).



Резиме: НАДЕЖДА ГАВРИЛОВИЋ ВИТАС, Археолошки институт Београд

## МОНУМЕНТАЛНИ СПОМЕНИК ИЗ СИНГИДУНУМА СА ПРЕСТАВАМА ЖРТВЕНЕ ПРОЦЕСИЈЕ – *POMPA ET IMMOLATIO*

Кључне речи. – римски споменик, жртвена процесија, жртвовање животиња, Сингидунум

Током грађевинских радова у самом центру Београда, античког Сингидунума, године 1932. пронађен је монументални римски споменик. На три стране споменика приказане су иконографске представе римске свечане жртвене процесије, док је четврта страна, на којој су се налазили натписно поље и натпис, на жалост, оштећена до непрепознатљивости. На задњој, широј страни споменика, наспрот оној на којој се налазио натпис, представљене су две мушке фигуре, у стојећем положају, са различитим ритуалним предметима у рукама и с коничним капама, тесно приљубљеним уз главу, које имају врпце за везивање испод браде. У питању су свештеници нижег реда који су помагали главном свештенику приликом приношења жртве – тзв. тутулати (*tutulati*), од којих један у десној руци држи крчаг за вино, док му се у левој руци налази посуда за либацију или ношење жртвених понуда – патера (*patera*). На његовом левом рамену налази се предмет са ресама, сличан пешкиру – тзв. мантиле (*mantele*), односно пешкир за брисање руку што га је свештеник нижег ранга додавао главном свештенику током приношења жртве. Други свештеник нижег реда држи обема рукама отворену кутију за тамјан – тзв. ацеру (*acerra*), орнаментисану фигуралном представом, вероватно вучице која доји Ромула и Рема. На левој бочној страни споменика (у односу на задњу страну са представом двојице свештеника) налази се сцена човека који води бика. У питању је слуга односно виктимаријус (*victimarius*), чији је посао био да води жртвену животињу и брине о њеном понашању, да је убије током самог ритуала жртвовања и да потом исече њено тело на комаде. Виктимаријус води

бика левом руком, док у десној руци држи секиру којом ће га убити приликом жртвовања. На десној бочној страни споменика приказан је виктимаријус са жртвеним ножем, односно култтаријус (*cultrarius*), који нож држи у десној руци, док левом руком води овна. На леђима обе жртвене животиње приказана је ритуална трака дорсуале (*dorsuale*), која је означавала посвећење животиње у ритуалне сврхе. Анализа и интерпретација монументалног споменика из Сингидунума показале су да је у питању археолошки споменик јединствене иконографије са простора римске провинције Горње Мезије, с обзиром на то да су представљене сцене свечане жртвене процесије. Изузетан значај олтара огледа се у томе што су двојица свештеника нижег реда, помагача главном свештенику, приказана на једној од широк страна споменика. То само додатно оснажује хипотезу да је у питању била важна ритуална свечаност која је, вероватно, приређена у част врховног римског бога Јупитера, генија императора или предака римског цара. Најближу географску аналогију представља сцена жртвене процесије са жртвеника из Асерије, док се друге аналогије могу пронаћи на рељефу две жртве из Лувра и барелефу из Сабрате у Либији. Може се претпоставити да је споменик из Сингидунума са представама свечане жртвене процесије био војни олтар који се налазио у простору храма посвећеног богу Јупитеру или, мање вероватно, неком од других значајних римских богова, близу претпостављеног римског форума у Сингидунуму, где је и пронађен. Монументални споменик из Сингидунума датује се у време од друге половине 2. века до почетка 3. века.