Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica 25(2): 465–482

Remarks on the so-called Plotinus' Sarcophagus ('Vatican Museums', inv. 9504)

José María ZAMORA CALVO[1]

Abstract. *In this article, we offer some philosophical notes on the so-called Plotinus sarcophagus, currently exhibited in the 'Vatican Museums' (inv. 9504), which has been dated to the end of the third quarter of the 3rd century. Since the sarcophagus in question has been the subject of discussion among experts since the 1920s, our aim is to contribute to the scientific debate with a number of philosophical remarks to assist in the interpretation of the iconographic representation of the teacher teaching, accompanied by two Muses, but also to make particular reference to certain passages taken from the On the Life of Plotinus, written by his disciple, Porphyry, three decades after the death of his teacher.*

Rezumat. *În acest articol propunem câteva opinii filosofice asupra așa-numitului sarcofag al lui Plotin, expus de curând la Musei Vaticani (inv. 9504), sarcofag care a fost datat la sfârșitul celui de-al treilea sfert al secolului al III-lea. Întrucât exponatul a fost subiectul discuțiilor încă din anii 1920, scopul acestei lucrări îl constituie o contribuție la această dezbatere științifică prin remarci filosofice privind interpretarea reprezentării iconografice a predării de către profesor, însoțit de două Muze. De asemenea, dorim să facem o referire specială la anumite pasaje preluate din lucrarea Despre viața lui Plotin, scrisă de discipolul său Porfir la trei decenii după moartea profesorului său.*

Keywords: Roman sarcophagus; Plotinus; Muses; Neoplatonic iconography; Roman eschatology.

State of the art

The Roman funerary portrait acquires a particular moral significance. The images are intended to convey a certain *uirtus* to the spectators who view them. In their artistic representation, memory and philosophical teaching unite in an inseparable way in the sculpture. As Pliny the Elder noted when referring to portraits that ornament libraries, the effigies speak to us of "immortal souls" (*immortales animi*).[2] Many aspects of Roman iconography, however, are almost always much more difficult to interpret than those of

[1] Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain; jm.zamora@uam.es. ORCID: 0000-0001-7101-2234.

[2] Plin. *HN* 35.9.

Greek art, particularly with regard to the portraits of philosophers. Symbolism, or allegory, confers life to the images, assigning them an ethical meaning in a certain social and intellectual context.

After the golden age of the Antonine era, Roman art, when it broke away from the Hellenistic style, became truly "Roman". From this moment, as is particularly evident in the relief, it manages to communicate not only a state of mind, but also a vital rhythm that runs parallel to the action it depicts. The spectator is compelled to relive an action in the course of its execution.

The collection of images attributed to Plotinus is not extensive. In addition to five portraits,[3] the Vatican Museums (ex Lateranense) hold a sarcophagus, considered to be the tomb of Plotinus, from an urban *officina* (Rome or peripheral workshops), which provides us with a valuable insight into the school, the teaching of philosophy and the culture of the ruling class in the decades between 260 and 280.

On the sarcophagus of the school of this philosopher, considered the founder of Neoplatonism, time is condensed into a single scene, a single moment, where the dramatic action captured culminates. It is, therefore, a Romanised and updated Greek archetype, marked by a hierarchical order in the representation. The school context influences the programme of the sculptor and, specifically, the style and composition that characterises the scene depicted. Could it perhaps be inspired by a scene from the school of Plotinus carried out in the house of Gemina? Moreover, the sculptural group is heir to the variations and mutations that Roman *pietas* experienced throughout the first three centuries. In the times of Gallienus, influencing the sculptural period immediately following, the static physiognomy of the philosopher teaching his disciples was exalted.

Comparison of the so-called Plotinus sarcophagus with philosophical texts, particularly those taken from the *On the Life of Plotinus*,[4] written by Porphyry in 301, three decades after the death of his teacher, could shed some light on certain questions posed by the iconographic testimony of the sarcophagus. Practising philosophy in the school of Plotinus entailed adopting a way of life inseparable from theoretical reflection. The always vigilant

[3] From the excavations of Ostia come three portraits that L'ORANGE (1951, 1957, 1961) considers as replicas of an image of Plotinus (Ostia Museum, Inv. 68, Inv. 436, Inv. 1386). To these should be added a copy of unknown origin kept in the Vatican Museums (Braccio Nuovo, Inv. 2203), and a head, recently incorporated into the collection (Santa Barbara Museum of Art. Inv. 1995.26.21). On the portrait of Plotinus and the problems of iconographic identification, see CALZA 1953; SAPELLI 2001; DANGUILLIER 2001, 53–57 and 224–226; FISCHER-BOSSERT 2001 (which excludes the portrait of the Ostia Museum, Inv. 436); ROMEO 2009; LANG 2012; SCHOTT 2013; ZEVI 2016.

[4] Porphyry's *On the Life of Plotinus* plays, according to Michalewski, a dual role: on the one hand, it serves to present Plotinus' exemplary mode of being and, on the other, it offers an introduction to the publication of the treatises. MICHALEWSKI 2017, 535–537.

disposition of his soul, orientated towards the principle from which it derived, meant that, after his death, Plotinus' soul could be reunited with that of Plato and Pythagoras, accompanying the entourage of divine beings.[5]

Descriptive and typological analysis

In Rome, the sepulchre served to enable the dead to instruct the living, as in this sarcophagus explicitly, by means of the representation of a scene of *paideia*. Through the tomb, the *monumentum* (from *moneo*), makes us "remember" and gives the living "advice"[6] on how to continue on the path of life. The *imago* of the deceased embodies the inherent virtues of a member related to the aristocracy or the bourgeoisie who cultivates philosophy and science.

Sarcophagus of a learned family (so-called Plotinus sarcophagus, *ca.* 275/280 CE)
Musei Vaticani, Museo Gregoriano Profano (ex Lateranense), Città del Vaticano, Inv. 9504
Provenience: Appartamenti Borgia
Photograph: Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (DAI); FA – Scan. Filmnummer: 4459
Measurements: H 147 cm; W 220 cm. Material: Marmor

[5] Porph. *Plot.* 23.26.

[6] Ulp. *Dig.* 11.7.2.6: *Monumentum est quod memoriae seruandae gratia existit.* See Varro, *Ling.* VI.49.

The relief was conveniently categorised at the end of the third quarter of the third century CE,[7] created in a metropolitan workshop, which inherited the stylistic forms and techniques characteristic of the post-Gallienic period. The frieze is organised internally in three compositional planes: in the first, which dominates the visual field, the philosopher is situated in the centre seated on a podium teaching, and he is escorted by two Muses; in the second, there are three male characters of philosophical/intellectual nature; and in the last, the *parapetasma* can be found.

The sarcophagus, which depicts a man teaching, identified by Rodenwaldt[8] as Plotinus (204/5–270 CE), is fragmentarily held in the Vatican's Gregorian Profane Museum, inv. 9504.[9] The memorial belongs to a relatively advanced phase of Roman sculptural evolution, shortly before the Tetrarchy, around 280.[10] The figures almost completely occupy the full width of the relief, and its theme reflects the practice of *paideia* in the Rome of the second half of the 3rd century.

The main character is seated in the centre of the composition, inside a tent or in front of curtains (*parapetasma*), with the remains of a Corinthian column on the right[11]. He is depicted as a man of letters, dressed in a robe and toga, which he wears like a cloak (*himation*), and, on his feet, he conspicuously wears shoes that illustrate his rank as a Roman gentleman.[12]

The owner of the sarcophagus stands out for being placed on a podium, with a *scrinium* and a *capsa* of scrolls at his feet, holding an open *uolumen* in his hands, from which he has been reading. The deceased is teaching a class to his disciples, which does not necessarily mean that all of the men represented are professionally dedicated to philosophy.

[7] WEGNER 1966, nº 116, fig. 64b.

[8] RODENWALDT 1922, 120, fig. 6, 122.

[9] MASSI 1792, 19, nº 10; BENNDORF and SCHÖNE 1867, 10, nº 16, fig. 17, 1; RODENWALDT 1922, 120, fig. 6, 122; MARROU 1938, 47–50, nº 17; HIMMELMANN 1962, 122–123, fig. 39, 2; 1980, 144, fig. 498; 152, fig. 539; WEGNER 1966, 47, nº 116, fig. 64b; 70.71; FITTSCHEN 1969, 301 ff.; 1972, 491–492; 1979, 585 ff.; 1992, 267, plat. 189; BERGMANN 1977, 130; ZANKER 1995, 277–278, fig. 150; WREDE 1981, 290–291, nº 252; FAEDO 1981, 90 ff., plat. 8; KOCH and SICHTERMANN 1982, 204, fig. 23; GOETTE 1990, 97, 168, nº S 111; SCHEFOLD 1997, 438, 546, fig. 324 and 325; EWALD 1998, 41 ff., fig. 18.19, 1.3–4; 1999, 167–169, nº D 3, fig. 42, 1 and 2; 43,1–4; ZANKER & EWALD 2004, 253–255, fig. 226; BORG 2009, 237–238, fig. 15; 2013, 195–196, fig. 123; BARATTE 2011, 206–207.

[10] From the hairstyle of the two women, the tomb has been dated to the end of the third quarter of the 3rd century (WEGNER 1966, 98; FAEDO 1994b, 1030). RODENWALDT (1922, 122) dated it to between 263 and 270 even though this dating coincided with Plotinus' life, which makes it difficult to identify the owner of the sarcophagus as the founder of Neoplatonism, as the German classical archaeologist asserted for the first time in 1922. On sarcophagus production in the Tetrarchy period, see KOCH and SICHTERMANN 1982, 200–201.

[11] In this text "right" and "left" are always used in relation to the monuments themselves or the figures portrayed in them, and not the right or left of the spectator looking at the piece.

[12] EWALD (1999, 38–42) observes that the figure of the gentleman in the centre is not taken from the iconography of the actual philosopher, but is characteristic of imperial and magisterial representations.

For the seriousness of his demeanour, it is not so much the *recitatio* of an orator, but rather a philosopher commenting on a passage of the text that he is holding in his hands.[13]

Two female figures with their heads covered by a cloak, depicted as Muses,[14] are situated on either side of him, showing a submissive and attentive demeanour. The woman on the left, leaning in like Polyhymnia, is helping the teacher hold the scroll with her left hand; the other, on the right, posing as Calliope, is holding a *uolumen*.

For the typological/iconographic crafting of these two Muses, the artisan resorted to the usual archetypal cartoons used in this type of Roman sarcophagus during the post-Gallienic period. In the sarcophagi of the 3rd century, Calliope occupied a prominent position in the *choros* of the muses.[15] The figure is depicted with the typical dress of the main muse: her left hand is holding a rolled up *uolumen*, while her right hand shows the *flexio digitorum*, recurrent immediately afterwards in the compositions of the Tetrarchy period.[16] The image of Polyhymnia, with her characteristic demeanour, wrapped entirely in a tight-fitting cloak that only exposes the neckline of the *chiton* and part of her forearms, is turning slightly to her right, leaning in with the weight of her body on her right leg. Bending her left arm at a right angle, with her hand holding one side of the *uolumen* unrolled by the teacher, while her other arm is flexed with her elbow supported, and her hand positioned under her chin.[17]

In the second plane of the relief, on the right and in profile, a male figure with a beard, wearing a *himation*, is situated between the deceased and the woman. On either side, two other male characters, also bearded, holding a *uolumen* in the left hand, direct their gaze to the outside, perhaps towards other companions located beyond the scene.

The image of the man on the far right, whose face is in three quarter view and who is of advanced age, has a bushy beard, bald head and reveals a bare shoulder from under his *pallium*, seems to be inspired by the portraits of Socrates, indicating that he clearly represents a philosopher.[18] For his part, the man in profile on the far left, who is of mature age and has a neat hairstyle and a thick and curly beard, is wearing a *himation*, just like the one located closest to the teacher. This marked contrast in the characterisation of these two men compared to the balder one on the left could reflect that they are engaged in other

[13] MARROU 1938, 48.

[14] BIE 1887; MARROU 1938, 231–257; WEGNER 1963; 1966; PANELLA 1967; FAEDO 1981, especially 129–132; 1992; 1994a; 1994b; WREDE 1981, 144–149; RUDOLF 1981, KOCH and SICHTERMANN 1982, 197–203; QUEYREL 1992; TURCAN 1999, 60–70; NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2001.

[15] WEGNER 1966, 98; FAEDO 1994a, 1030.

[16] WEGNER 1966, 98–99; PANELLA 1967, 31–32; FAEDO 1994a, 1057. This oratory gesture, formed with the thumbs, index and middle fingers raised, was adapted by the iconography of the first Christianity, assigning it a new symbolism (NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2001, 196 and 204–205) that has lasted to the present.

[17] PANELLA, 1967, 18; FAEDO 1981, 136; NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2001, 203.

[18] BERNOULLI 1901, I, 184–205; ZANKER 1995, esp. 12–13; 32–39, 57–62, 173–224, 310–322.

professions[19] not necessarily related to philosophy, or that they are philosophers who belong to other schools.[20]

The scene captures the precise moment that the teacher interrupts his reading of the scroll, possibly to comment on a passage of the text or to listen to a question asked by one of the attendees, perhaps by the man who is closest on his right, with his hand near his cloak.

At the back of the sarcophagus, a lion hunt, characteristic of the end of the Gallienic period, is depicted in low relief. The depiction of the hunt highlights the *uirtus* of the hunter, by referring to the *romana militia*,[21] emphasising the traditional practice of Roman courage. During the 3rd century, hunting became a popular pursuit as a way of demonstrating heroism, permeating all Roman social classes. Lion hunts, as well as those for wild boar, deer or wolves, are represented on demystified sepulchres, where footmen with rustic capes replaced the Dioscuri and robed riders.[22]

The execution of the scene is classicist. Both the beards and the hair are in chiaroscuro, with intersections of lines in the drapery. The folds in the wide curtains (*parapetasma*) in the background emphasise the loss of volume of the figures.

The main character, characterised as a "philosopher", is surrounded by his disciples, men and women. The geometrised shape of his head, with marked wrinkles, reflects the characteristics of late 3rd century portraits. Although classicist, the image seeks to capture the personality of the deceased as accurately as possible, highlighting visual forms and avoiding rigid exposition, showing certain "oriental characteristics", in keeping with the Egyptian origin of the deceased: Plotinus was born in Lycopolis in 204 or 205. His face also stands out for its concentration, inward gaze and abstraction, but in connection to cultured senatorial circles, as they are shown in the Porphyry's notice *On the Life of Plotinus and the Arrangement of his Works.*[23] Unlike most stereotyped representations of jurists or men of letters, the scene as a whole is both intimate and solemn[24], with aerial figures, where the moral figure of the teacher stands out in the centre.

Symbolism: shaping the soul

For there to be "funerary symbolism", as Turcan maintains, it is necessary "not only for the container (i.e. the image) to exactly hold the content (i.e. the meaning) or for the signifier to materially coincide with the signified, but also for the signification to be appropriate to the

[19] According to BORG (2009, 238), these two men are experts in other fields not necessarily philosophical.

[20] ZANKER 1995, 278; EWALD 1999, 94.

[21] Hor. *Sat.* II.2.10.

[22] TURCAN 1999, 66. On representations of hunting on Roman sarcophagi, see ZANKER & EWALD 2004, 225–227, fig. 203 and fig. 204; 348–351, fig. 38.

[23] See *infra*, n. 47 and n. 54.

[24] BARATTE 2011, 207.

deceased as such".[25] For this, it is also necessary not to interpret that symbolism in isolation, but in connection with the funerary iconology as a whole, which in the case of this tomb attributed to the philosopher Plotinus rests on a doctrinal system based on the Neoplatonic ethics of virtues. At this point, it is somewhat close to symbolism and Christian imagery, which, for the most part, is of pagan origin. This hermeneutical connection allows us to note a certain chronologically defined homogeneity over the course of the 2nd and 2nd centuries CE.[26]

In his treatise *De pallio,* Tertullian contrasted the toga of the Roman citizen with the *pallium* of the philosopher.[27] The sarcophagus shows that the deceased sets aside the obligations of a Roman senator (*togatus*) to devote himself to the practice of philosophy (*palliatus*). Thus, we can think that the owner of the sarcophagus meditates, dedicated to the teaching of philosophy, comments on texts by Plato, Aristotle or the Stoics, but without abandoning the obligations to the State that his social status requires him to perform.

For Seneca, nothing but virtue can give us immortality.[28] The four cardinal virtues of a good Roman citizen are courage, mercy, piety, concord and conjugal fidelity. For his part, in his treatise *On Virtue* (*Enn.* I, 2 [19]), Plotinus distinguishes four levels corresponding to four types of virtue: civic, purifying, contemplative and paradigmatic virtues.[29] These virtues are inherent to the soul, since, in Intelligence, there are no virtues, but only models of virtue. But *uirtus* is inseparable from *sapientia*, and both come from nutrition (*trophe*) and education (*paideia*), everything that, according to Plato in *Phaedo*, the soul carries with it when it reaches Hades.[30] According to the narrative thread of the relief, it is about giving form to the soul, ordering it, thanks to the Muses, as if in a certain way the philosopher is making an effort to sculpt his own statue.[31]

In the funerary context of the 3rd and 4th centuries, the *uolumen* in the hand of both the Muses and men can refer to a book, either concerning a specific branch of human knowledge or a more generic order, expressing universal knowledge.[32] Through the cultivation of the sciences, the Muses allow the exercise of virtue and come to resemble the divine. In *Timaeus*, Plato considered effort in the love of knowledge as a virtue conducive to elevating thought to

[25] TURCAN 1978, 1733 (= TURCAN 2003, 203).

[26] WOOD 1986, 24–25.

[27] Tert. *De pallio*, 5.1: *a toga ad pallium*; see 6.1–2.

[28] Sen. *Ep.* 73.15.

[29] On the four kinds or degrees of virtue in Plotinus, see ZAMORA CALVO 2013, 276–290.

[30] Pl. *Phd.* 107d.

[31] Plot. *Enn.* I.6 [1] 9.

[32] MARROU 1938, 190–196.

the spheres of the divine.[33] For Plutarch, Polyhymnia embodied the disposition of souls to the love of wisdom.[34]

Throughout the 3rd century CE, the theme of the Muses was disseminated in the field of funerary art from the philosophical schools permeating practically all social classes, contributing decisively to the shaping of Roman eschatology.[35] The depiction of the two Muses—Polyhymnia and Calliope—signifies that the deceased possessed, through them, all culture (πάσης μουσικῆς μετέχουσα), that is to say, the totality of the manifestations of intellectual activity, capturing the expression that Marrou applies to the inscription of the tombstone of Claudia Itala (Paris, Louvre, Depot: H.I).[36] But the "Muses" not only relate to themselves, but to all fields of knowledge. Indeed, the "Muses" (*Mousai*) are so named because they are "initiators" (*muousai*) of men into the sciences, that is, they teach them beautiful and useful things that are beyond the reach of the ignorant.[37]

The sarcophagus, as a *monumentum*, seeks to address the concern to endure in the memory of men. The deceased and his companions are depicted exchanging Greek and Roman elements, from philosophy and oratory.

According to the Roman conception, *felicitas* comes and derives from *pietas.*[38] With respect to *concordia*, during the 3rd century, its scope was related to public life, particularly to senatorial dignity. In the Magistrate's sarcophagus (so-called "Brother sarcophagus", *ca.* 260/270 CE; Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6603),[39] the physiognomy of the two male figures suggests that it is the same man in two places at once: depicted with a senatorial toga on the left and with a Greek *himation* characteristic of the philosopher, with a bare torso pointing to a roll of papyrus, on the right.[40] The theme of the main scene shows the importance of education for a high Roman official, who is surrounded by lictors and other companions, which illustrates his high position as a senatorial official. Thus, the sarcophagus would reveal the dual vocation of its owner: a Roman senator who devoted himself to philosophical practice. This Neapolitan memorial, however, is unique among its kind in that it does not include the image of the Muses, and seems to have been a personal commission.

---

[33] Pl. *Ti.* 90b.

[34] Plu. *Quaestiones conuiuales*, IX.14.7.746e. For Horace, the Muse gave him happy residence in heaven. HORACE, *Od.* IV.8.28–29: *dignum laude uirum Musa uetat mori / caelo Musa beat.*

[35] NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2001, 185–186; who follows at this point to MARROU 1938; CUMONT 1942, 253–350; and TURCAN 1999.

[36] MARROU 1938, 76–77, nº 71, fig. 3. See TURCAN 1999, 75; see also EWALD 1999, 59; BORG 2009, 229, n. 41.

[37] D.S. *Bibliotheca historica*, IV.7; cf. Phot. *Bibl.* 279.530b–531a (VIII.173.40 Henry). On muses in the "philosopher sarcophagi", see CUMONT 1942, ch. 4; EWALD 1999, 29–53; HANSEN 2008, 276–277.

[38] TURCAN 1988, 5.

[39] EWALD 1999, 54–56; 200–201, G9, fig. 88, 1; WREDE 2001, 70–71, fig. 17, 1; ZANKER & EWALD 2004, 169; BORG 2009, 228, fig. 14; BORG 2010, 242–243, fig. 5; 2013, 190, fig. 119.

[40] BORG 2009, 235.

In the so-called Plotinus sarcophagus, the arrangement of the figures is hierarchical. The portrait of the deceased is similar to the "face" of the apostle Paul, with the same characteristic physiognomic features, conveyed in the same way throughout the centuries of Christian art. From the style of his shoes (*calcei*), he can be specifically identified as a member of an equestrian order. In general terms, the portrait does not inherently correspond to that of a philosopher, but to that of a well-to-do and learned Roman citizen seated on a podium, reminiscent of a magistrate presiding over a trial, accompanied by his female relatives with their hairstyles like Roman matrons.[41]

An encyclopaedic education is a prerequisite for philosophical practice. Although, ultimately, the most important thing is adherence to a moral standard that can only be achieved through *askesis,* spiritual training, and the help of a role model whose own life supports the exercise of purification and the return to itself.

Plotinus invited each soul to purify itself of everything that had been added to it in consortium with the body. Only "when it returns to itself (ὅταν ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ἀνέλθῃ)",[42] purifying itself of the body, will it live a "good and wise life"[43] and believe that it is immortal, situating itself in the intelligible region and in the pure region: "For he will see an intellect which sees nothing perceived by the senses (ὄψεται γὰρ νοῦν ὁρῶντα οὐκ αἰσθητόν τι), none of these mortal things (τι οὐδὲ τῶν θνητῶν τούτων), but apprehends the eternal by its eternity, and all the things in the intelligible world (πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ νοητῷ)".[44] The deceased "philosopher" addresses his listeners, each soul that shares his search, to, distancing itself from the corporeal, discover and persuade itself that it is part of divine nature.[45]

Plotinus' aristocratic circle in Rome

Plotinus arrived in Rome in 244, at the age of 40. He was soon welcomed by social and cultural elites, such as Gemina, a rich aristocratic widow,[46] in whose house he lived and established his school.[47] Thus, he adopted the social model of the philosopher, guest of an important family, who exercised the function of teacher, counsellor and spiritual guide. This same model had

[41] On the formal nature of the faces and hairstyles of the Muses, as well as the figures of the philosophers in the sarcophagi of this period, see FITTSCHEN 1972, 494; FAEDO 1981, 93.

[42] Plot. *Enn.* IV.7 [2] 10.14.

[43] Plot. *Enn.* IV.7 [2] 10.5–6. See Pl. *R.* 521a4.

[44] Plot. *Enn.* IV.7 [2] 10.32–35. Trans. ARMSTRONG 1984, 383. Cf. *Enn.* IV.8 [6] 1.1–10; see O'MEARA 2013, 38–46.

[45] WOOD 1986, 24.

[46] SAFFREY (1992, 4) suggests that she was the wife (later widow) of Emperor Trebonianus Gallus, Decius' successor (years 251–253).

[47] GOULET-CAZÉ 1982, 231–257. O'MEARA (2003, 14) describes the house of Gemina in which Plotinus lived as an "unofficial circle or philosophical school".

been reproduced in Rome since the Republican era.[48] The house of Gemina must have been very spacious because it was also home to slaves, numerous pupils to whose tutelage he was entrusted, the widow Chione, with her children, who entrusted him with the administration of her fortune.[49]

In the biography that he dedicated to his teacher, Porphyry did not explicitly mention a "school"[50] of Plotinus, although he makes reference to the teacher, disciples and the classes he taught. Plotinus' circle enjoyed official recognition in the 3rd century. Thus, Longinus, despite not agreeing with him on many doctrinal points, gave him a privileged position in the philosophical context of his time.[51] His disciple Porphyry presented Plotinus as a teacher (*didaskalos*)[52] and, with great frequency, alluded to classes and meetings in which he had discussions with his disciples. The students took notes, which Amelius later collected together in the form of books,[53] and, as in all academic years, there were holidays.[54]

Plotinus had an excellent relationship with the Roman aristocracy, counting, as he did, among his disciples and listeners, a number of senators[55] and his personal friends Emperor

[48] The civic elites shared with the Greek intellectual elites the same basic, rhetorical and philosophical culture. To model the figure of power in Rome, the influence of the Stoics was decisive. After a power crisis, the emperors needed to re-establish a consensus with the Senate, people and army.

The question of the position occupied by philosophers in Rome began in the High Empire, where the Stoic doctrine constituted a kind of substratum in the culture of the elites, as in the case of the "Stoic senators" of the 1st century. But this phenomenon continued into the age of the Antonines, where imperial power and philosophy were mutually reconciled; in the 3rd century, the senator Rogatianus, friend and disciple of Plotinus, renounced the quality of life and privileges of his rank. See Porph. *Plot.* 7.31–46. On this topic, see GANGLOFF 2018, 457–458.

[49] Porph. *Plot.* 9.5–10; 11.15.

[50] August. *Ep.* 118.5.33: *tunc Plotini schola Romae floruit habuitque condiscipulos multos acutissimos et sollertissimos viros*. See GOULET-CAZÉ 1982, 31.

[51] Porph. *Plot.* 19.36–37.

[52] Porph. *Plot.* 18.21.

[53] Porph. *Plot.* 3.46–47; 4.5.

[54] Porph. *Plot.* 5.3–5; see GOULET-CAZÉ 1982, 229–327.

[55] Porph. *Plot.* 7.29–30. The disciples (*zelotai*), close friends faithful to the group who gathered around the teacher for the love of philosophy, sought to imitate Plotinus intellectually and in their way of life. They were also characterised by their mature age and high social status. Porphyry provided a list of its members: Amelius from Tuscany, whose family name was Gentilianus (*Plot.* 7.1–4); Paulinus, whom Amelius nicknamed "Mikkalos", "because he was so prone to misunderstanding" (*Plot.* 7.5–7); the doctor , the Alexandrian Eustochius, whom Plotinus cared for until his death; Zoticus, critic and poet, author of a number of amendments to the text of Antimachus, and who put the Plato's myth of Atlantis into verse; the doctor Zethus from Arabia, married to a daughter of Theodosius, Ammonius' former companion; Castricius, surnamed Firmus, to whom Porphyry dedicated his treatise *De abstinentia*; the members of the Senate: Marcellus Orontius, Sabinillus and Rogatianus; and Porphyry himself. A total of eleven people were therefore included on the list of "disciples".

Rogatianus renounced all of his possessions, dismissed all of his slaves and even resigned his position as senator. When he became a praetor, and was to be taken to the court, with the lictors already at his door, he refused to come out or to have anything to do with the office. This senator, who abandoned political life, was whom Plotinus loved.

Gallienus and Empress Salonina.[56] At that time, however, Rome was not a dynamic philosophical centre like Athens or Alexandria. His school was not part of the official chairs of the empire,[57] nor was it a private institution: the courses were public and free, disciples and listeners discussed and shared a way of life, and women, who were "philosophers in their own right", also attended.[58] Plotinus imparted an education that was open to all, but without directing an official institution that would have received a salary from Rome or from the emperor. Although the word *demosieuontes*, used by Longinus to refer to Plotinus and Amelius,[59] suggests that we should not rule out the possibility that Plotinus received a state pension or grant, at least during the reign of Gallienus (253–268).

If Plato's great project consisted of founding a city whose philosophers would be kings, Plotinus, who is considered to have purified Platonism of every political component, longed for a city governed by the *Laws* of Plato, and gave it the name of "Platonopolis".[60] This political project, which could not be carried out due to the intrigues of certain people close to the emperor, revealed the presence of Plotinus in the midst of the Roman aristocracy. On the one hand, the teaching of the philosopher was aimed at listeners and disciples belonging to the senatorial political class in order to dissuade them of some of their political proposals[61] and, on the other, his teaching exercised an arbitratory function with such diplomacy that he would not make a single enemy during his 26 years of Roman life.[62]

In the house of Gemina, Plotinus did not teach in the manner of a salon philosopher, but rather led a community organised and inspired by Pythagorean precepts: vegetarianism,[63]

---

made him welcome and, heaping the highest praise upon him, constantly held him up as an example to those who engaged in philosophy" (*Plot.* 7.44–46; trans. EDWARDS 2000, 16).

We cannot be sure though if this is a comprehensive list or whether Porphyry, in this passage of the biography, named only people who occupied an important social position in Rome. BRISSON 1982, 55–114; 1992, 235; SCHRAMM 2013, 110, n. 115.

[56] Porph. *Plot.* 12.1.

[57] Through Porphyry, we know that during Plotinus' period of teaching in Rome (245–270), Platonic *diadochi* in Athens continued at the head of the Academy and, as SAFFREY and WESTERINK (1968, xxxvii) point out, were holders of the chairs of Platonic philosophy in the School. We do, however, have to differentiate between the title of "Platonic diadochus" from that of "scholarch" from the Academy. In the imperial era, the title of "diadochus" was reserved exclusively for the holders of the official chairs of philosophy.

[58] GOULET-CAZÉ 1982, 239; SAFFREY 1992, 32; MÄNNLEIN-ROBERT 2005, 249; MICHALEWSKI 2017, 541–542.

[59] Porph. *Plot.* 20.32.

[60] O'MEARA 2003; SCHRAMM 2013, 1–2; 55–56, and 110; ZAMORA CALVO 2015.

[61] Porph. *Plot.* 7.20–21.

[62] Porph. *Plot.* 9.20–22: "Therefore, though he stayed in Rome for twenty-six whole years, and played the arbiter for many in their disputes with one another, he did not once make a foe of anyone in the political class". Trans. EDWARD 2000, 18. As Igal points out, it was probably 25 complete years: from the spring of 244 until the end of 269 or the beginning of 270. See IGAL 1982, 145–146, n. 50.

[63] Porph. *Plot.* 2.3–5.

sobriety,[64] reduced sleep,[65] refusal to go to public baths,[66] and celibacy. All these practices were based on the feeling of shame that Plotinus felt to be in a body, which led him to refuse to have his portrait made[67] or to celebrate his birthday.[68] Plotinus' disciples left their possessions at his disposal, which we can associate with Pythagorean principles of community of property and the firm friendship that united the members of a school. The teacher's affection towards his disciples manifested itself in his custom of greeting them with a kiss.[69] For their part, the disciples showed him a quasi-religious admiration.

Thus, in his Roman school, traditions inherited from the Academy and Pythagoreanism converged, creating a dynamic form of Platonism. Plotinus' aim was not so much to educate young people in a traditional way, but to extend to a circle of disciples his new interpretation of Platonism.

The "image of an image"

Porphyry recounted that Plotinus refused to pose for a portrait, considering that this would only be the "image of an image".[70] This story can help us to interpret the following key point: for Plotinus, that which was essential lay in the inner life of the intellective soul, and not in the anecdotes of incarnate life, since the body is only an image of the soul. Plotinus was opposed to the making of his portrait, the "image of an image", the "reflection of a reflection" (εἰδώλου εἴδωλον);[71] however, his fundamental concern was conveying a philosophical education, whose purpose was to show the need for the soul to turn to the intelligible principles from which it came. The soul, starting from a return to itself, indulges, becomes aware of its power and dignity.[72]

A portrait, whether sculpted or painted, takes as a model the human body, that is, it is the reflection of a body that, in turn, is a reflection of another reality. For Plotinus, each level of reality is an image of the level immediately above, and, in turn, constitutes a model of the level immediately below. What is generated is the image of the generator:[73] Intelligence is the image of the Good-One,[74] the Soul is the image of Intelligence;[75] and the sensible world is the

[64] Porph. *Plot.* 8.21–22.
[65] Porph. *Plot.* 8.22.
[66] Porph. *Plot.* 2.5–6.
[67] Porph. *Plot.* 1.4–9.
[68] Porph. *Plot.* 2.37–40.
[69] Porph. *Plot.* 2.17.
[70] Porph. *Plot.* 1.2. At the beginning of his first chapter, Porphyry reflected on the episode of the portrait, which Amelius, his disciple and assistant, wanted but the teacher refused.
[71] Porph. *Plot.* 1.8.
[72] Plot. *Enn.* V.1 [10] 1.27–28.
[73] Plot. *Enn.* V.1 [10] 7.39–41.
[74] Plot. *Enn.* V.4 [7] 2.26; V.1 [10] 7.1; VI.8 [39] 18.36.

image of the intelligible world.[76] According to this processional scheme, the body can be considered the *eidolon* of the soul;[77] and the portrait, as an "image of an image", is a replica of the body.

In Plotinian anthropology, there is a descending hierarchy that started from the true man (the soul, independent of the body), his image (the body) and the image of the image (the portrait).[78] A copy always occupies a lower, gradually degraded level with respect to the model: the intelligible world is a model of the sensible world, which, in turn, is a model of the painting.[79] For Plotinus, the image (the portrait, which lacks life) is inferior in the 3rd degree[80] to the first archetype (the true man), since it took as a model the body (the visible man).

The sculptor sculpts the body, and not the soul, just as the sensible world reflects the intelligible, but not Intelligence. The sculptor, or the painter, reproduces only the component of lower dignity, since he takes as a model the body and not the soul.[81]

Conclusions

In fact, at the end of the 3rd century and the beginning of the 4th century, "the altars of Plotinus were still being kindled and his books were in the hands of cultivated people, more than the dialogues of Plato!".[82] Through the biography and edition of the *Enneads*, Porphyry wanted to convey the message that philosophy was the true means that enabled the soul to be elevated to the divine.[83]

Both the archaeologist and historian of philosophy tried to correctly identify the representations, in the first case, remains, and, in the second, texts. The exegesis of the sarcophagus of the philosopher teaching, preserved in the Vatican Museums, is of great interest to those who wish to explore the aesthetic and moral environment of the ruling classes of the Empire in a period that Dodds refers to as the "Age of Anxiety".[84]

The relief is in a sepulchre style characterised by the introduction in the first compositional plane of the symbolic image of the deceased as a philosopher teaching, flanked

[75] Plot. *Enn.* V.1 [10] 3.6–7; 6.46–47; V.3 [49] 8.9–13.

[76] Plot. *Enn.* V.8 [31] 7.14–15; 8.20; II.9 [33] 4.25–26; 8.15–29.

[77] Porph. *Plot.*1.6–8.

[78] Plot. *Enn.* VI.7 [38] 5.11–16.

[79] Plot. *Enn.* VI.2 [43] 22.33–46.

[80] Plotinus took Plato's comments as a reference, that art is a 3rd-degree imitation of the true being, see Pl. *R.* VI.597e; 598b; 599a–d; 600e; 602c.

[81] Plot. *Enn.* VI.2 [43] 22.33–46; see the analysis of PÉPIN 1992, 306–307.

[82] SAFFREY and SEGONDS 2012, xxv.

[83] On the last words pronounced by Plotinus to his doctor and disciple Eustochius, collected in Porphyry's biography (*Plot.* 2.25–27), see ZAMORA CALVO 2018.

[84] DODDS 1965.

by two Muses, who are an expression of heroism and immortality, through the cultivation during their earthly existence of philosophy and science. On the second plane of the composition stand three bearded male characters of philosophical/intellectual nature, with the one located on the far right depicted with Socratic features. On the third plane, a wide curtain (*parapestama*) spans the compositional background in its entire width.

Rodenwaldt was the first to identify the teacher seated squarely in the centre, unfolding a scroll in his hands, as Plotinus teaching in front of his disciples.[85] This central character, however, is not wearing the usual philosopher's *pallium*, but a toga and the *calcei* characteristic of Roman gentlemen, meaning that this is not the sarcophagus of the founder of Neoplatonism, but that of a Roman citizen belonging to the senatorial aristocracy or equestrian bourgeoisie, who, given the iconographic details in the composition, shows a clear interest in the teaching of philosophy and the cultivation of science.[86] Moreover, in the Roman sarcophagi of this period, it was common practice to include the teacher and characterise him as a thinker or philosopher, together with the Muses who appear to be listening attentively to his teachings.[87]

The scene of the portrait, together with this requirement of communicating the desire to live differently, indicates that Plotinus himself would have been surprised that someone would create a tomb for his body, since it would signify an attraction to the inferior powers of the soul to endure in physical memory by means of a superfluous iconographic erudition instead of by the conveying of his philosophical teaching. For Plotinus, "each of us is an intelligible universe (ἐσμὲν ἕκαστος κόσμος νοητός)".[88] As a result, each human being, by updating the intellective dimension of his soul, can be in contact and unite with the cosmos of intelligible forms. The desire to be portrayed by someone connects us with the sensible, chaining us to the lower parts of the universe, the one of external appearances; conversely, curiosity to learn about the principles raises us to the upper parts of the intelligible universe.[89]

Acknowledgement. This paper belongs to the Research Project HAR2017-83613-C2-2-P: "Neoplatonic Readings on the Immortality of the Soul: from Plotinus to Damascius", subsided by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness, and is part of the activities of the UAM Research Group: "Influences of Greek Ethics on Contemporary Philosophy" (Ref. F-055).

[85] RODENWALDT 1922, 120, fig. 6, 122.

[86] EDWALD 1999, 169; LANG 2012, 1070.

[87] FAEDO 1994b, 1043–1045; nº 158–171.

[88] Plot. *Enn.* III,4 [15] 3.22. Plotinus said that "we are an intelligible universe", and not "the intelligible universe". See Procl. *in Prm.* 948.15–18. "Intelligible", with the meaning of transcendent, as opposed to "sensible". As each individual is his soul, each individual is, like the soul, an ordered system of transcendent powers, some superior and others superior. See IGAL 1985, 107–108, n. 26; and 112, n. 46.

[89] Plot. *Enn.* III.4 [15] 3.23–25; see MICHALEWSKI 2017, 544.

References

ARMSTRONG, A.H. 1984. *Plotinus with an English Translation*, IV, *Enneads IV. 1–9*. Cambridge, MA–London.

BARATTE, F. 2011. *Histoire de l'art antique: l'art romain*. Paris.

BENNDORF, O., R. SCHÖNE 1867. *Die antiken Bildwerke des Lateranensischen Museums*. Leipzig.

BERGMANN, M. 1977. *Studien zum römischen Porträt des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr*. Bonn.

BERNOULLI, J.J. 1901. *Griechische Ikonographie mit Ausschluss Alexanders und der Diadochen,* I: *Die Bildnisse beruhmter Griechen von der Vorzeit bis an das Ende des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*. München.

BIE, O. 1887. *Die Musen in der antiken Kunst*. Berlin.

BORG, B.E. 2009. Das Bild des Philosophen und die römischen Eliten. In: H.-G. Nesselrath (ed.), *Dion von Prusa. Der Philosoph und sein Bild*, 211–240. Tübingen.

BORG, B.E. 2010. Performanz und Bildinszenierung am Übergang zur Spätantike. In: C. Kost and C. Juwig (eds.), *Bilder in der Archäologie – Archäologie der Bilder?*, 235–248. Tübingen.

BORG, B.E. 2013. *Crisis and Ambition: Tombs and burial customs in third-century CE Rome*. Oxford.

BRISSON, L. 1982. La prosopographie. In: L. Brisson, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, R. Goulet *et alii* (eds.), *Porphyre. La Vie de Plotin*, I, *Travaux préliminaires et index grec complet*, 55–114. Paris.

BURNET, J. 1900–1907. *Platonis Opera*, I–V, *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit.* Oxford.

CALZA, R. 1953. Sui ritratti ostiensi del supposto Plotino. *Bollettino d'Arte* 38, 203–210.

CUMONT, F. 1942. *Recherches sur le symbolisme funéraire des Romains*.

DANGUILLIER, C. 2001. *Typologische Untersuchungen zur Dichter- und Denkerikonographie in römischen Darstellungen von der mittleren Kaiserzeit bis in die Spätantike*. Oxford.

DODDS, E.R. 1965. *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety: Some Aspects of Religious Experience from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine*. Cambridge.

EDWARDS, M. 2000. *Neoplatonic Saints: The Lives of Plotinus and Proclus by their Students.* Liverpool.

EWALD, B.J. 1998. Bildungswelt und Bürgerbild. Ikonographische Elemente magistratischer und bürgerlicher Repräsentation auf den römischen Musen-Philosophen-Sarkophagen. In: G. Koch (ed.), *Akten des Symposiums 125 Jahre Sarkophag-Corpus*, 39–51. Mainz.

EWALD, B.J. 1999. *Der Philosoph als Leitbild. Ikonographische Untersuchungen an römischen Sarkophagreliefs*. Mainz.

FAEDO, L. 1981. I sarcophagi romani con muse. In: H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, 12.2, 65–155. Berlin–New York.

FAEDO, L. 1992. Le Muse suadenti. Contributi sull'iconografia delle Muse. *Studi Classici e Orientali* 42, 165–187.

FAEDO, L. 1994a. Mousa, Mousai, Le Muse in età ellenistica. In: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (*LIMC*), VII, 991–1013, Zürich–München.

FAEDO, L. 1994b. Mousa, Mousai, Le Muse sui sarcophagi. In: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (*LIMC*), VII, 1030–1059. Zürich–München.

FISCHER-BOSSERT, W. 2001. Der Portraittypus des sog. Plotin: Zur Deutung von Barten in der römischen Portraitkunst. *Archaologischer Anzeiger* 1, 137–152.

FITTSCHEN, K. 1969. Zu einem Sarkophag-Fragment in Berlin. *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 301–308.

FITTSCHEN, K. 1972. M. Wegner, Die Musensarkophage. *Gnomon* 44, 486–504.

FITTSCHEN, K. 1979. Sarkophage römischer Kaiser oder vom Nutzen der Porträtforschung. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 94, 578–593.

FITTSCHEN, K. 1992. Zur Rekonstruktion griechischer Dichterstatuen. 2. Teil: Die Statuen des Poseidippos und des Ps.-Menander. *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts Athenische Abteilung* 107, 229–271.

GANGLOFF, A. 2018. *Pouvoir impérial et vertus philosophiques: l'évolution de la figure du bon prince sous le Haut-Empire*. Leiden and Boston.

GOETZ, G., F. SCHOELL. 1910. *M. Terenti Varronis de Lingua Latina*. Leipzig.

GOETTE, H.R. 1990. *Studien zu römischen Togadarstellungen*. Mainz.

GOLDBACHER, A. 1898. *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis episcopi Epistulae. Pars II, Ep. XXXI–CXXIII*. Vienna.

GOULET-CAZÉ, M.-O. 1982. L'arrière-plan scolaire de la *Vie de Plotin*. In: L. Brisson, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, R. Goulet *et alii* (eds.), *Porphyre. La Vie de Plotin*, I, *Travaux préliminaires et index grec complet*, 229–337. Paris.

HANSEN, I.L. 2008. Muses as Models: Learning and the Complicity of Authority. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volumes* 7, 273–285.

HEINTZE H. von. 1963. *Vir sanctus et gravis*. Bildniskopf eines spätantiken Philosophen. *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 6, 35–53.

HENRY, R. 1959-1991. *Photius. Bibliothèque*, I–IX. Paris.

HENRY, P., H.-R. SCHWYZER 1964. Porphyrii *Vita Plotini*. In: P. Henry & H.-R. Schwyzer (eds.), *Plotini Opera*, I, 1–38. Oxford.

HENRY, P., SCHWYZER, H.-R. 1964-1982. *Plotini Opera*, I–III. Oxford.

HIMMELMANN, N. 1962. Sarkophag eines gallienischen Konsuls. In: N. Himmelmann & H. Biesantz (eds), *Festschrift für Friedrich Matz*, 110–124. Mainz.

HIMMELMANN, N. 1980. *Über Hirtengenre in der antiken Kunst*. Opladen.

HUNINK, V. 2005. *Tertullian. De pallio.* Amsterdam.

IGAL, J. 1982. *Porfirio: Vida de Plotino. Plotino: Enéadas I–II*. Madrid.

IGAL, J. 1985. *Plotino. Enéadas. III–IV*. Madrid.

KOCH, G., SICHTERMANN, H. 1982, *Römische Sarkophage*, München.

KRUEGER, P., MOMMSEN, T. 1962-1963. *Digesta Iustiniani Augusti*, I–II. Berlin.

L'ORANGE, H.P. 1951. The Portrait of Plotinus. *Les Cahiers Archéologiques* 5, 15–30.

L'ORANGE, H.P. 1957. Plotinus-Paul. *Byzantion* 27, 473–486.

L'ORANGE, H.P. 1961. I ritratti di Plotino ed il tipo di San Paolo nell'arte tardo-antica. In: *Atti del VII Congresso Int. Archeologia Classica (Napoli 1958)*, II, 475–485. Roma.

LANG, J. 2012. Plotin. Iconographie. In: R. Goulet (ed.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, V, *De Paccius à Rutilius Rufus*. 1re partie – Va. *De Paccius à Plotin*, 1068–1070. Paris.

MÄNNLEIN-ROBERT, I. 2005. Longin und Plotin über die Seele. Beobachtungen zu methodischen Differenzen in der Auseinandersetzung platonischer Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts n.Chr. mit Epikur und Stoa. In: R. Chiaradonna (ed.), *Studi sull'anima in Plotino*, 223–250. Napoli.

MAYHOFF, C. 1892-1909. *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae*, I–V. Leipzig.

MARROU, H.-I. 1938. ΜΟΥΣΙΚΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ. *Étude sur les scènes de la vie intellectuelle figurant sur les monuments funéraires romains*. Grenoble.

MASSI, P. 1792. *Indicazione antiquaria del pontificio museo Pio-Clementino in Vaticano* (= *Catalogue indicatif des antiquités composant le musée Pie-Clèmentin au Vatican par Paschal Massi de Cesène garde dudit musèe*). Roma.

MICHALEWSKI, A. 2017. Vivre en philosophe. Signification de la *philosophia* dans la *Vie de Plotin*. In: P. Vesperini (ed.), *Philosophari. Usages romains des savoirs grecs sous la République et sous l'Empire,* 535–562. Paris.

NOGUERA CELDRÁN, J.M. 2001. "Las musas en Murcia". A propósito de dos sarcófagos romanos de edad tetrárquica reutilizados en el siglo XVI en la Catedral de Cartagena (Murcia). In: J.M. Noguera Celdrán and E. Conde Guerri (eds.), *El sarcófago romano. Contribuciones al estudio de su tipología, iconografía y centros de producción. Actas de las Jornadas de Estudio celebradas en la Universidad de Murcia del 8 al 17 de mayo de 2000*, 175– 255. Murcia.

O'MEARA, D.J. 2003. *Platonopolis: Platonic Political Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. Oxford–New York.

O'MEARA, D.J. 2013. *Sur les traces de l'Absolu: études de philosophie Antique*. Fribourg.

PANELLA, C. 1967. Iconografia delle muse sui sarcofagi romani. *Studi miscellanei* 12, 327–351.

PÉPIN, J. 1992. L'épisode du portrait de Plotin (*VP* 1.4–9). In: L. Brisson a, J.-L. Cherlonneix, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé *et alii* (eds.), *Porphyre. La Vie de Plotin*, II, *Études d'introduction, texte grec et traduction française, commentaire, notes complémentaires, bibliographie*, 301–334. Paris.

QUEYREL, A. 1992. Mousa, Mousai. In: *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (*LIMC*), VI, 657–681. Zürich and München.

REYNOLDS, L.D. 1965. *L. Annaei Senecae Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*. Oxford.

RODENWALD, G. 1922. Porträts auf spätrömischen Sarkophagen Gerhart Rodenwaldt. *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 57 (N.F. 33), 119–123.

ROMEO, I. 2009. Ritratti ostiensi del tipo "Plotino": repliche, prototipo, interpretazione. In: C. Braidotti, E. Dettori & E. Lanzillotta (eds.), *Ou pân ephèmeron: In memoria di Roberto Pretagostini*, II, 749–767. Roma.

RUDOLF, E. 1981. Typologische Untersuchungen zu den stadtrömischen Musensarkophagen des 3. Jhs. n.Chr. In: *Marburger Winckelmann-Programm,* 33–43. Marburg.

SAFFREY, H.D. 1992. Pourquoi Porphyre a-t-il édité Plotin ? Réponse provisoire. In: L. Brisson, J.-L. Cherlonneix, M.-O. Goulet-Cazé *et alii* (eds.), *Porphyre. La Vie de Plotin*, II, *Études d'introduction, texte grec et traduction française, commentaire, notes complémentaires, bibliographie*, 31–64. Paris.

SAFFREY, H.D., A.-P. SEGONDS 2012. *Porphyre. Lettre à Anébon l'Égyptien*, Paris.

SAFFREY, H.D., L.G. WESTERINK 1968. *Proclus. Théologie platonicienne*, I. Paris.

SAPELLI, M. 2001. Ritratto maschile cosidetto Plotino. In: S. Ensoli & E. La Rocca (eds.), *Aurea Roma: dalla città pagana alla città cristiana*, 646 f, nº 353. Roma.

SCHEFOLD, K. 1997. *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*. Basel.

SCHOTT, J.M. 2013. Plotinus's Portrait and Pamphilus's Prison Notebook: Neoplatonic and Early Christian Textualities at the Turn of the Fourth Century C.E. *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 21, 329–362.

SCHRAMM, M. 2013. *Freundschaft im Neuplatonismus: politisches Denken und Sozialphilosophie von Plotin bis Kaiser Julian*. Berlin and Boston.

STEEL, C., C. MACÉ, P. D'HOINE 2007-2009. *Procli in Platonis Parmenidem commentaria,* I–III. Oxford.

TURCAN, R. 1978. Les sarcophages romains et le problème du symbolisme funéraire. In: W. von Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II, 16.2, 1700–1735. Berlin–New York (= In: TURCAN, R. 2003. *Études d'archéologie sépulcrale: sarcophages romains et gallo-romains*, 165–205. Paris).

TURCAN, R. 1988. *Religion romaine. Le culte*. Leiden.

TURCAN, R. 1999. *Messages d'outre-tombe: l'iconographie des sarcophages romains*. Paris.

VOGEL, F., C.T. FISCHER 1888–1906. *Diodori Bibliotheca historica*, I–V. Leipzig.

WEGNER, M. 1966. *Die Musensarkophage*. Berlin.

WICKHAM, C., H.W. GARROD 1912. *Q. Horati Flacci opera*. Oxford.

WOOD, S.E. 1986. *Roman Portrait Sculpture, 217–260 AD: The Transformation of an Artistic Tradition*. Leiden.

WREDE, H. 1981. *Consecratio in forman Deorum: Vergottliche Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz.

WREDE, H. 2001. *Senatorische Sarkophage Roms. Der Beitrag des Senatorenstandes zur römischen Kunst der hohen und späten Kaiserzeit*. Mainz.

ZAMORA CALVO, J.M. 2013. Neoplatonic Ethics of Virtue. In: G. Rossi (ed.), *Nature and the Best Life Exploring the Natural Bases of Practical Normativity in Ancient Philosophy*, 275–295. Hildesheim.

ZAMORA CALVO, J.M. 2015. Restaurar una ciudad ideal: Plotino y el proyecto de Platonópolis. *Politica antica* 5, 209–226.

ZAMORA CALVO, J.M. 2018. ¿Cómo elevarse a lo divino? Sobre las últimas palabras de Plotino. *Synthesis-La Plata* 25, 83–103.

ZANKER, P. 1995. *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity*. Berkeley–Los Angeles.

ZANKER, P., B.C. EWALD 2004. *Mit Mythen leben: die Bildwerke der römischen Sarkophage*. München.

ZEVI, F. 2016. Sui ritratti ostiensi creduti di Plotino. *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia. Serie III, Rendiconti* 88, 137–157.