THE IMPERIAL CULT AND THE INDIVIDUAL:
THE NEGOTIATION OF AUGUSTUS' PRIVATE WORSHIP
DURING HIS LIFETIME AT ROME

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Ancient Mediterranean Studies
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
CLAIRE McGRAW
Dr. Dennis Trout, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2019

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

THE IMPERIAL CULT AND THE INDIVIDUAL:
THE NEGOTIATION OF AUGUSTUS' PRIVATE WORSHIP
DURING HIS LIFETIME AT ROME

presented by Claire McGraw,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Dennis Trout

Professor Anatole Mori

Professor Raymond Marks

Professor Marcello Mogetta

Professor Sean Gurd

DEDICATION

There are many people who deserve to be mentioned here, and I hope I have not forgotten anyone. I must begin with my family, Tom, Michael, Lisa, and Mom. Their love and support throughout this entire process have meant so much to me. I dedicate this project to my Mom especially; I must acknowledge that nearly every good thing I know and good decision I've made is because of her. She has (literally and figuratively) pushed me to achieve this dream. Mom has been my rock, my wall to lean upon, every single day. I love you, Mom.

Tom, Michael, and Lisa have been the best siblings and sister-in-law. Tom thinks what I do is cool, and that means the world to a little sister. Michael and Lisa send their love and support (and pictures of their dogs), somehow knowing exactly when I could use a little bully-love.

I would never have gotten to this point, writing a dissertation, if it had not been for my father. He was an eighth-grade science teacher who took Latin in college so he could better learn scientific names, and in the process fell in love with the ancient world. He fostered that love in his children, but died from cancer while I was still in middle school. In the first year of my master's, I came across a letter of Cicero contemplating apotheosis for his late daughter Tullia, and I understood Cicero's grief all too well. This set me on a path to the divine emperors of Rome; by studying these deified men, I hope to honor my father's memory while looking forward to my own future, just as the Romans had done.

I have been beyond fortunate to have a wonderful group of friends who have helped me, lifting me up when I'm down, rallying around me when I need support, and celebrating every triumph, no matter how small. I begin with Brad Bunch, because he

will like that. I met Brad in undergrad Latin and he has a good soul. Brad was my roommate during my master's and he became my best friend. Brad deserves so much and I can't mention it all here, but he knows.

Dr. Andy Smith and Shari Faber are the kind of people you're lucky to know, and even luckier if they are your friends. Without them, I would have floundered in Columbia. Andy is a careful listener, a skilled scholar, and has a strong sense of right and wrong. He loves all living things and he taught me that sometimes the best option is to watch the turtles for a little while. Shari is the kind of person who knows herself, which gives her strength, and she lends that strength to those around her. I feel I can say that she believes in me, and believes I can accomplish what I aim to do, and that is empowering. Both have taught me that the important things are worth taking a day-off for. I would not have completed my dissertation if they hadn't taught me to enjoy the moment I'm in and the people I'm with. The two of them together are unstoppable, and they are fierce in their friendship and I thank them for everything; thank you for making me a part of your family.

I must also thank Anna Meyer, Shawna Young, Elizabeth Janda, Josh Nudell, Kristin Harper, and Cassie Yacovazzi. They deserve more space than this, but I did not want to overlook their significant and important roles. Anna makes all of the things and she is a great artist and friend. Shawna is my oldest friend and we both share a way of looking at things; I hope one day to be as confident in pursuing my goals as Shawna. Elizabeth has been a wonderful friend since I met her, and, despite my flaws, she still is quick to support and encourage me. Josh Nudell taught me how to argue like a scholar by actually showing me how scholarly debate works. Kristin Harper is one of the most happy, giddy

people I know and it is so hard to be glum around her. Cassie Yacovazzi pushes me to be better and also recognize my humanity. All of these people and more have playing an important role in the completion of this project.

I must also acknowledge the animals that have played a role in my completion of the project. I find that it is much easier to work when there is a snoring doggo or purring cat (or both) sitting next to me, reminding me to stand up, walk around, and sniff the roses. Through my work as a pet-sitter, I have met some great animals: Hektor, Gus, Max, Huge, Jan, Al, Stella, Enzo, Izzy, Trix, Cisco, Boots, and Jack (the goodest boy). Jack is no longer with us, and the world is a little less happy without his tippy-tapping toes.

All of these people (and animals) deserve to be acknowledged beyond what I am able to say here. Thank you for all of your help, friendship, love, encouragement, and so much more. I hope one day I can be half the person you all are.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first and foremost like to thank the faculty of the Department of Ancient Mediterranean Studies for their help with my research and for them encouraging me to look at the imperial cult in a different way. My advisor, Dr. Dennis Trout, has consistently pushed me to anchor and begin my interpretations in detailed analyses of textual evidence, material culture, epigraphy, and modern theories. His advice and guidance has taught me how to construct a narrative, and how to unpack my speech and hand gestures into a clear presentation of scholarship. Any flaws in my approach are very much my own.

Dr. Raymond Marks has been my mentor throughout this process, listening to my ideas before they are strong enough to appear on the page. He was also the first one to tell me that in the writing process, I cannot keep every idea in the framework of a persuasive narrative, and things must be cut and saved for future projects.

Dr. Anatole Mori has also encouraged and focused my arguments throughout this process and my graduate career. She helped me write my first seminar paper and demonstrated the importance of footnotes. Her guidance has taught me not only to stand by my own ideas, but also the importance and value of criticism.

Additionally I must thank Mr. Aaron Harms and Dr. Stephanie Kimmey at the Writing Center. In the course of this year, I have had the opportunity to tutor all levels of students at every stage of the writing process as Fellow at the Writing Center. The act of tutoring has made it easier for me to integrate comments and critiques into my own work, and fully comprehend the reality that writing is rewriting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter 1 LIVING MAN SEEKING WORSHIP: EXCESSIVE HONORS IN LATE- REPUBLICAN AND TRIUMVIRAL ROME	1
I. Contributions to the Field: The Road from <i>Vivus</i> to <i>Divus</i>	5
II. Current Scholarship that Supports Private Cult of Augustus	11
III. Terminology	20
IV. Chapter Outlines	25
V. Precedents and Problems with Living Divinity	32
VA. The Role of Architecture and Literature in Late-Republican Collective Memory	34
VB. Octavian's Early Forays into Divinity	41
VI. Private Cult in Augustan Rome	46
Chapter 2 POETIC SCENES OF SACRIFICE: WORSHIPPING THE LIVING EMPEROR IN ROME.....	47
I. Sacrifices to the <i>Vivus</i> Augustus.....	48
IA. Poetry as a source	50
IB. Historical Context.....	53
II. Horace: Libation and Prayers	59
IIA. Horace: Greek Practices	62
IIB. Horace: Imperial Poet.....	66
IIC. Horace: <i>Numen</i> and <i>Genius</i>	76
III. Sacrifice in Ovid: Libation and Prayers	83
IIIA. Sacrifice in Ovid: Prayers at the <i>Sacrum Caesaris</i> to the <i>Divus</i>	88
IIIB. Sacrifice in Ovid: For Whom the Incense Burns	92
IIIC. Ovid: <i>Numen</i> and <i>numina</i>	98
IIID. Ovid: Poet on the Outside	100
IV. Conclusion.....	103
Chapter 3 A CITY OF MARBLE: ALTARS AND CULT PLACES FOR THE LIVING EMPEROR IN ROME.....	111
I. Place, Ritual, and Worship	113
II. Historical Context: <i>Res Gestae</i>	117

IIA. Historical Context: Terminology	119
III. <i>Lares</i> in Rome: Whose <i>Lares</i> ?	122
IIIA. <i>Lares</i> in Rome: A Study in Marble	134
IV. Where is the <i>genius Augusti</i> ?	142
V. Campus Martius	145
VA. Campus Martius: <i>Ara Pacis Augustae</i>	148
VB. Campus Martius: <i>Horologium</i> and Obelisk	152
VC. Campus Martius: Mausoleum and Private Motivations	157
VI. Conclusion: Cult Places for the <i>Divus</i>	161
Chapter 4 LOOKS LIKE A GOD: CULTIC STATUES OF THE LIVING EMPEROR	169
I. Sources	172
II. Statues in Context: Silver Statues of the Emperor	176
III. Terminology	180
IIIA. Terminology: Basic Definitions	184
IIIB. Terminology: Authorial Frequencies	187
IIIC. Terminology: <i>Res Gestae</i> and Silver Statues	191
IV. Location	194
IVA. Location: Campus Martius and the Mausoleum of Augustus	194
IVB. Location: Pantheon	199
V. Appearance: Silver Statues in the <i>Res Gestae</i>	208
VI. Conclusion: Ritual Activity	219
VIA. Ritual Activity: Incorporating Cults within Public Temples	221
VIB. Ritual Activity: Campus Martius and Ritual Activity	227
VIC. Ritual Activity: Conclusion	231
Chapter 5 A <i>PRAESENS</i> GOD IN ROME	233
I. <i>Praesens</i> Augustus	238
II. What is Left?	241
III. The Living, Divine Augustus	243
Bibliography	244
VITA	257

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABull	Art Bulletin
<i>AE</i>	<i>L'Année épigraphique</i>
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AJPh	American Journal of Philology
<i>Ann.</i>	<i>Annales</i> (Tacitus)
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i> (Cicero)
<i>AUC</i>	<i>Ab Urbe Condita</i> (Livy)
BMCRE	Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum
BullCom	Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma
CARI	Città e architettura nella Roma imperiale
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
CJ	The Classical Journal
ClAnt	Classical Antiquity
CPh	Classical Philology
CQ	Classical Quarterly
CR	Classical Review
<i>DA</i>	<i>Divus Augustus</i> (Suetonius)
<i>Ex Ponto</i>	<i>Epistulae Ex Ponto</i> (Ovid)
HSPh	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
HThR	Harvard Theological Review
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i>
<i>Iul.</i>	<i>Divus Iulius</i> (Suetonius)
JHS	Journal of Hellenic Studies
JSAH	Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians
JSIRS	Journal for the Integration of Religion and Society
JRA	Journal of Roman Archaeology
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>Liddell–Scott–Jones Greek–English Lexicon</i>

MAAR	Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome
MEFRA	Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'école Française de Rome, Antiquité
<i>Met.</i>	<i>Metamorphoses</i> (Ovid)
<i>OLD</i>	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i>
RIC	Roman Imperial Coinage
RPC	Roman Provincial Coinage
RRC	<i>Roman Republican Coinage</i>
SO	Symbolae Osloenses, auspiciis Societatis Graeco-Latinae
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association
<i>Tib.</i>	<i>Tiberius</i> (Suetonius)
ZPE	Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

THE IMPERIAL CULT AND THE INDIVIDUAL:
THE NEGOTIATION OF AUGUSTUS' PRIVATE WORSHIP
DURING HIS LIFETIME AT ROME

Claire McGraw

Dr. Dennis Trout, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues for a reevaluation of the imperial cult in Rome. It demonstrates that worship of the living Augustus began in private acts which progressed into public rituals after his senate-decreed divinity in 14 CE. Scenes of private worship, preserved in architecture, poetry, and the city's topography, as well as private images of the emperor anticipate Augustus' public cult as a *divus* (deified emperor). The chapters show how the climate in Rome allowed for the private articulation of Augustus' living cult, and then address specific aspects of his worship: sacrifice, cult places, and cultic statues. This argument expands our understanding of Augustus' divinity in Rome to include worship of the *vivus* (living emperor), and demonstrates how this worship transitioned into public cult. No less importantly, it challenges lingering modern assumptions about the boundaries between divinity and humanity as these played out around the figure of the emperor in early imperial Rome.

Chapter 1 LIVING MAN SEEKING WORSHIP: EXCESSIVE HONORS IN LATE-REPUBLICAN AND TRIUMVIRAL ROME

I will argue in this dissertation for a reevaluation of our understanding of the imperial cult in Rome and the worship of the living emperor there. I assert that the private cult of the living (*vivus*) Augustus in Rome, its sacrifices, cult places, and cultic statues, established the cult practices of the deified (*Divus*) emperor. Simon Price defines Roman ruler cult, what I collectively term as the imperial cult, as “a permanent institution, created and organized by the subjects of a great empire in order to represent to themselves the ruling power.”¹ The imperial cult embraces all the ways individuals represent the emperor to themselves, based on his divine qualities, more-than-human status, and a cause-effect relationship between the emperor and the Roman populace (see chart on p. 8). This worship is the communication between individuals and the emperor, where the individuals evoke the absent emperor. None of these aspects requires the emperor’s death for an act of worship to be a part of the imperial cult. Private individuals participating in the *vivus* cult of Augustus were the same people who worshipped the *Divus* Augustus, and their private practices transitioned (that is, underwent a change in status) into the public sphere after Augustus’ official deification in 14 CE.²

¹ Simon Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 1, 29-30. His argument focuses on a provincial manifestation of the imperial cult, but I address below on p. 8 with a chart, and discuss in section I the Roman negotiation between emperor and his citizens.

² My argument for transition and progression follows, in part, Michael Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 23-4, “it appears that even in antiquity there was confusion,” about the relationship between extraordinary men and the divine. Koortbojian argues that there must have been some difference between pre- and post-deification images of Julius Caesar and Augustus, but the *consensus* of imperial power and authority makes it difficult to pick a moment from which the one stopped and the other started. I do not seek to prove a ‘relative’ or ‘absolute’ divinity in this dissertation, but follow more the observations of D. S. Levene, “Defining the Divine at Rome,” *TAPA* 142, no. 1 (2012): 76 who states that poetry is our best example for divine emperors; since boundaries of fictionality in poetry were “fuzzy,” the living man could be described as divine with otherwise unexpressed assumptions being spelled out to the reader. I add that

My argument is based, in part, upon the reality that the divine status of Augustus did not spontaneously appear overnight. This approach stands in contrast to the methods employed to recognize and communicate with the more-than-human emperor. Modern scholars of the imperial cult generally agree that there was no living cult of Augustus in Rome, and that any private worship derived from hyperbolic encomia, ulterior motives, or foreign influence.³ Additionally, the argument that Augustus himself impeded any development of his *vivus* cult in Rome overlooks and minimalizes the role of private individuals in the imperial cult, both to the *vivus* and *Divus* emperor.⁴ Moreover, it leaves the emperor's cult in a nascent and undeveloped stage for twenty-three years after his senate-decreed deification in 14 CE, until Caligula's dedication of the Temple of *Divus* Augustus in 37 CE. Augustus' presence, image, and authority pervaded the topography

poetry should not be isolated from the poets and the culture that created it, but should be analyzed within its cultural moment. The emperor's divinity was never explained or defined by the emperor or senate, leaving the people (including poets) to interpret it in a way that produced meaning for their own circumstances.

³ E.g., Lily Ross Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime," *TAPA* 51 (1920): 128, 131-3 on Augustus' *genius* not his person receiving cult in Rome; A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 2 Vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 121 that Augustus never fulfilled any prayers and sacrifices were not offered to him "in hope of supernatural blessings;" Thomas Pekáry, "Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter, quas ipse sustuli: Interpretationen zu *Res gestae divi Augusti* 24," in *Monumentum Chiloniense: Studien zur augusteischen Zeit*, ed. Eckard Lefèvre (Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1975), 104; Simon Price, "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult," *JHS* 104 (1984): 83 that officially Augustus was not a god in Rome during his life, although he was called such in Greece; Mary Beard, J. North, and S. Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. I: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 349 that only vows were offered on the emperor's behalf to the gods in Rome; Ittai Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 112 on the public resistance to worshipping Augustus' person in Rome; Jan Felix Gaertner, *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*, ed. and trans. by Jan Felix Gaertner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 12 "Thus, in Rome there was no state cult for Augustus during his lifetime;" Duncan Fishwick, "Numen Augustum," *ZPE* 160 (2007): 255 on the idea that worshipping the living emperor as a god would negate any reason to formally deify him; Matthew McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 101 that no explicit public worship existed in Rome, and 105 that Ovid is "pathetic" in describing his worship of the *Divus*; Karl Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 169-173 that the imperial cult started in the east with Hellenistic practices; Edmund Thomas, "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," *JRS* 107 (2017): 181 that "he [Augustus] resisted any idea of cult offered to him in Rome;" Harriet I. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden: Religion at the Roman Street Corner* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 307 that Augustus aimed for divine status as a *divus* after death, not before."

⁴ E.g. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 109-39 that actively separating the private and public aspects of his divinity in an effort to subvert his living cult. Thomas, "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," 181 echoes this sentiment, asserting that Augustus himself resisted cult offered to him in Rome.

and literature of Rome, so private individuals were not limited to a single, monolithic image of the emperor; thereby, we cannot assume that their communications with and interpretations of him were limited to his later, public cult.⁵

In my argument for Augustus' private cult, I follow the relative argument for Augustus' divine status. The current trend in scholarship is to argue for the relative, rather than absolute divinity, of Roman emperors. Absolute divinity is the idea that there are different species, or kinds, of gods, and there is a discernable hierarchy in the ancient understanding of the two; this holds that one is either a god or not a god, much like animal classifications. Relative divinity holds that there is only one kind or species and that power and status determines the difference between man and god, "reflecting the status of the individual worshiped relative to the worshiper."⁶ I adhere to the principles of relative divinity when I argue for Augustus' more-than-human status and divine qualities; these are aspects that the individuals and collectives participating in worship would identify in the emperor, not in themselves.

I analyze in the following chapters evidence and examples of the emperor's private worship in Rome during his lifetime: scenes of sacrifice in poetry, cult places where participants communicated with their emperor, and cultic statues that were the focus of ritual activity, all of which anticipated Augustus' official public cult as a *divus*. This

⁵ John Scheid, *The Gods, the State, and the Individual*, trans. by Clifford Ando (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 14-15 on the weaknesses and failures of models of civic religion. Scheid admits that studies of public cult cannot explain changes in the private sphere, even if a cult started a religious revolution. He argues that the gap between public and private cults is the reason for change in cultic practice, but the change he describes is the addition of foreign cults. The worship of the living emperor in Rome, as will be described in detail below, was not a Greek cult but a Roman system of worship, cf. Chapter 2, sections IIA and IIB.

⁶ Levene, "Defining the Divine at Rome," 42-44 (42 for the quote) interpreting Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 25-32, 71-2, 101-3, 321-36, 349-56. Ben R. Crenshaw, "The Nature of the Gods: Absolute vs. Relative Divinity in Roman Emperor Worship" (paper presented at the regional meeting of the American Academy of Religion-Society of Biblical Literature-American Schools of Oriental Research, Boulder, Colorado, March 24-25, 2017), 3 provides a helpful summary of the two.

differs from Christian Habicht's criteria for worship of divine men in Greek cities (temple, altar, cult statue)⁷ in that my areas of focus (sacrifice, cult place, cultic statue) center on the actions of private individuals who anticipate the emperor's divinity with their worship, recreating the ritual activities in places throughout the city. It is not my intent that evidence I analyze in each chapter be treated as an isolated moment or image; all three elements (sacrifice, cult place, and cultic statue) prove the existence of Augustus' *vivus* cult in Rome. I hold that the same people, as individuals and as a collective, participated in, moved through, and engaged with these elements in their private acts of worship. Both the acts performed and monuments erected by these people during the emperor's lifetime unofficially granted him what would, after his senate-decreed divinity in 14 CE, become official and public aspects of his cult.

In this first chapter, I have the following goals: establish my study's place in the field of scholarship on the imperial cult, and establish the precedents for living men becoming divine in late-Republican Rome. In the first half, I locate for my reader my analysis' stance within the current scholarship of the imperial cult, and define the categories and terms I will employ in this study. I then introduce the layout of the project in subsequent chapters. In the second half, I examine the precedents and procedures for a man to become divine that would have influenced the people of Rome. I identify the architectural and literary reminders of non-imperial men who aspired to divinity in order to determine how individuals in Augustan Rome and the emperor himself utilized these recent traditions. My twofold goals work in tandem to familiarize my reader with the imperial cult at its beginning stage.

⁷ Christian Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities: The Early Cases*, trans. John Noel Dillon (Michigan: Michigan Classical Press, 2017), 103.

I. Contributions to the Field: The Road from *Vivus* to *Divus*

My dissertation counters the *communis opinio* that Augustus received no lifetime worship in Rome. The current trend in scholarship on the imperial cult is to call into question long-standing “truths” about emperor worship in Rome and the Roman Empire. Examples of this trend are the works of Harriet Flower and Ittai Gradel,⁸ who question long-held assumptions about the *genius Augusti*. Flower’s analysis of the *Lares Augusti* goes the furthest of the two, proving with careful analysis that the *genius Augusti* is “a phantom of early twentieth-century classical scholarship,”⁹ thus concluding the discussion of why this divine aspect is so challenging for scholars to find in Augustan Rome. My research here aims to follow this trend and call into question the long-standing assertion that Augustus received no lifetime cult in Rome. As John Scheid has proven, studies of public cult, which I read to include the public imperial cult, cannot address changes in the private sphere.¹⁰ The direction of influence is not from public to private, but from private to public; therefore, any discussion of the imperial cult’s origins in Rome cannot fully address its subject without an analysis of private practice. From a private perspective, the imperial cult becomes multifarious and multilocular, where it has no set, official boundaries of what it is and what it is not, and may simultaneously operate in different locations. Jörg Rüpke’s study of lived religion in Rome recognizes the power of the individual in Roman religion: “The individual is not seen as somebody who simply acquires and reproduces established and normative ways of thinking or acting; instead,

⁸ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 109 158, 256, 229-312, 280, 300-3; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 209, cf. Chapter 3, section IV.

⁹ *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 310.

¹⁰ *The Gods, the State, and the Individual*, 14-15 (cf. n. 5 *supra*). This is not exclusive for any and all evidence, but the general trend for private and public cult.

hegemonic as well as alternative options are evaluated, selected, and transformed for the individual's purposes."¹¹ My analysis of private practice aims to focus on lived religion, "reconstructed as everyday experiences, practices, expressions, and interactions."¹²

Individuals, through their engagement with the emperor, his image, deeds, status, and authority, are the driving force behind the imperial cult.

My study of the imperial cult as the actions of individuals in Rome allows these people the same freedoms of expression as is understood with provincial iterations of the imperial cult, where local populations interweave and incorporate the emperor, his image, deeds, status, and authority, into traditional cults.¹³ Henceforth in this discussion, when I say "Augustus," I mean his image, deeds, status, and authority, not him as a person. I find this same interweaving in the cult of the *vivus* Augustus in Rome, where private individuals insert him into already established rituals and cult places. It would be too

¹¹ Jörg Rüpke, *On Roman Religion: Lived Religion and the Individual in Ancient Rome* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2016), 4 as part of his introduction to the study of religion as the study of gods, rituals, architecture, and roles, not the people who worshiped those gods (1-7). He calls this "cold" religion, as opposed to the performative, situational, and expressive nature of actual practice (3).

¹² Rüpke, *On Roman Religion*, 4 allowing that economics and social hierarchy would have had an impact on the "freedom" of movement in Roman religion, but that should "invite us to pay more attention to individual variations in religious behavior, resistance to and rejection of certain practices, and the consequences of these over time."

¹³ When I say interweave, I mean it in the sense of infuses, incorporates, and layers. Price, *Rituals and Power*, 1: "The answer to the problem [accepting subjugation to the authority of the emperor] lay in finding a place for the ruler within the framework of traditional cults of the gods." He continues that provincial cults thrived without the physical presence of the emperor, since no emperor visited Asia Minor "in the whole of the first century A.D." Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol. II.1* (Boston: Brill, 1991), 440-5 identifies the sharing of space in provincial contexts but he argues adamantly against "joint cult." He reads the two as "piety to a deity is combined with a declaration of Imperial or local patriotism, parallel language being used to express worship on the one hand and honor or respect on the other," (440). I disagree, pointing out that this removes any local expression of Augustus as more-than-human, arbitrarily limited him to the mortal world despite visual and linguistic evidence that he was more so. Clifford Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 5-6 notes that "the needs of provincials were neither identical nor even articulated in the same fashion in different parts of the empire." William Van Andringa, "Statues in the Temples of Pompeii: Combinations of Gods, Local Definition of Cults, and the Memory of the City," in *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, ed. Beate Dignas and R. R. R. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 110 that cults could be interwoven in a single setting (i.e. temple) and must be viewed on a local level (i.e. how they would be read by a local ritual participant).

presumptive, and would again ignore the value of private practice, to credit every instance of this infusion and acts of worship to a top-down arrangement, furthered by Augustus' single motivation of achieving both a living and posthumous cult; rather, individuals interpret and react to their ruler, picking and choosing what elements best suit their needs as Romans. Since the imperial cult is the way subjects represent the emperor to themselves,¹⁴ I approach the *vivus* cult of Augustus from a "bottom-up" perspective, keeping the chronology of the source material in mind.¹⁵ By this I mean I look at the imperial cult not as an institution imposed on the people by the emperor, but as the product of private devotion, initiative, and lived religion. I caution that these individuals were not necessarily empowered with the goal of making the emperor divine, which was the ultimately the role of the senate (see below); rather we cannot measure their belief in the emperor's divinity, but can note their responses and interpretations of Augustus as a more-than-human emperor.

In the next few paragraphs, I separate Roman imperial cult from Hellenistic ruler cult in order to establish a Roman private process. Habicht's analysis of the correlation between worshipped living men and their worshippers in the Hellenistic world offers some insight into this bottom-up phenomenon, as well as into the interplay between cultures that fostered Roman, living divinity. Habicht argues that in Hellenistic cults, the cause-effect relationship results in the people granting a man divinity (cause), which they confirm with their sacrifices (effect).¹⁶ This relationship makes the people and the individual equal partners in the elevation of a man to a god; the people and man are

¹⁴ Cf. n. 1 *supra*.

¹⁵ Manfred Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*. Der römische Kaiser als Gott," *Klio* 78, no. 2 (1996): 429 argues to this effect, that "Nicht Gott wählte sich ein Volk, sondern die Menschen wählten einen oder mehrere Götter für sich aus; God did not choose a people, but the people chose one or more gods for themselves."

¹⁶ Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 99, 102 n. 31.

engaged in a *do ut des* contract for the continuation of worship. I view Roman divinity as a negotiation based on cause and effect, in which private individuals anticipate his divinity with their sacrifices and ritual activity (cause), and the senate later officially grants Augustus divinity (effect). It is a negotiation of practice, rather than a contract because divinity is developing but has not yet been granted by the senate.¹⁷

Hellenistic Cults for Living Men	Roman Imperial Cult
1. People grant divinity 2. Divinity confirmed with sacrifice	1. People worship the emperor 2. Divinity confirmed by senate

Moreover, the Roman system of negotiation still maintains its Republican roots, as I address in section III below, allowing for the possibility of posthumous divinity to be withdrawn or denied by the senate. This negotiation of divinity places most acts of worshipping the living emperor in the private sphere at the impetus of individuals.

Fundamentally, these practices and the participants in these two types of ruler cult are linked in their interpretations of rulers, their power and status. We can and should admit that the two are similar and that Hellenistic traditions are employed in Rome to similarly address the emperor, as I analyze in Chapter 2, section IIB, where Horace employs Hellenistic traditions and genres to establish and rewrite ruler cult in Rome. Horace and his readers were aware of Hellenistic literary traditions and how they described the divine status of the Ptolemies. The imperial cult did not exist in a cultural vacuum, but given that it embodies the ways individuals represent Augustus to themselves, I identify the use

¹⁷ Additionally, Price, “Gods and Emperors,” 91-2 cautions the imperial cult’s cause-effect relationship does not imply a ‘*do ut des*’ contract between the emperor and individual participant in the cult. The negotiation between the *princeps* and Roman citizens is what makes deification Roman (as Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, argues throughout).

of Roman practices to represent this Roman emperor;¹⁸ for example, Horace's modifications of Hellenistic traditions, and the use of Carrara rather than Pentelic marble in Rome. In the Roman process, the senate officially makes the emperor into a god, so we have a specific moment when what had been private becomes public, but I find no specific change in practice.¹⁹

My emphasis on influence between Hellenistic ruler cult and the imperial cult in Rome calls into question certain statements about Augustus' living worship in Rome. For example, John Pollini's argues that in the case of the eighty silver statues Augustus mentions at *Res Gestae* 24.2 (which he repurposed into golden gifts to Apollo), silver as the medium was an excessive, Hellenistic honor for a living man, citing Pliny the Younger's later *Panegyricus* and its reference to Domitian's and Trajan's statues.²⁰

¹⁸ By "Roman practices" I mean, for example, that Dio Cassius does not call Augustus Σεβαστός, as Strabo had for his Greek audience, but Αὐγουστος for his Roman one. Catherine Rubincam, "The Nomenclature of Julius Caesar and the Later Augustus in the Triumviral Period," *Historia* 41, no. 1 (1992): 98 notes that Dio is unique in this, since Σεβαστός was far more common in Greek inscriptions and the works of other Greek authors, but he is using Roman terms to address a Roman audience. In architecture, Carrara marble (rather than the previously popular Pentelic marble) is the preferred medium for public and private displays of Augustus and Augustus' more-than-human status in Rome, as I examine in Chapter 3, section IIIA and VA-C. In Egypt, at Karnak and at Philae, smaller Roman style temples were added to the extant cult places. Both temples were the only Roman-style structures at the sites, and use local media for Roman architectural features, like the use of sandstone as the main medium and an Egyptian *cavetto* cornice supporting the Roman pediment at Philae (Judith McKenzie, *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt c. 300 BC to AD 700*, (Yale: Yale University Press, 2007), 166-7 for the media used at Philae; Dieter Arnold, *Temples of the Last Pharaohs* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 226, 237; Stefan Pfeiffer, "Imperial Cult in Egypt," in *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, ed. by Christina Riggs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 88-9 on the features of the temple at Philae; Pfeiffer, "Imperial Cult in Egypt," 90-1; Elizabeth Blyth, *Karnak: Evolution of a Temple* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 233 using the findings of J. Lauffray, "Abords occidentaux de premier pylône de Karnak: le dromos, la tribune et les aménagements portuaires," *Kemi* 21 (1971): 120 for Karnak).

¹⁹ Spencer Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 6, 23-24. Cole does argue that belief was an essential component of Roman deification but belief is incalculable. Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 21 identifies the senate's unique role in this decision.

²⁰ John Pollini, *From Republic to Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2012), 75 on *Panegyricus* 52.3. Cf. Chapter 4, section V on the use of silver in statues not provoking Augustus because the images were transgressive or Hellenistic.

Pollini is not alone in his interpretation,²¹ but a closer look at the evidence does not support this claim. Kenneth Scott's survey of statues made of precious metals in emperor worship finds that the majority of metallic statues as divine honors for Hellenistic kings or queens were actually gold or bronze, so silver alone would not have evoked a purely Hellenistic precedent for a viewer.²² Following Scott's list, gold would have been a far more Hellenistic medium than silver; additionally, the bronze colossal statue atop Augustus' Mausoleum would have been more Hellenistic than these eighty silver statues, but it is not interpreted negatively as such in modern scholarship.²³ I will address in greater detail in the next section the importance of contemporary ancient sources to document Augustus' lifetime cult, but we should not discount evidence of Augustus' private cult in Rome by terming it to be 'Hellenistic,' and therefore anathema to Roman

²¹ Alison E. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 212 and Kenneth Scott, "The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship," *TAPA* 62 (1931): 101 both citing Pliny the Elder 33.54.151 for the Hellenistic reference; Peter Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 172-3 calls the statues "an unrivalled spontaneous expression of loyalty by the Roman populace in the language of Hellenistic honours," (173). More generally, Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 22 states "At Rome, however, custom was different, and such [divine] honors, indistinguishable from monarchy if not divinity, were unacceptable: whom the Greeks chose to enshrine by means of their institutions had no purchase in Roman culture."

²² Scott, "The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship," 101-3 listing golden statues of Ptolemy Soter and Berenike at Dodona (driving chariots), Ptolemy Philadelphus with two golden statues on columns (driving chariots), the Decree of Canopus in 238 BCE lists gold statues for Princess Berenike's cult, Antiochus I Soter was voted a gold equestrian statue during his lifetime, Attalus I had in his lifetime a colossal gold statue next to Apollo's, to list a few. Even in his description of statues for regular men (not kings), the images are bronze and gold. Pharnaces and Mithridates Eupator are the only foreign kings Scott lists with silver statues.

²³ Paul Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*, ed. John G. Younger (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 42-3 hypothesizing about the Mausoleum's statue's unknown appearance, suggests the image may have been a semi-nude, Hellenistic image of Augustus as Poseidon, calling to mind his victory over Sextus Pompey at Naulochus in 36 BCE, but he does not deem the medium of bronze to be Hellenistic. Jodi Magness, "The Mausolea of Augustus, Alexander, and Herod the Great," in *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, ed. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 322 considers the statue to be Hellenistic, following the model of Alexander, but she comes to this conclusion from monumental comparanda, not from the medium of the statue.

imperial cult. The two cultures shared many things,²⁴ and I do not discount an image or phrase with Hellenistic influence from my analysis of and argument for Augustus' *vivus* cult.

II. Current Scholarship that Supports Private Cult of Augustus

In the following paragraphs I identify the scholars, scholarship, and theoretical framework that have influenced my examination and presentation of Augustus' private *vivus* cult. I begin by establishing the necessity for contemporary evidence to document the progression from private to public cult. In the absence of such evidence, I employ later sources, but do not remove them from their later context. Second, I utilize the under-cited work of Manfred Clauss to establish how an ancient Roman understanding of *praesens* applies to the living cult of Augustus. In my own view individuals make the emperor present to meet their local needs, which allows for his cult to be multilocal throughout the empire. Then I introduce Ittai Gradel's monograph on the emperor worship as an essential source to my study, but I address his work's limitations in analyzing private living worship, and discuss how I differ in my presentation of the imperial cult. In addition to Gradel, I present other studies that have influenced the methodology of my project in their scope, treatments of evidence, and argumentation. Finally, I place the *Augustales* within the context of private recognition of Augustus' status, but agree with the assessment of Margaret Laird that the *Augustales* did not participate in the ritual aspects of Augustus' *vivus* and *Divus* cults. The analyses and processes of these modern scholars, in addition to my adherence (as much as possible) to

²⁴ E.g. Horace, *Epistle* 2.1.156-7 "*Graecia capta ferum uictorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio*; Captured Greece took her harsh victor and imported her arts to rustic Latium."

sources contemporary to Augustus' lifetime, support my argument for and interpretation of the imperial cult from a bottom-up perspective.

I focus as much as possible on contemporary evidence to support my argument for Augustus' private *vivus* cult progressing and developing into his public *Divus* cult. As I stated above, the direction of influence between private and public cult is generally from the former to the latter, and I avoid (where possible) using public cult to describe private practice.²⁵ I use with caution the later statements of Suetonius (see below, section VB) to determine private cultic practice, but I do employ the *Res Gestae* and Dio Cassius as sources for private interpretations of Augustus. I begin every chapter with a discussion of my sources and the historical context of my evidence; given that the imperial cult is how individuals represent Augustus to themselves and a negotiation between citizens and *princeps*, the *Res Gestae* represents the emperor's side of that negotiation. His statements characterize his and the senate's interpretation of events, which I deem as 'official' and 'public' (see section III below). Individuals responded to Augustus, and the *Res Gestae*, in my view, is our best source for both sides of the negotiation and what exactly they were responding to in Rome.

A much later source than the *Res Gestae* is Dio Cassius' *Historiae Romanae*, published in the third century. His role in presenting Augustan evidence to a third century Roman audience must be taken into account, as he alone documents certain practices. I follow P.M. Swan's argument, that Dio had access to both the *acta senatus* and *acta diurna* in his accounts of Augustan Rome.²⁶ In terms of anachronisms, since what had been private cult during Augustus' lifetime would have been fully public cult to Dio and

²⁵ Cf. n. 5 *supra* and my discussion at the beginning of the chapter.

²⁶ P.M. Swan, "Cassius Dio on Augustus: A Poverty of Annalistic Sources?" *Phoenix* 41, no. 3 (1987): 274, 277, 285.

his reader, Flower adds that in certain contexts it is unlikely that Dio anachronistically introduced trends “based on practices or expectations current in his own day.”²⁷ Dio’s descriptions of the city and historical figures assume a familiar reader who does not need (or is uninterested in) topographical context.²⁸ Buildings reveal information about the men who built them, but are not allusions to these men, as is the case with Livy and Tacitus.²⁹ I do not mean to say that there are no anachronisms in Dio, but instead that he utilizes his sources, including the *acta*, in his descriptions of customs, monuments, and people to present his readers with accounts of Augustus’ lifetime practices and also those of his citizens.

An example of this would be Dio’s description of libations and prayers given to Augustus, which differs from the emperor’s own account in the *Res Gestae*.³⁰ I interpret Dio’s addition of libations to Augustus (as well as prayers on his behalf), as documenting both official and unofficial practice. The official language, used by Augustus and the senate, was to pour libations and offer prayers on his behalf; whereas in private cult, individuals performed these to Augustus’s person, which was an unofficial practice. Dio’s later material preserves some of the negotiation that is missing from contemporary sources, i.e. both sides (the *princeps* and his citizens). His accounts should be understood with caution, but we cannot fully avoid later sources with our limited evidence. My focus

²⁷ Harriet I. Flower, “The Tradition of the Spolia Opima: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus,” *CIAnt* 19, no. 1 (2000): 52-3.

²⁸ Alain Gowing, “Cassius Dio and the City of Rome,” in *Cassius Dio – Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, ed. C. Lange and J. Madsen (Boston: Brill, 2016), 118, 122.

²⁹ Gowing, “Cassius Dio and the City of Rome,” 127, 133.

³⁰ *Historiae Romanae* 51.19.7 on prayers for Augustus on behalf on the senate and people (*ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς εὐχαῖς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου*), in addition to libations poured to him (*αὐτῷ*); *Res Gestae* 9.1-2 on prayers (and libations) offered on behalf of Augustus’ health (*pro salute, pro valetudine*). Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 99, 102 n. 31 correctly states that sacrifice on behalf of a person does not indicate or equal a cult for that person, but he argues that sacrifice (blood, burnt offerings, or libations) are proof of cultic worship. Cf. Chapter 2, section II and IIIB.

on contemporary evidence and applying later sources (with caution) to depict both sides of the negotiation allows for the imperial cult to progress over time, and in different contexts, as individuals participate in and develop his cult.

A challenge for my argument is the lack of evidence for ritual practice. I examine poetic scenes of sacrifice in Horace and Ovid in the next chapter, but sources for rituals occurring within the cult places and directed towards the cultic statues I identify are limited or circumstantial. Habicht, in his analysis of divine honors in Greek cities, states “Hellenistic historians did not consider the cult of living persons to be something worth noting and reporting,”³¹ and although I refrain from suggesting a rationale, there is a similar absence in Roman sources. In my analyses of cult places and cultic statues, I fill this absence with speculation rooted in the surviving evidence, or I infer from the perspective of lived religion, how individuals would have moved and interacted in a space and with a cultic statue. An example of this is my analysis of the Mausoleum of Augustus as a cult place in Chapter 3 and the statue atop it as a cultic statue in Chapter 4. There is no surviving evidence, literary or otherwise, that documents rituals occurring there during Augustus’ lifetime; in light of this, I recreate how an individual would have moved through the space. Deena Ragavan provides a model for this movement, where the ritualized movement of people in a ritual landscape like the northern Campus Martius, shaped the function and meaning of those monuments.³² I employ the arguments of Jane Clark Reeder and Penelope Davies to recreate the ritualized movement of circumambulation within and outside of the monument, focused on the cultic statue of

³¹ Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 96.

³² Deena Ragavan, “Heaven on Earth: Temples, Ritual, and Cosmic Symbolism in the Ancient World,” *Oriental Institute Seminars* no. 9 (2013): 1 “Temples and shrines were not constructed in isolation, but existed as part of what may be termed a ritual landscape, where ritualized movement within individual buildings, temple complexes, and the city as a whole shaped their function and meaning.”

Augustus.³³ While we cannot know or reconstruct what an individual would have been thinking during this movement, I argue that the act of circumambulation within the monument (elite participants) and around it (non-elite participants) was ritualized movement that recognized Augustus' lifetime status as bridging the mortal and the divine, where he would not reside among the dead, but due to his exceptional deeds (documented in the surrounding monuments) would rise like his statue towards heaven. We can also see the negotiation of cult in this practice, since the emperor's construction of the monument influenced and inspired this ritualized movement. In this way, while I cannot pinpoint exact moments of active ritual participation, I identify how a ritual participant would have done such activity and their possible purposes for the ritual.

The progression of worship maintains that the private individuals participating in the *vivus* cult made the emperor present throughout the city, establishing local and individual relationships with the emperor. Their perception of emperor as a *praesens* god bridged the gap between official avoidance and private acts of worship, cultivating the divinity of Augustus in the civic and domestic spaces of Rome. Manfred Clauss argues that Augustus was indeed a living god in Rome, finding no difference or nuance between ruler-cult and the many public and private cults of the Roman Empire.³⁴ His arguments, however, do not emphasize the participants of living cult in Rome, only that he was a god

³³ Jane Clark Reeder, "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: Tumulus and Tholos," *ClAnt* 11, no. 2 (1992): 298-300 argues for an elite ritual, with access to the interior of the private monument limiting participation. Penelope J. E. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 59, 125 qualifies Reeder's claim, pointing out that the monument itself was private and would have been closed to visitors except at times of ritual activity. Additionally, she adds that a visitor would have had a choice of paths to the burial chamber, but puts in an in-text parenthetical that this choice would still accommodate circumambulation (59). Strabo, *Geographica*, 5.3.8 and Suetonius, *DA*, 100 describe public walkways encircling the Mausoleum that would have accommodated more inclusive ritual participation in circumambulation.

³⁴ "*Deus Praesens*," 427-30.

there.³⁵ We cannot separate Rome, its practices and people, from the rest of the empire when analyzing the imperial cult. Much in the same way that Hellenistic practices should not be removed as influential sources and source material for Roman practice, we should not isolate Augustus' status as a *praesens* god from the participants of his cult. I adapt Clauss' argument to support my reading that individuals interpreted Augustus to meet their own needs; thereby his presence is often evoked when his living person is worshipped. I find a common goal in these elements of Augustus' cult (sacrifices, cult places, and cultic statues) that individuals seek to make the emperor present to meet their needs on a local level.

In contrast to Clauss, Ittai Gradel argues that Augustus' divinity was relative, finding differences in ruler cult and the official cults of the pantheon. He does not read, as Clauss does, that the people regarded Augustus as fully divine, but that he was more divine than they were.³⁶ I agree with this assessment, that Augustus was not fully a living god, but was understood to possess divine qualities and aspects. In this way, Augustus could still die and not undermine his lifetime deeds and honors. Gradel's monograph on emperor worship in Rome aims to recreate ritual and practice, focusing on state practice. He finds an absence of Augustus' living cult only there, in *the state cult*, which I term public cult (see section III below).³⁷ While Gradel's analysis of evidence is detailed and useful for my project, I differ from his interpretation of the relationship between private and public

³⁵ Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*," 429 arguing specifically from inscriptions here: "... viele Städte und Gemeinden Kulte für die lebenden Herrscher einrichteten, dann lag dies an der munizipalen 'Autonomie,' die es jeder Gemeinde erlaubte, ihre eigenen Götter zu wählen...; ...many cities and communities established cults for the living rulers, then this was due to the municipal 'autonomy' that allowed each community to choose their own gods..."

³⁶ David Wardle, review of *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, by Ittai Gradel, published in *Scholia* Vol. 13 (2004): 125-6 n. 1 points out that Gradel did not take into account Clauss' article (among other sources) in adapting his dissertation into its book form.

³⁷ *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 223 emphasis his.

cult. He bases his analyses on the assertion that public and private cult shared no spheres of influence: “private cults merely affected the private persons involved.”³⁸ I see a progression and shared participation where he sees none. Gradel additionally credits Augustus with actively separating the private and public aspects of his divinity in an effort to subvert his living cult.³⁹ Gradel does not approach the imperial cult from the perspective of lived religion, focusing instead on top-down arguments for Augustus’ role in his own cult.

Although Gradel recognizes the prevalence of private cult to the living emperor in Rome,⁴⁰ his separation of participants into two groups, private and public, and the emperor’s administering of both, leaves a gap in his interpretation of the imperial cult. He notes the degree to which scholars have overlooked Augustus’ cult in Rome, asserting: “The fact that the mistaken claim as to the absence of emperor worship in Rome has become so commonly accepted as to be quoted in virtually every handbook on the Roman empire without any doubt or opposition only goes to show the exclusivity with which scholarship has focused on public emperor worship and ignored private cults.”⁴¹ Despite this assertion, Gradel does not link the participation in private cult to the foundations of public emperor cult. I engage with Gradel as a source because of his thorough collection of evidence, even if he does not characterize private evidence to support private cult. For example, Gradel thoroughly analyzes the implications of *Augustus* as an adjective, but he does not address private application of this adjective or private readership. He reads the

³⁸ *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 12 in his discussion on state cult functioning on behalf of the Roman people, but were not impacted by municipal or private cults (which he describes almost as if they were ‘free-agents’).

³⁹ *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 109-39.

⁴⁰ *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 223: “The oft-repeated assertion that there was no cult of the living emperor in Rome is proved absurd by these and other private monuments... Rome was clearly crowded with cults dedicated to the living emperor....”

⁴¹ Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 223.

adjective as “vaguer and more subtle” in recalling the emperor, which was “a conventional gesture that flattered the emperor or expressed passive sympathy with the state and its policies.”⁴² He does not suggest that the adjective could be applied privately (i.e. funded by individuals or collectives, see section III below) to monuments to show active participation in his living cult. Additionally, he does not extend his analysis to the contexts in which individuals would have read this adjective in Rome, where public gods deemed to be *Augustus* were limited to five,⁴³ so we cannot assume the emperor’s or senate’s involvement in every use of the term. I incorporate Gradel and others into my analysis to demonstrate that private worship of the living emperor is apparent as the precursor to public cult in their own examinations, and that living cult comes to the fore when the evidence is interpreted without pre-existing denials of cult or exclusive separations of private from public practice.

My methodology for this project is based upon Clifford Ando’s *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, in which he seeks to address why the empire lasted so long, why it was so stable, and why (and to what end) provincials ‘Romanized’. Like Ando, I began with questions about the origins and stability of the imperial cult, focusing on Rome: what did private worship of the emperor in Rome look like, what systems allowed it to flourish, and why (and to what end) did individuals participate in it? While I do not and cannot argue for blanket acceptance of the imperial cult anywhere in the empire, my analyses aim to provoke further debate about how private individuals

⁴² Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 103-6 for the adjective in general; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, Vol. II.1, 448 gives the summary of the adjective as a gesture.

⁴³ As identified by Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 256, 334; J. Bert Lott, “The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome,” *CJ* 110, no. 2 (December-January 2014-2015): 135; J. Bert Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 102-3: Pax *Augusta* in the Campus Martius, Concordia *Augusta* in the Forum, Providentia *Augusta* in the Campus Agrippae, Ops *Augusta* in the Vicus Iugarius, and Iustitia *Augusta* in the Circus Flaminius. Cf. Chapter 3, section III, n. 44.

engaged in negotiations to outline Augustus' divine status in Rome. I selected evidence beginning with material that has often been considered problematic or conclusive in terms of Augustus' living cult in Rome (see section IV below), approaching it without a preexisting denial of living or private cult. Like Ando, I analyze a variety of evidence to recreate the zeitgeist of Augustus' status in Rome.

My analysis of private practice and my emphasis on individuals participating in Augustus' *vivus* cult does not address or argue for priests. Since the Roman imperial cult was a negotiation between citizens and *princeps*, and how individuals represent Augustus to themselves, no priests are required for worship to exist.⁴⁴ This fact, the existence of the imperial cult without specific priestly offices controlled in the same way as other such Roman positions, has led scholars to determine that the imperial cult was not, in fact, a cult.⁴⁵ Contrary to these assertions, the imperial cult was more than political demonstrations of loyalty, and we should not limit ourselves to locating belief in its elements. Sacrifices and ritual activity in a cult place are the foundations of living, cultic worship, but that does not make individual members priests, nor does it necessitate the

⁴⁴ Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 104 supports this, arguing that divine honors in and of themselves do not necessitate the creation of a priest or priests. Livia became the first *sacerdos/ἱέρεια* to the cult of *Divus* Augustus after official decree Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, 56.46.1-2, 57.12.2, 19.1; Ovid, *Ex Ponto*, 4.9.107). Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*," 428 does not isolate private from public worship, characterizing instead living divinity and the development of cult in terms of loyalty: "Insofern lassen sich Religiosität, und Loyalität nicht sauberlich voneinander trennen. Religiosität schafft und fördert Loyalität, Loyalität münden in Religiosität; in that sense, religiosity and loyalty cannot be neatly separated. Religiosity creates and promotes loyalty, loyalty leads to religiosity." He determines this relationship of loyalty and gratitude became institutionalized throughout the *res publica* in the provinces, city, and "ja selbst im privaten Bereich; yes even in the private sector." I find no fault with his assertions, but he does not thoroughly identify the necessary components of cult – ritual, place, and image.

⁴⁵ Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Connecticut: American Philological Association, 1931), 35, 237-8; Duncan Fishwick, "The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire," *ANRW II*. 16, no. 2 (1978): 1253 that it was more politics than religion; Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 241 that the imperial cult was homage not worship; K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960), 312-26 that it is an expression of political loyalty. Price, *Rituals and Power*, 16-7 notes the absurdity and prejudice behind this rationale, which he credits to Christian foundations for Roman practices.

creation of a priestly group for private worship. This kind of worship in Rome fits with the absence of the *Augustales* there, while the organization (comprised of municipal groups) thrived elsewhere.⁴⁶ The *Augustales*, as Margaret Laird presents them, were not municipal priests of the imperial cult;⁴⁷ instead, members of the *Augustales* “overlaid emperor worship onto civic spectacle and euergetism,” but their primary goals were not the worship and performance of ritual to the living or deified emperor.⁴⁸ The *Augustales* take part in a narrative of local populations demonstrating awareness of Roman trends and imperial narratives in art and architecture. In Rome individuals did not need to become members of a group like the *Augustales*, but in their own *vici* and throughout the city participated in a similar narrative of awareness and engagement with the emperor.

III. Terminology

In this section, I define the terms I apply in my study to categorize the different spheres of interaction between citizens and *princeps*. The progression from private to public worship is not linear, where an individual moves directly from one to the other and progress may be marked during the course of Augustus’ lifetime. As a result, we must

⁴⁶ Steven Ostrow, “‘Augustales’ along the Bay of Naples: A Case for Their Early Growth,” *Historia* 34, no. 1 (1985): 64-5 identifying a “Campanian primacy” for the *Augustales*, with over two thousand five hundred inscriptions from the emperor’s lifetime to the mid-third century CE; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, Vol. II.1, 609 for the *Augustales*’ presence in Campania; Margaret Laird, *Civic Monuments and the Augustales in Roman Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 6, 8 asserts a western predominance for the group, but for the purposes of her study she does not limit her areas of evidence to Campania. She clarifies that the organization was not an official order, but rather municipal groups.

⁴⁷ *Civic Monuments and the Augustales*, 6-7, 203 counters the arguments of Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, Vol. II.1, 609-16, in which he asserts that the *Augustales* “were founded independently and specifically concerned with the cult of the emperor” (609). Inez Scott Ryberg, “Rites of State Religion in Roman Art,” *MAAR* 22 (1955): 98 and Fishwick also characterize the organization’s membership as consisting of “humble social classes,” and “largely composed of freedmen,” whereas Laird has found that membership varied from region to region and cannot be singularly characterized by that status.

⁴⁸ *Civic Monuments and the Augustales*, 7, 84-5, even though the *Augustales* often paid for renovations of public temples and statuary, they were not directly involved in the construction and maintenance of imperial monuments and did not direct or oversee cultic activities. Cf. Chapter 4, section IIIB, n. 69 for Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 63.18.3 for the *Augustales* spending too much on a statue of Nero.

view these spheres as overlapping, so as to fully recognize the aspects of the negotiation within my analysis. In this way, private and public are non-binary terms that are not wholly independent of each other, but are terms that describe overlapping concepts that often depend on context. Even after Augustus' deification in 14 CE, the elements of private practice do not go away and are not renovated by participants (e.g. statues of Augustus *vivus* are not recut to depict the *Divus*).⁴⁹ In order to observe and examine instances of worship directed at the *vivus* Augustus, I use the categories public, official, private, and unofficial in deliberate ways in order to avoid conflict with their modern uses. Ancient participants would not have used these categories in the same way,⁵⁰ but my intent is to specify for my modern reader the progression of worship during Augustus' lifetime. Again, the spheres of practice that these terms represent overlap, so my definitions rely on context.

The categories of public, official, private, and unofficial worship relate to who or what organization appropriated permission and funds for the act of worship (sacrifice, cult place, or cultic statue). Public and official are linked in that they both denote the imperial side of the negotiation of the imperial cult. For the purpose of my study, public worship entails acts of worship overseen and paid for by the state and its institutions.⁵¹ Public

⁴⁹ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 182-3, 185, 189, 226; Koortbojian unsuccessfully attempts to find visual differences between statues of the man and those of the god. When he cannot isolate any specific differences, he argues that inscriptions on the statue bases would have provided the correct identification.

⁵⁰ As noted by Amy Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 8-16; Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 8-13.

⁵¹ Definition follows Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, 102; John Bodel, "Cicero's Minerva, Penates, and the Mother of the Lares: An Outline of Roman Domestic Religion," in *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*, ed. John Bodel and Saul M. Olyan (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008); Fergus Millar, *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic* (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998), 4, 45 on the ideology of public life. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 8 defines public cults as "always carried out and controlled by freeborn of high rank," with Festus' *De Verborum Significatu* as evidence, which uses expense as a determining factor.

worship requires the involvement and sponsorship of the emperor himself, the senate, or both; an example of this is a senatorial commission for a temple or the dedication of a statue. This is related to the category of official worship; the emperor and the Roman state sanctioned an official act of worship, thus often making it public.⁵² This understanding limits official aspects to those that the senate and emperor commented on and were aware of, i.e. Augustus' language in describing prayers and libations offered on his behalf in the *Res Gestae*.⁵³

In contrast to public worship, individual initiative is the driving force behind private acts of worship. These acts are then the responsibility of individuals, families, or private collectives. For example, the compital altars of the *vici* were private altars, because they were commissioned by the *vicomagistri* and not paid for by the state.⁵⁴ Similar to private worship are unofficial acts of worship; since individuals, families, or private collectives were the hands behind these acts, there was no explicit approval from the Roman state and the emperor. An example of this would be the unofficial wording of libations and prayers to Augustus that Dio Cassius preserves in his *Historiae Romanae* and also appears in Augustan poetic scenes of sacrifices.⁵⁵ This does not limit private and unofficial worship to unique or infrequent events, or remove them from view; unofficial

⁵² I follow in this definition John Pollini, "Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate," in *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, ed. Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 335-335 n. 3, on definitions of images of the emperor represented as divine: "by 'official' I mean those modes of representation sanctioned by the Roman state rather than by a local government having some measure of autonomy." This understanding limits official aspects to those that the senate and emperor commented on and were aware of.

⁵³ *Res Gestae* 9.1-2, cf. n. 30 *supra* for the difference in language between the *Res Gestae* and Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 51.19.7, also addressed in Chapter 2, section IB.

⁵⁴ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 10, 101; 136-7; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 11.

⁵⁵ Cf. n. 30 *supra* and Chapter 2, sections IB for the passages in the *Historiae Romanae* and the *Res Gestae*, II, and III for analyses of how Horace and Ovid are aware of this official wording in their unofficial presentations.

and private acts of worship were widespread, or even popular. These occurred within full view of the people, as with the compital altars, or were widely read in literary sources. Moreover, the individuals participating in or overseeing acts of worship were not limited to an elite or non-elite representation of Rome; these were heterogeneous groups that included different social and economic assemblies across the entirety of the Roman Empire.⁵⁶ Individuals as viewers and ritual participants often employed private and unofficial acts of worship to respond to public and official ones, creating a narrative of Augustus' divine status in Rome. By narrative, I mean to imply both visual and textual language to communicate and convey Augustus' status. Both elements work in tandem as parts of the zeitgeist of Augustan Rome.

A complication in distinguishing between acts of worship immediately arises when placing these acts within a space. The particulars of public and private in ancient Rome, in terms of my study, depend on legal and financial distinctions, rather than space and settings; both public and private acts of worship could occur in the same sacred spaces, in both civic and domestic settings (as will be addressed below).⁵⁷ Therefore, I do not limit an act of worship, public or private, to certain locations; given that sacred space throughout Rome had no fixed boundaries, Roman behavior in ritual cannot be fixed to a limited number of locations. We can divide Roman sacred spaces into three categories:

⁵⁶ Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, 103-4 on 'public' not including everyone. Anna Clark, *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 80 expands this reasoning beyond public and private, stating that audience for divine qualities is not a single homogenous group, but rather a heterogeneous group spanning social, economic, and temporal boundaries. Content, setting, and landscapes (real and fictional) allowed for different and unique readings of the quality in monumental associations. As will be discussed below, the content and context of representations of men as divine relied on collective memory to recall past honors in terms of present visions. I counter Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 8 specifies social and economic standing in his interpretations of the terms.

⁵⁷ Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, 103, following Jörg Rüpke, *The Religion of the Romans*, trans. and ed. Richard Gordon (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007) 4; Nicole Belayche, "Religious Actors in Daily Life: Practices and Related Beliefs," in *A Companion to Roman Religion*, ed. Jörg Rüpke (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2007), 275-8.

loca sacra, *loca religiosa*, and *loca sancta*. The first refers to “places and things dedicated to the gods,” the second “designates the tombs and places struck by lightning,” and the third “concerns the divine protection of town walls in particular.”⁵⁸ A preference for location overlooks the ranges of sacred space in the city as a whole as well as in a temple complex.⁵⁹ For example, Propertius’ description of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine is set within the temple complex, but his meanderings are not acts of worship. Additionally, the lack of a temple to the living emperor in Rome, and the postponement of the dedication of the Temple of *Divus* Augustus until 37 CE, does not mean the city’s residents lacked a specific location or locations where they could participate in worship of the *vivus* or *Divus*. As such, the evidence I examine in this study will not assess worship as public or private based on location alone.

The difference between domestic and civic space captures my focus on individuals and lived worship in the imperial cult, since individuals moved between the two without hindrance. As John Bodel maintains, there was a porous boundary between civic and domestic worship; an individual could offer domestic sacrifices to the emperor that echoed civic practices which fell short of actual worship, as was the case with libations.⁶⁰ For example, the *Ara Pacis Augustae* and *horologium* of the Campus Martius were public and official statements of the emperor’s exceptionalism, but made neither a public nor an

⁵⁸ William Van Andringa, “M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae) solo et peq(unia) sua” Private foundations and Public Cult in a Roman Colony,” in *Private and Public in Ancient Mediterranean Law and Religion*, ed. Clifford Ando and Jörg Rüpke (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 99-100, citing the *Institutes* of Gaius 2.9.

⁵⁹ *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, 100 “A fundamental behavioural and performative definition of sacred space is space in which religious ritual is performed.” Simply said, using sacred space as a marker of worship is a circular argument. The relationship between location and ritual is further developed in Chapter 4, section VI (A-C) but Ton Derks, *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideals and Values in Roman Gaul* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998), 210 explains the relationship between architectural and cosmological categories. He specifies that the altar served as the main boundary between sacred and profane space in a temple complex.

⁶⁰ “Cicero’s Minerva, *Penates*, and the Mother of the *Lares*,” 249; Bodel’s argument focuses on the relationship between public and private worship in domestic space.

official declaration of divinity. These monuments during the emperor's lifetime are then public and civic. The private commissioners of compital altars to the *Lares Augusti* acknowledge these public monuments, creating a narrative of Augustus' divine status in civic space that spans public and private spheres.

IV. Chapter Outlines

Within each of the following chapters I focus upon a specific element of private worship—sacrifices, cult places, and cultic statues—utilizing evidence contemporary to Augustus' lifetime as much as is possible. The arguments of each chapter should not be understood as isolated moments or images; all three elements together (sacrifice, cult place, and cultic statue) prove the existence of Augustus' *vivus* cult in Rome. I hold that the same people, as individuals and as a collective, participated in, moved through, and engaged with these elements in their private acts of worship. I outline below the goals and evidence I assess in each chapter in order to prove that Augustus' private *vivus* cult transitioned into his *Divus* cult, in which private images and practice are the foundations of his later, public cult. This transition or change in status is a progression from private to public practice, where public actions are developed in the negotiations with emperor. In the conclusions of each chapter, I establish the progression of cult by identifying these private practices in those of public cult. Given that the direction of influence between private and public cult is from the former to the latter, and the latter cannot be used to explain the former, I employ evidence of post-14 CE practices to show how individuals

relied on private precedents to worship Augustus as a *Divus*.⁶¹ In this way, echoes of the private *vivus* cult can be heard in the public *Divus* cult of Augustus.

The element of worship I will analyze in the second chapter is private sacrifices to Augustus in poetry. I use the *Res Gestae* 9.1-2 to identify the official language and practice to which these private scenes respond in order to characterize the private libations, prayers, and incense offerings to Augustus as the people's side of the negotiation.⁶² I focus on scenes of sacrifice in Horace and Ovid because they have differing statuses as poets, with the former as imperially sponsored and the latter as an exile, but they present similar interpretations of private and domestic sacrifices to Augustus. My goal in this chapter is to argue that lifetime sacrifices in poetry, although they exist in the imagined landscape of the poet, convey and preserve unofficial and private practices that existed in Rome.

Horace employs a tradition of men becoming gods that links Cicero, Theocritus, and Homer, but Horace revises the tradition to prove to his reader that Augustus will become a Roman god on account of his exceptional deeds, morality, and his divine *numen*. Ovid on the other hand does not seek to prove that Augustus will be a Roman god, but rather the implications of his divine authority. To Ovid, the collective recognition of Augustus' more-than-human status grants him a divine authority on earth that has long-lasting repercussions. If we recognize with sacrifices Augustus' divinity and divine aspects, as Horace did, then we allow Augustus to possess the anger of a god on earth. I examine

⁶¹ Cf. n. 5 *supra* and my discussion at the beginning of the chapter.

⁶² Cf. section II, n. 30, Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 102 n. 31 that sacrifice on behalf of a person does not indicate or equal a cult for that person. Simon Price, "Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult," *JRS* 70 (1980): 28-33 identifies sacrifices 'on behalf of' the emperor in the majority of epigraphic evidence from eastern provinces, but this does not rule out sacrifices to the emperor in Rome and elsewhere.

both the lifetime and posthumous sacrifices Ovid gives to the emperor in order to prove that his treatment of the two is the same;⁶³ he does not differ in practice pre- and post-14 CE.

The conclusion of this chapter presents the progression and transition from private to public. This passage from one state (private) to the other (public) is marked by the emperor's senate-decreed deification. I identify the Roman practices documented in Horace and Ovid in non-poetic sources –coins (lifetime and posthumous) and descriptions of Livia's sacrifices as the *flaminica Augustalis* recall and incorporate aspects documented in poetic domestic scenes of sacrifice. Both the private and public sacrifices seek to communicate the more-than-human status and divine aspects of Augustus, *vivus* or *Divus*, so that he as a god is present to his worshippers.

In the third chapter, I will analyze cult places as an element of Augustus' private *vivus* cult. My evidence is the private compital altars of the *Lares Augusti* in the *vici*, the public monuments of the northern Campus Martius (*Ara Pacis Augustae* and *horologium*), and also Augustus' private Mausoleum. I apply Ton Derks' definition of cult places, which “are spaces intended for the worship of one or more cosmological powers, separate from the profane world, in which the members of the cult community regularly gather in order to perform their personal or collective rituals before a ritual focus,”⁶⁴ to prove that these locations served as cult places for the private individuals worshipping Augustus.

⁶³ McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 104 on Ovid in particular spanning the public and private dichotomy of Augustus' divinity. He does not categorize scenes as domestic, focusing instead on the publication and readership of Ovid's works.

⁶⁴ Derks, *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices*, 133. He makes ritual focus a required component for a cult place. I analyze in the fourth chapter rituals and ritual focus, particularly cult statues.

As I mentioned above, sources for rituals occurring within cult places and directed towards the cultic statues of the living emperor are limited or circumstantial,⁶⁵ so I reconstruct how individuals and collectives would have moved through and interacted with the cult places, with visual and linguistic cues to guide their interpretations and actions. I cannot definitively state that a group of individuals would have moved through the Campus Martius at a particular date with ritualistic aims, but I can identify how individuals and collectives would have read the use of *Augustus* as an adjective-*cum*-epithet, Carrara marble, and how the proximity and layout of monuments constructs a narrative of Augustus' more-than-human status. This narrative connected both private and public monuments, so we can see the negotiation of the imperial cult present in imperially funded and privately commissioned monuments throughout the city. I argue that this visual narrative dictated how individuals and collectives interacted with these cult places.

A large part of my argument for this chapter is the interweaving of Augustus (his image, deeds, status, and authority) into established public and official cult places in the city. This incorporation (Augustus sharing space with an official god) legitimizes private practices and further encourages viewers to recognize the emperor's status as more-than-human.⁶⁶ In these instances of interweaving, the viewer does not interpret Augustus *vivus* as equal to the official god; images of Augustus in these locations are not on an equal plane with the god or goddess.⁶⁷ Instead, the viewer recognizes Augustus' role and

⁶⁵ Cf. section II, especially n. 31 *supra*.

⁶⁶ This is the case in Rome as well as in provincial contexts, cf. section I, especially n. 13.

⁶⁷ Cf. my analysis of the altar of the *Vicus Sandaliarius*, Chapter 3, section IIIA, n. 78-9, and section VA on the image of Augustus on the *Ara Pacis*. Karl Galinsky, "Venus, Polysemy, and the *Ara Pacis Augustae*," *AJA* 96, no. 3 (Jul., 1992): 475 seeks to place the layered viewing of the *Ara Pacis* in a documented layer of tradition "rather than be content with endlessly hectoring about "ambiguities" while not presenting convincing documentation" (475).

relationship as supplementing that of the god. For example, Augustus' *vivus* cult is present in the compital altars of the *Lares Augusti* through his adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augustus*. Augustus in this way does not detract due worship from the *Lares*, but he becomes a resident of every *vicus*;⁶⁸ Augustus through his adjective-*cum*-epithet shares in worship as a god of place, while simultaneously being a member of the collective participants of the *vicus*. This shared cult place and multiple locations of Augustus within the space furthers his cult's role as multilocular and multifarious, depending on local needs.

After Augustus' deification in 14 CE, these private cult places transition into public without requiring the participants to change or renovate the places. In the twenty-three year gap between Augustus' deification and the dedication of the Temple of *Divus* Augustus, the people of Rome persisted in their utilization of these civic cult places.⁶⁹ I argue that the presence of private cult places at the time of Augustus' death and deification removed any urgency in dedicating the Temple of *Divus* Augustus; the participants already possessed places where they could worship Augustus. The addition of the *Res Gestae* to the Mausoleum of Augustus and its publication throughout the empire allow for participants in Rome and abroad to locate themselves within these cult places, where Augustus is simultaneously present as a *vivus* and a *Divus*.

The final element of Augustus' *vivus* cult that I will analyze is cultic statues as the focus of private worship. I examine non-extant cultic statues (in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon, atop the Mausoleum, and the eighty silver statues mentioned in the *Res*

⁶⁸ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 121; he states that this does not mean that the *Lares Augusti* are Augustus' household gods.

⁶⁹ The Temple of *Divus* Augustus was not dedicated until 37 CE under Caligula's reign. Duncan Fishwick, "On the Temple of *Divus* 'Augustus'," *Phoenix* 46, no. 3 (Autumn, 1992): 232; Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 141, history records no official reason for the delayed dedication.

Gestae) to demonstrate how individuals engaged with these statues to participate in Augustus' private living cult. To avoid confusion between posthumous cult statues of the *Divus* and cult statues of the *vivus*, I term the latter 'cultic statues,' since they relate to the imperial cult but are not yet official representations of its public manifestation; however, I find no difference between a cultic statue and a cult statue other than chronology, since cultic statues of the *vivus* became cult statues of the *Divus* with only a possible change in the inscription to denote the difference.⁷⁰

Given that these statues exist for modern scholars only in literary sources, I extrapolate private ritual activity from the terminology used to categorize them, their locations within cult places, and their appearance (when described). I focus as much as possible on how the viewer and ritual participant would have seen these statues or heard them described.⁷¹ Using the terminology, location, and appearance, I reconstruct for my reader how private individuals and collectives would have focused their private ritual activity towards these images of Augustus. More so than the other elements of private worship, ritual activity confirmed a cultic statue's status, and without ritual the absent emperor could not be made present.⁷² As was the case with cult places, I identify the infusion and interweaving of cults, where Augustus' proximity to an official and public god or gods directs the viewer to add Augustus' divine status to their worship of the public god, without denying

⁷⁰ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 182-3, 185, 189, 226; Koortbojian unsuccessfully attempts to find visual differences between statues of the man and those of the god. When he cannot isolate any specific differences, he argues that inscriptions on the statue bases would have provided the correct identification.

⁷¹ Joannis Mylonopoulos, "Introduction: Divine Images *versus* Cult Images. An Endless Story about Theories, Methods, and Terminologies," in *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Joannis Mylonopoulos (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 6 suggests an etic perspective for examining cult statues in ancient contexts, where the perspective of the viewer supersedes modern interpretations. Mylonopoulos' analyses focus on position (here location), appearance, and cult involvement.

⁷² Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 7: "ritual defined cult statues, not the other way round."

any due obeisance. A cultic statue of Augustus within an established cult place, like the Pantheon, encouraged viewers and ritual participants to acknowledge the emperor's role in making manifest the will of that god. He received shared worship from ritual participants, who admit that Augustus' more-than-human status and divine qualities brought the god's favor to the Roman people. The presence of his statue within the cult place solidifies and represents this arrangement. After his deification, the same statue continued to perform this function; much like his cult places, Augustus' presence and his role as a *praesens* deity is not hindered by chronology.

Unlike the previous two chapters, my argument for cultic statues relies, in part, on such later sources as Dio Cassius. His role in presenting Augustan evidence to a third century Roman audience does not undermine my analyses of statues in this chapter; instead, it reveals the statues' unaided change from private to public worship. I identify Dio's specific language in his descriptions of Augustan statues to report their original locations and appearances to his contemporary, Roman audience.⁷³

Private individuals erected cultic statues to *vivus* Augustus throughout the city of Rome, making him present to meet their needs. After 14 CE, these cultic statues became cult statues, but ancient ritual participants and viewers required no visual marker to denote the change. These images transitioned from private to public cult, but the people who supported those cults, I argue, neither modified their behavior, nor their interpretations of Augustus.

⁷³ I adapt the study of frequencies and applications of terms found in Sylvia Estienne, "*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*: The Status of Divine Images in the Temples of Rome" in *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Joannis Mylonopoulos (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 260 to include Dio Cassius. She does not link her results to the development of the imperial cult, but the imperial cult explains features of her findings. Cf. section II, n. 26-29 *supra* for Dio's uses of *acta*, not introducing trends in certain cases, and his treatment of topography.

V. Precedents and Problems with Living Divinity

In the second half of this chapter, I survey the challenges and models of living, more-than-human, Roman men that Augustus and his citizens shared in their cultural memory. Caesar and Pompey the Great provided human templates for interpretations of divine status in Rome, as well as the agency of the negotiations of cult between the man and the people. These precedents impacted Augustus' early forays with divinity, in which he dictated his divine image rather than allowing the people to do so. I aim to prove in this survey that, just in the same way that Augustus' divinity did not develop overnight, the most recent precedents for Roman deification occurred as people attempted to relate and differentiate divine status over a period of time. I do not find all of these precedents to be positive examples of successful practice in that the men honored attained lifetime and posthumous divinity. Additionally, I identify Octavian's early engagements with divinity, where the young *triumvir* did not allow individuals to direct the development of his divine status.

From these precedents, I argue that Octavian and his citizens learned how to participate in the negotiation of cult, where the people gain an emperor with more-than-human status and divine qualities who meets their needs, and the emperor gains an avenue for lifetime and posthumous honors that do not require his constant maintenance or management of cult. Without the negotiation between the two, official lifetime presentations of divine status are tenuous at best; they require the constant action of one man, rather than a collective, to maintain that divine status.

Within Roman cultural and collective memory, the recognition and communication of divine qualities and more-than-human status pre-date Augustus and the *triumviri* of the late Republic. Maggie Popkin, describing this process in terms of French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, states that the individual's memory occurs within the social framework of their group, i.e. their collective memory.⁷⁴ Collective memories often become hazy and blurred in retrospect, brushing over individual and societal differences in the group. This blurring allows the varied membership to share a collective memory of divine precedents.⁷⁵ Art, architecture, and literature served as mnemonic devices for these memories,⁷⁶ reminding generations of Romans of the men who achieved divine honors or even posthumous cult. Of these men, Hercules and Quirinus were the only precedents who possessed public and official cults and temples in the city.⁷⁷ I interpret the following examples of Caesar and Pompey in terms of collective memory and agency of cult in order to establish how these precedents were remembered by Roman citizens.

⁷⁴ Maggie Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph: Monuments, Memory, and Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 11 citing Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, trans. L. A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). Popkin does not use the pronoun 'their' with groups, but I add the pronoun to clarify ownership and membership of the individual and the group to which she belongs.

⁷⁵ Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph*, 11-12 citing Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 182-3. Popkin addresses criticisms of Halbwachs' theory, specifically that it negates the individual's experience; she argues that in terms of a public event, the external societal framework colors the individual's memory of the event. The project's methodology is in part influenced by Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of habitus (structured ways of thinking that lead an individual to act in a reactionary or reflexive manner) and field (network of relations between individuals and institutions competitively engaged in the dynamics of power), presented in Stephen Grusendorf, "Bourdieu's Field, Capital, and Habitus in Religion," *JSIRS* 6, no 1 (2016): 1-13. Habitus, for the purposes of this study, is the private worship of the emperor and the field is comprised of the acts of negotiation between the emperor and people. The habitus changes over time, making no aspect of cult identical to others.

⁷⁶ Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph*, 13, 17-18 on the importance of art and architecture in recalling these collective memories. She later responds to Mary Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 37 who states that writing (literature, inscriptions) provided the best mnemonic for a triumph, but I think both are necessary and permeated the cityscape of Rome. Isolating the monuments from the words written on them provides only half of the story.

⁷⁷ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 20-1. Hercules and Quirinus possessed a sanctuary and altar at Rome; Koortbojian does not credit Quirinus' human form (Romulus) with cult, since no evidence of cult or ritual activity survives for his hut on the Palatine, tomb in the Forum Romanum, and a statue at the *Ficus Ruminalis*. He also discounts Aeneas since there is only evidence for its existence at Lavinium and (possibly) Alba Longa.

VA. The Role of Architecture and Literature in Late-Republican Collective Memory

I begin my survey of challenges and models of living, more-than-human, Roman men in the late Republic. By the mid first century BCE, state officials increasingly sponsored temples and associations with gods and divine qualities at Rome.⁷⁸ The populace thanked both the individual official and the god, recognizing a greater status in the official than his peers, yet maintaining that he is still less than the gods –a more-than-human status that the man and his family upheld through the maintenance of the temple.⁷⁹ This more-than-human status did not equal living cult, since a cult required ritual and sacrifice;⁸⁰ it indicated, however, that the people could recognize living men, through their achievements and qualities, as closer to the divine. Following the Roman negotiation of cultic worship between the man and the people, the man needed to perform actions and possess traits that would inspire the people to instigate ritual and sacrifice that recognized those events and traits. The man, for it was typically men, could either inspire or create this reaction; for example, a *triumphator* could publically extend his temporary divine status through dedications of temples and monuments that celebrated his relationship

⁷⁸ Alan Wardman, *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), 24 argues that this increase correlates with an increase of religious offices. Penelope Davies, *Architecture and Politics in Republican Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017): 2-3 notes that generally in the Roman Republic, “only elected officials commissioned public buildings, and did so on behalf of the *res publica*; *privati* did not deploy their own resources on state construction.” This system kept non-senators “from using public architecture, a powerful language of authority, from protesting a system that was heavily weighted against them.” She notes that “public temples (*aedes publicae*) [were erected more] than any other type of state building.”

⁷⁹ Wardman, *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans*, 24 (superiority to peers, not gods), 33 politician is “at home” among the gods, 28 temple as monument to himself as well as offering to the gods.

⁸⁰ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 21 on *Divus Julius* requiring ritual. He states “But just as such divinization [by senatorial decision] adumbrated cult, cult required ritual...” Koortbojian does not view Roman divinity and the imperial cult in the same terms as this study, where private worship negotiates the parameters of public cult, but he does describe the action. This worship of and sacrifice to *Divus Julius* occurred before his official deification in 42 BCE.

with the divine. This created a visual reminder of his triumph, but there was a risk that his future actions could undermine this relationship –visual statements of divinely favored victory required future victories to uphold these claims.

Another route relied on others to record and react to a man's exceptionalism. This required a bit of flattery and ambition on all sides, where both the recorder and the man would benefit from their relationship and the man's continued more-than-human status, a *do ut des* contract between the two. For example, as I examine below, Cicero's presentation of Pompey's *divini* qualities honors both Pompey as the possessor and Cicero as the recorder, with the people as the audience of both. This mutual benefit relies on the people continuing to maintain trust in Pompey's divine qualities; if Pompey failed to demonstrate a *divina sapientia*, then both his status and Cicero's would diminish in the eyes of the people. The mutual connection required the recorder to over-state and assume the man's (here Pompey's) qualities and continued more-than-human status, since the recorder could not know the outcome of future events. I examine in the following paragraphs the two possible avenues for men to create or inspire the cultural memory of their divine qualities and status. My models for these avenues are Pompey and Caesar; I address how they both cultivated statuses (by creating and inspiring in monumental and literary media), and how the people maintained their statuses.

A *triumphator* could temporarily extend the honor of his triumph, standing before all of Rome as a Jupiter-on-Earth, through monumental representations. The creation of these monuments did not violate the honor and ritual of the event, but were the *triumphator's* private representations of a public and official ritual that served as a

mnemonic for the viewer's collective memory.⁸¹ This allowed the *triumphator* to directly communicate his divine status, and how to interpret it, to Roman viewers. During the Triumviral period, elite men depended on monuments to convey the memory of their achievements, their more-than-human status, and their divine qualities.⁸² These monuments were not cult places, since there was no ritual focus, but they did present to the viewer the *triumphator*'s elevated status and extended relationship with the divine.

For example, in 63 BCE Pompey received from the senate the official honor of wearing his triumphal costume at all Circus games, "extending its [the garb's] association of man and god beyond the moment of the ceremony itself."⁸³ Two years later, during his third triumph, Pompey participated in an extended two-day ritual, marking him as a world conqueror.⁸⁴ The viewer's memory of the ritual stretched beyond Pompey's dress

⁸¹ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 3 clarifies that these are private monuments; Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 28, 263 spells out that men like Pompey had a "greater control of financial and symbolic resources," (quote from the latter page) but she does not specifically clarify that the monuments were private commissions. Andrew P. Gregory, "Powerful images: responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome," *JRA* 7 (1994): 84 identifies visual elements of the triumph itself: statues, paintings, captives, etc. that served as a reminder in the moment of the victor's achievement.

⁸² Monuments and coinage could present the man directly or indirectly as divine; Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 70 that indirect representations show a relationship with the god through (1) "a divinity or divinities on one side of a coin and a symbol of the Roman State or representation of the living leader on the opposite side," (2) "a divinity might appear within the context of a monument as a whole, but apart from the image of any living human being," (3) "the head of state might also be depicted sacrificing to a divinity, usually in the form of a statue or cult image." For direct modes of representation, (1) "a leader might be represented accompanied by a divinity or divinities," (2) "the leader might appear as theomorphic (godlike), taking on in some way the form of a divinity," (3) "the leaders facial features might be used for an image of a god or otherwise assimilated with those of a divinity." This study will not focus on direct or indirect representations of Augustus as a god, because these are top-down presentations of divinity, not private reactions and interpretations of the emperor's status. For example, the RRC 483/1 and 2, issued in 44-3 BCE by the mint moving with Sextus Pompey, depict Pompey and the symbols of Neptune; Antony and Sol as discussed below. Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), 44-53 and Andrea Cucchiarelli, "Ivy and Laurel: Divine Models in Virgil's 'Eclogues'" *HSPH*, no. 106 (2011): 155-78 summarize that in the 40s BCE, the confrontation between leaders took shape in part as confrontations between different models of divinity.

⁸³ Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. I*, 143, 143 n. 79, tracing the honor to Aemilius Paullus after his victory over the Macedonian king in 168 BCE For ancient sources: Valerius Maximus, *Factorum ac dictorum memorabilium libri IX*, III. 6.4 states that Pompey only used the honor once; Cicero, *Att.*, I. 18.6 mentions the honor with derision, calling it a '*togula*.'

⁸⁴ Beard, *Roman Triumph*, 8-10, 15; even though Caesar celebrated five triumphs to Pompey's three, the triumph of 61 BCE signified a Pompeian view of the Roman world.

(regardless of how often he actually wore his triumphal costume) to his monuments along the triumphal procession's route. The Theater of Pompey in the Campus Martius, dedicated in 55 BCE, located along the triumphal route, served as a monumental reminder of the *triumvir*'s achievements and the standard they and Pompey set for subsequent *triumphatores*.⁸⁵ Pompey's shrines at the top of the seating area inside the theater complex impart to the viewer and ritual participant the relationship between Pompey and his divine qualities, Venus *Victrix*, *Honos*, *Virtus*, and *Felicitas*, while also extending his honor of a triumph beyond the ritual moment.⁸⁶ I view the possible danger in constructing these associations on a monumental scale as the fact that the dedicator must continue to embody his divine qualities.⁸⁷ Pompey's visual mnemonics necessitated his continued personification of a world conqueror and the divine qualities present for the viewer to continue the association; he must continue to assure the people that their trust in him as a world conqueror is well placed and worthy of divine associations. After his defeat at Pharsalus and ignoble death in 48 BCE, Pompey no longer embodied these qualities and the memory they conjured in the viewer changed to one of his failures. The

⁸⁵ Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph*, 42 does not believe a procession was intended to pass through the *parodos*, as was the case (she argues) with the later Theater of Marcellus. Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, 304, 337, makes similar assertions in general terms, not focusing on Pompey specifically.

⁸⁶ Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 225-8 follows the *fasti Amiternini* for the festivals to "*Veneri Victrici, Hon(ori), Virtut(i), Felicitati in theatro marmoreo*; to Venus *Victrix, Honos, Virtus, and Felicitas* in the marble theater." The *fasti Allifani* conversely lists "*V V H V V Felicitas*" which she reconstructs as "*V(eneri) V(ictrici) H(onori) V(irtuti) V[?] Felicitati in theatro Pompei*". She follows G. Sauron, "Le complexe pompéien du Champ de Mars: nouveauté urbanistique à finalité idéologique," in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire, I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.-III. siècle ap. J.-C. Atti del Coll. Internazionale Roma 8-12* (Rome: Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 1985), 457-73; G. Sauron, *Quis deum? L'expression plastique des idéologies politiques et religieuses à Rome* (Rome: Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 1994), 249-314 for the layout of the three qualities as a divine triad.

⁸⁷ Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 28: "The more effective the appropriation, however, and with it control over which connotations of the divine qualities were evoked, the more acute the need to live up to the claimed association. In the event of failures, those resources would demand alternative readings."

viewer no longer trusted in his divine associations and status, so the negotiation between the people and Pompey broke down before full divinity could be achieved.

Cicero's language describing the qualities of Caesar and Pompey exemplifies an alternative method to Pompey's monumental statements. Cicero undoubtedly flatters and attempts to attach his own ambitions to those of the *triumviri*, but I read his language as representing a private response to these men in the collective memory of the late Republic. We should not consider whether or not Cicero actually believed that these men possessed divine qualities, but rather focus on the implications of his language in terms of divine status and living divinity in Rome. Cicero's statements form a contract between the *triumvir* and himself, which is upheld by the people's trust, where the agency of the *triumvir*'s relationship with the qualities and the viewer lay with both the *triumphator* and Cicero but is maintained by the people. Cicero's approval and admiration of Pompey is present in his attribution of the adjective *divinus* to the man's qualities:⁸⁸

Sed tamen alterius partis periculum, Sertorianae atque Hispaniensis, quae multo plus firmamenti ac roboris habebat, Cn. Pompei divino consilio ac singulari virtute depulsum est. ⁸⁹	But nevertheless the danger of the other part, that of Sertorius and Hispania, which had a great deal more support and strength, was expelled by the divine counsel and the remarkable courage of Gnaeus Pompeius.
Ita tantum bellum, tam diuturnum, tam longe lateque dispersum, quo bello omnes gentes ac nationes premebantur, Cn. Pompeius extrema hieme apparavit, ineunte vere suscepit, media aestate confecit. Est haec divina atque incredibilis virtus imperatoris. ⁹⁰	Thus Gnaeus Pompeius prepared at the end of winter, he undertook at the beginning of spring, and by the middle of summer ended such a great war, lasting for so long, spread far and wide, by which war all nations and people were oppressed. This is the divine and incredible courage of the general.

⁸⁸ Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 39 specifies, correctly, that Cicero applies *divinus* to Pompey's qualities, not Pompey himself. Cicero did attribute men with the adjective, but only after death, like Scipio the Younger.

⁸⁹ *Pro Lege Manilia* 10.3. All translations, unless otherwise indicated are my own.

⁹⁰ *Pro Lege Manilia* 36.1.

Divinus here implies Pompey's more-than-human qualities and virtues, but the man himself is not called 'divine'. Cicero's praise, like the shrines in the Theater, requires that Pompey dutifully be seen to embody his *divinum consilium* and *divina virtus*, as well as continue his successful military track record, for his association with the divine, as Cicero writes it, to persist. It varies, however, since Cicero, in conjunction with Pompey, are agents of the *triumvir*'s divine associations; if Pompey no longer embodies the association with the divine, then both he and Cicero will lose status relative to their peers, and the people will lose trust in both. The power in this negotiation lies with the people, who respond to both Pompey and Cicero.

Caesar, in contrast, received from Cicero divine qualities with strings attached; he must meet civic obligations and parameters before Cicero will deem his qualities to be *divinus*:

Tantum enim mansuetudinem, tam inusitatam inauditamque clementiam , tantum in summa potestate rerum omnium modum, tam denique incredibilem sapientiam ac paene divinam tacitus praeterire nullo modo possum. ⁹¹	For I am in no way able to pass over in silence such mildness, such extraordinary and unheard-of clemency , such moderation in one with supreme power over everything, and finally such incredible and almost divine wisdom .
O clementiam admirabilem atque omnium laude, praedicatione, litteris monumentisque decorandam! ⁹²	Clemency , wonderful and deserving to be honored with all possible praise and publicity, in both literature and monuments!

Cicero persuades Caesar to embody a mortal's *clementia*, not *divina clementia*, before he seeks divine honors.⁹³ This arbitrary limitation Cicero placed on Caesar, I argue,

⁹¹ *Pro Marcello* 2.1.

⁹² *Pro Ligario* 6.1. Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 127 reads *Pro Ligario* as a celebration of Caesar's *clementia* as a means of seeking immortality (but it is not a *divina clementia*).

⁹³ Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 114 observes that by making his divine qualities conditional, Cicero seeks to identify ways to restrain the man's ambitions. In a similar way, Cicero in *Att.* 8.16.1-2 complains that the people delight in Caesar's *insidiosa clementia* because they fear Pompey's anger (*illius iracundiam formidant*). Caesar's not-yet divine *clementia* in both the letters and speeches is a prominent quality. Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 127 believes that Cicero's emphasis on *clementia* as a parameter for Caesar's divine status anticipates the Temple of *Clementia Caesaris*, which

permitted him to progress towards a more-than-human status rather than continuously embody it.⁹⁴ Cicero is still connected to Caesar's status, as he was Pompey's, but his limitations and obligations shift the agency of Caesar's relationship with his qualities and the viewer. Caesar need only possess a mortal's *clementia* for his *sapientia* to be *divina*; Cicero and the viewer/reader are the agents who recognize Caesar's divine quality and respond to them in thanks for what Caesar has done for them. Caesar's progress is both driven and measured by the people, their actions and statements. Unlike Pompey, the progression of status allows for more flexibility in the negotiation; Caesar becomes divine in the perception of the people, whereas Pompey must continue to demonstrate to them that he already is.

Cicero does not present the only view of Caesar's divine status, but his language in granting divine qualities anticipated the Roman imperial process of negotiation between the man and people. This differs from Pompey's more Hellenistic interpretation of divinity, which was upheld by the individual and confirmed by the people. Caesar's progression allowed him to become divine in the eyes of the people, rather than continuously prove that he already was and should continue to be so. I note that these two possible avenues I identify are not mutually exclusive, and that we cannot know whether or not Caesar possessed intent in the outcome and development of his status. The difference I wish to highlight is the agency of the men and their negotiations with the people. I posit that Caesar's deification was successful (i.e. confirmed by the senate) on account of chance (his victory at Pharsalus) and the collective recognition of his mortal deeds as being more-than-human. I believe Caesar's deification would have happened

Stephan Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 241 doubts that it was actually built although it is shown on a *denarius* issued by P. Sepullius Macer, c. 44 BCE (RRC 480/1).

⁹⁴ I say arbitrary, since Cicero could not, and probably did not intend to, hold Caesar to such a statement.

with or without Cicero's obligations and parameters, since it was the people who called for Caesar's deification. Cicero documents for us part of the private initiative in developing and acknowledging a man's proximity to the divine.

Additionally, I wish to emphasize the role of the senate in Caesar's deification. As I stated above, the senate has the final say in making a man into a god.⁹⁵ The senate did not deify Caesar until January 42 BCE, partially in response to political pressure from the Second Triumvirate, but mostly due to pervasive public practice.⁹⁶ It was not the actions of Cicero that made Caesar a god, but Cicero's writings exist within the cultural movement of men becoming more divine than human. As a result of Caesar's deification, the senate had the final say in whether or not a man had become divine, in response to pervasive private recognition of that status; the people's actions and recognition culminated in senate-decreed divinity, the progression to which had already been negotiated during the man's lifetime.

VB. Octavian's Early Forays into Divinity

These are only a few examples of the cultural language and understanding of men who were described as possessing divine qualities and were themselves more-than-human, but the inglorious death of Pompey and the murder, cult, and deification of Caesar established non-mythic exempla (as opposed to Hercules, Aeneas, and Romulus) for

⁹⁵ Cf. section I, n. 19 *supra* and chart on p. 8. Davies, *Architecture and Politics in Republican Rome*, 272-5 adds that the senate's role in granting Caesar his lifetime honors was an 'art of resistance' in which the honors lost their meaning and "the honors enveloped him in an aura of kingship that eventually he could not escape, regardless of intent or agency, which made him 'assassinatable.'" (274). The "visual arts" of monuments became for the senate an instrument to spur others to save the Republic.

⁹⁶ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 21-30 for the senate's declaration, 35 for Second Triumvirate. He counters in n. 51 (located on p.243) the claims of Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, and Duncan Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol. I.1* (Boston: Brill, 1987), 63 that Caesar received *all* the trappings of divine honors (emphasis his) before his death.

future private cult and divine status.⁹⁷ The young Octavian participated in the trend most recently laid out by Caesar and Pompey, where living men accumulated and were recognized to possess divine qualities. I caution that Octavian did not possess a template for divine status and cult, but rather he as a man lived and operated within the cultural and cultic memory (memory of living and posthumous cult) marked by the mnemonics of Caesar and Pompey. I argue in the following paragraphs that Octavian's early associations with the divine culminated in his and the senate's official and public statements on his divine status (i.e. that he himself is not divine). I aim to locate a possible rationale for such, and identify how these statements did not impede private cult at the beginning of his reign.

The shift in divine qualities for Caesar (where he progresses towards divine status) placed the agency of his cult on the shoulders of individuals and collectives, which the senate confirmed. We must not forget, however, the fact that Caesar was assassinated and that his murder, in part, spurred the people to call for his public and official deification.⁹⁸ The haziness surrounding the relationship between men and the divine inhibited the creation of an official rulebook for the Julio-Claudians to follow in achieving posthumous divine status.⁹⁹ Relative divinity necessitates the viewer interpreting the emperor as being more divine or possessing more divine qualities relative to herself, so no cumulative

⁹⁷ I specify "non-mythic" since of the gods Hercules, Aeneas, and Romulus, as Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 20-1 points out, only Hercules and Quirinus (not Romulus) possessed an active cult, and these gods were not recent features in the cultural memory of Rome, cf. section V, n. 77.

⁹⁸ Cf. n. 96 *supra*. We can never fully know the degree to which Caesar received divine honors in Rome before his death (hence debate outlined by Koortbojian, Fishwick, and Taylor in n. 96), but his murder led to the creation of the Second Triumvirate and thus the senate's act of deification.

⁹⁹ Cf. n. 2 *supra* on Levene, "Defining the Divine at Rome," 76 on the "fuzzy" boundaries between men and gods in poetry, which I also identify in the culture of the time. Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 23-4, 155ff attempts to find a rationale behind the confusion in making men into gods in Rome. Ultimately, he finds that the process was ongoing and resistant to strict parameters; for example, the emperor's statuary depicted both the *vivus* and the *Divus*, depending on chronology and maybe a changed in the accompanying inscription (182-3, 185, 189, 226).

interpretation or rule-book can exist for every viewer. Octavian therefore, could not distill a formula for divinity (living or posthumous) from Caesar's example, and we can assume he wished to avoid such a gruesome assassination. I examine below the δωδεκάθεος banquet as a presentation of Octavian's divine status that the viewer/reader did not imbue with positive meaning (i.e. no private cultic practices). The association between Octavian and the divine in this narrative did not invite or encourage the reader to acknowledge Octavian as possessing a more-than-human status relative to her own.

Our only source for the δωδεκάθεος banquet is Suetonius, whose account is not contemporary to the event. In light of this, I recreate how the Roman people as individuals and a collective would have responded to such an event given the historical events happening around the same time (40-36 BCE).¹⁰⁰ Some scholars believe this was the wedding banquet of Octavian and Livia, while others doubt it ever took place.¹⁰¹ Whether or not the banquet took place does not diminish what it tells us about the way Octavian's early experiments with divinity and divine status were viewed (either during his lifetime or in a later tradition).¹⁰² According to Suetonius, a highlight of the banquet featured Octavian dressed as Apollo and his guests dressed as the other Olympians:

¹⁰⁰ Robert Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995), 94-6 follows Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 119 that the banquet can be dated to after Brundisium in 40 BCE, but argues that because of the private nature of the event, it should not shape a view of Octavian as a public figure at that time. J. Gagé, *Apollon romain: essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du ritus Graecus à Rome des origines à Auguste* (Paris: E. De Boccard, 1955), 487 dates the banquet to 37 BCE, but John F. Miller, *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 15, 17-18 puts the banquet generally between 40-36 BCE. For Miller, Gurval's reading of the banquet as private is contrary to elite Roman banqueting practice, and Suetonius' listed evidence for the event makes dismissal 'extreme.'

¹⁰¹ Supporters of wedding feast: Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 70; Josiah Osgood, *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 237-6; Kenneth Scott, "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C." *MAAR* 11 (1933): 30-1. Those doubting the banquet was more than Antonian propaganda: Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 15, Gurval, *Actium and Augustus*, 94-7; Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*," 415 presents the banquet as an orgy.

¹⁰² Andrew Laird, "Ut Figura Poesis: Writing Art and the Art of Writing in Augustan Poetry," in *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, ed. Jas Elsner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 101 on how a

<p>Cena quoque eius secretior in fabulis fuit, quae vulgo δωδεκάθεος vocabatur; in qua deorum dearumque habitu discubuisse convivas et ipsum pro Apolline ornatum non Antoni modo epistulae singulorum nomina amarissime enumerantis exprobrant, sed et sine auctore notissimi versus:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">cum primum istorum conduxit mensa choragum, sexque deos vidit Mallia sexque deas, impia dum Phoebi Caesar mendacia ludit, dum nova divorum cenat adulteria: omnia se a terris tunc numina declinarunt, fugit et auratos Iuppiter ipse thronos.</p> <p>Auxit cenae rumorem summa tunc in civitate penuria ac fames, adclamatumque est postridie: omne frumentum deos comedisse et Caesarem esse plane Apollinem, sed Tortorem, quo cognomine is deus quadam in parte urbis colebatur.¹⁰³</p>	<p>There was also a private banquet of his, which the people called ‘the banquet of the twelve gods,’ at which the guests reclined in the garb of the gods and goddesses and (Octavian) himself dressed just as Apollo, as was charged not only in the letters of Antony, who bitterly recounted the names of all the guests, but also in these anonymous lines, which everyone knows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">As soon as the table of those rascals hired a choragus, and Mallia saw six gods and six goddesses, now Caesar impiously plays the false role of Apollo, while dining among the new adulteries of the gods: all divinities then turned themselves from the earth, and Jupiter himself fled his golden throne.</p> <p>The matter of the banquet magnified the rumor because at that time in the city there was destitution and famine, the next day there was an outcry: the gods had eaten all the grain and Caesar was in truth Apollo, but Apollo the Tormentor, by which name the god was worshipped in a certain part of the city.</p>
--	---

The period of 40-36 BCE places this banquet during or just before Sextus Pompey’s blockades, so the people of Rome would indeed have been starving or experiencing shortages.¹⁰⁴ The reception Suetonius presents, that the people rejected the divine status of Octavian-Apollo or even Octavian-Apollo *Tortor*, I interpret as the people, due to their circumstances, resisting Octavian’s presentation of his own divine status. Octavian alone, in the narrative, supports and maintains his association with Apollo. The act of men dining as gods had Republican and Hellenistic precedents, but Octavian here does not

verbal description becomes a work of art; just as an ecphrasis does not necessarily need to refer to a ‘real’ piece of art, this anecdote reveals that a representation of Octavian/Augustus as a living manifestation of the divine was not well-received by the people and garnered no private sacrifices or rituals.

¹⁰³ DA 70.1-2.

¹⁰⁴ Kathryn Welch, Magnus Pius: *Sextus Pompeius and the Transformation of the Roman Republic* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012), 24 and Shelley C. Stone, III, “Sextus Pompey, Octavian and Sicily,” *AJA* 87, no. 1 (Jan., 1983): 13 date the blockade to 42/3-36 BCE.

celebrate a victory or partake in local honors;¹⁰⁵ the Roman people here gained little from his image, deeds, status, and authority, all of which confirmed his cruelty more than his divinity. I read this scene to describe a trend visible in Augustus' *vivus* cult in Rome, where the people respond with private cult when the emperor is present to meet their needs. Augustus' lifetime actions must therefore benefit the people, as Caesar's *clementia* in Cicero had, in order for them to respond to those actions with cult.

This earlier experiment with Roman living divinity, I argue, was part of a movement away from top-down statements of divinity or divine status that did not place the onus of the assertion on the viewer and reader. I identify a bottom-up trend, where the people, as individuals and members of communities, dictated their own terms of worship through their interactions with the absent emperor (his image, deeds, status, and authority). They created an image of the emperor that demonstrated an awareness of Rome and imperial themes, while at the same time addressing their local needs. This invited, but did not necessitate, imperial interaction and reinterpretation (as will be argued in Chapter 4). For example, as Chapter 3 proves, the emperor did not dictate the features and language of the compital altars to the *Lares Augusti* in the *vici*, but the people reacted to his reorganization of the *vici* and reinstatement of the festival in a way that made Augustus present in every *vicus* in Rome.

¹⁰⁵ Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 49 and Miller, *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*, 16-18 argue that Suetonius is exaggerating the event, citing examples of Alexander the Great and other Republican men participating in banquets as gods: Metellus Pius in the 70s in Spain receiving unofficial divine honors at banquets in Valerius Maximus 9.1.5, Plutarch, *Sertorius*, 22.3; L. Munatius Plancus dancing in costume as the sea-god Glaucus in Velleius 2.83; Alexander in Athenaeus 12.537e recording Ehippus dressing as Ammon, Artemis, and Hermes. With the exception of Alexander, both Metellus Pius' and L. Munatius Plancus' behavior can be explained. Metellus Pius' behavior at a banquet was in response to a victory over his enemy Sertorius, making his honors similar to those other generals like Pompey received while abroad, not in Rome. For L. Munatius Plancus, his behavior in this anecdote and elsewhere is not presented in a favorable light by Velleius, making his behavior not something to emulate.

VI. Private Cult in Augustan Rome

In my dissertation I argue for an expansion of our understanding of Augustus's divinity in Rome to include the worship of the living emperor in the private sphere. By sacrificing to the emperor, worshipping him in the streets of Rome, and creating cultic statues of him, individuals participating in his private cult make the living but absent emperor visually and linguistically present to themselves. The negotiation between the people and emperor cultivated the collective memory of Augustus's divine status long before his official deification in 14 CE. These people easily moved from the private to the public sphere, where their private actions dictated the engagement with the public *Divus* cult. I will argue in the following chapters that private statements and interpretations of Augustus and his cult should be considered in terms of the progression of private to public cult, granting value to the private acts of worship enacted by individuals during his lifetime. The interpretations and reactions of Roman citizens to official and public language, monuments, and images of Augustus established the foundations of his posthumous divinity and cult.

Chapter 2 POETIC SCENES OF SACRIFICE: WORSHIPPING THE LIVING EMPEROR IN ROME

After the victory at Actium in 31 BCE and the end of civil wars, the developments made in cultivating and recognizing the divine status of extraordinary figures were not forgotten. I analyze in this chapter several private acts of worshipping the living Augustus with sacrifices, specifically libations and offerings of incense. On this basis I will argue that the emperor was worshipped, not just revered, with sacrifices on behalf of his person. I hold that sacrifices to the *vivus* Augustus in private anticipated and styled the official and public cult that appeared after Augustus' formal deification in 14 CE.¹ Horace's and Ovid's accounts of these sacrifices employ generic traditions and divine exempla to advise their readers on the practices and implications of acknowledging the divine status of Augustus. I assert that analyses of private cult, in this case sacrifices to the emperor portrayed in contemporary poetry, present a view of the imperial cult's origins in Rome, and the progression from private to public. I do not see this gap between public and private in the imperial cult as requiring private foreign cults to institute change in the public sphere;² I counter that while private sacrifices to the *vivus* in poetry utilized Greek poetic traditions to communicate Roman differences, these sacrifices were not relegated to foreign cults, and were not discounted because of their uses of Hellenistic elements.

¹ Cf. Chapter 1, section III, n. 52 for the definition of 'official' in this study. Scheid, *The Gods, the State, and the Individual*, 14-15 on the weaknesses and failures of models of civic religion. Scheid admits that studies of public cult cannot explain changes in the private sphere.

² I oppose Scheid, *The Gods, the State, and the Individual*, 15 who describes the instigator for change between private and public cults as the addition of foreign cults.

Since the direction of influence between private and public cults moves from the former to the latter,³ the majority of evidence for my examination of private sacrifices to the emperor is found in poetry and supported by coins and official practices. I read these poetic scenes as revealing private acts of worship within the *domus* that demonstrate the poet's individual awareness of more prevalent practices within Rome. I look at the language of sacrifice in both domestic poetic scenes and also in official statements and histories, arguing that these domestic scenes document broader trends. In addition to the language of sacrifice, I also assess the language used for the emperor's person in these sacrifices. I argue that the *numen* of the emperor, as part of Augustus' living person, serves as a divine-metonymy for the man; his divine *numen* is a facet of the man's whole divine status.⁴ I counter scholarship on the relationship between *numen* and *genius* in libation offerings to the emperor;⁵ the divine *genius* of the emperor was not worshipped as a means of avoiding the living emperor's divinity, but rather his *numen* alone (not *genius*) represents the ways that individuals celebrated the divine qualities and more-than-human status of the emperor in their private worship.

I. Sacrifices to the *Vivus Augustus*

I focus upon poetic vignettes of sacrifice to the emperor in the context within which they appear: literary, domestic, and contemporary to *vivus* Augustus. Multiple modern studies have examined these vignettes both as literature and as ritual, finding them to be

³ Cf. Chapter 1, n. 5 and section I on the direction of influence between public and private cults.

⁴ Duncan Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," *HThR* 62, no. 3 (1969): 361 traces the use of *numen* in Augustan literature as a metonymy for god, but does not follow the argument to assert Augustus' living divinity in Rome.

⁵ Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 138-9 on the *genius* as demeaning for senators to worship; Fishwick "Genius and Numen," incorrectly reading Horace's use of *numen* in *Carmen* 4.5 as referring to the *genius Augusti*.

ambiguous as acts of worship.⁶ I analyze the texts as well as their literary and historical contexts without a preconceived denial of Augustus' living divinity and sacrifices to him. I, in my analyses of the poetic scenes, consider their features as descriptions of private domestic cult rather than purely fictitious scenes of poetic sycophancy.

Given the ephemeral nature of a domestic libation to Augustus, one pour and it is done, the majority of evidence for such acts survive in poetic vignettes; libations in the works of Horace and Ovid contemporaneous to the emperor's lifetime, therefore, comprise my evidence for my argument of private sacrifices. I give specific consideration to the language used to refer to the emperor; sacrifices to and on behalf of Augustus are not synonymous. I use distinctions between the two to evaluate the negotiation of worship in the private sphere –the former as an act of worshipping the emperor and the latter as an act of veneration, not worship.⁷ The use of the two forms (to and on behalf of) denotes to me the private and public stances, respectively, on the emperor's divine status. Private and public understandings of Augustus' living divinity were not binary concepts, where the one could not share space with the other.⁸ These two concepts, I argue, influence an individual's relationship with the emperor and her understanding of Augustus' power and authority.

I first address the genre of poetry as a source for sacrifices, then the historical context and wording of libations and prayers to the emperor. Next, I examine libations poured to Augustus in Horace's *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1, concentrating on the language and

⁶ To name a few: Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime," 116-33; Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," 356-67; Weinstock, *Divus Julius*; Price, "Gods and Emperors," 91-2; Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. I*, 207; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 198-211; McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*; Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*.

⁷ I define veneration as the honor and reverence due to an extraordinary person (i.e. he adores his wife) whereas worship recognizes the divine qualities of a person or deity with sacrifices, temples, and cult.

⁸ Cf. my discussion in Chapter 1, section III on the overlapping nature of categories of worship.

characters used in each, followed by an analysis of Augustus' *numen* and *genius* as they allegedly and actually appear in the texts. I then compare Horace's vignettes of sacrifice to those in Ovid; the younger poet's language and scenes of sacrifice in the *Fasti* and *Epistulae Ex Ponto* (henceforth *Ex Ponto*) demonstrate the movement from private to public worship. Since Ovid lived and worshipped the emperor before and after his death, his works provide the best evidence for the progression of worship. Ovid's vignettes, however, should not be taken out of context but read within the framework of his corpus. I believe that the differing positions of the poets in terms of imperial sponsorship (the former receiving imperial sponsorship and the latter as an exile), demonstrate to a reader their views on Augustus' more-than-human status; their positions in and outside of the imperial sphere allow us as readers to witness the dynamic relationships between poet, emperor, reader, and the practices that connect the three. Finally, in this chapter I also compare poetic sacrifices to depictions of sacrifices in other media in order to corroborate these private acts of worship in both official and unofficial media.

IA. Poetry as a source

The vignettes presented in poetry exist in an imagined, domestic setting. The multi-faceted layers of viewing within each scene (that of the characters within the scene, the poet's view, and the reader's perspective) are literary representations of the possibilities of practice. I caution that these vignettes do not necessarily depict an actual sacrifice, nor do they offer official, state-sanctioned explanations of the participants' or poet's motivations in their sacrifices. Jörg Rüpke addresses this function of poetry, describing the practice in his analysis of Ovid's *Fasti*: "religious practice and symbols invite

questions and can be explained. Answers are neither forbidden nor dogmatic. The narrator is quite aware that his own answers are questionable. Explanation is not inimical to religion, but part of it.”⁹ Following Rüpke’s assessment of poetry, I assert that exegetical poetic narratives of sacrifices to the emperor (i.e. the poet’s interpretation and explanation), when present, are not official or even a representation of an opinion universally shared by others, but the practices and settings recognize the poet’s ability to make gods.¹⁰ Poetry mixes together imagined, real, or exaggerated actions in a heterogeneous blend; in poetry gods and men can interact in impossible ways, and men can negotiate the relationship between their gods and the emperor. Poetry then was a valuable medium for explaining sacrifices directed to the emperor’s divinity and divine qualities; no other contemporary genre possessed the means to speak to the unofficial nature of the emperor’s divine status and the movement of worship from private to public. As a mental landscape, these scenes present us with a vision of what sacrifices to the living emperor entailed and explanations of their utility. Thus my analysis of sacrifices in Horace and Ovid reveals the ways these imaginative offerings given to the *vivus* emperor in poetry played with Augustus’ official avoidance of outright declaration of such honors.

Beyond the actions of the poet as narrator, the reader is able to participate in these sacrifices with the guidance of the poet. Sacrificial vignettes are not didactic, but the reader learns from the poet’s experience; the interplay between the layers of viewing and participation creates a social negotiation of practice, much like the negotiation inherent in

⁹ *On Roman Religion*, 94.

¹⁰ Levene, “Defining the Divine at Rome,” 76 on poetry in general being “fuzzy,” where concepts relating to the emperor’s divinity that were unexpressed elsewhere could be addressed; on Ovid specifically: McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 111-2; Kenneth Scott, “Emperor Worship in Ovid,” *TAPA* 61 (1930): 68.

the imperial cult.¹¹ The reader may accept the poet's representation and explanation of sacrifice to the living emperor, or may not.¹² For this study's purposes, however, I state that the reader's reaction can only be traced in documented sacrifices to *Divus* Augustus in prose and material culture, which I will briefly address in the conclusion. In this way I argue that the reader's immediate negotiation regarding the *vivus*' divinity in poetry cannot be recreated in literary form. We cannot know whether or not the reader accepted the practice as the poet presented it, but I trace these practices in poetry to actual representations of similar sacrifices in order to show that the poets, their scenes of sacrifice, and Romans all contributed to the zeitgeist of Augustus' divine status. My focus in this chapter then is poet's representation and explanation of sacrifices to the *vivus* emperor.

The poet as a source becomes limiting when considering his audience for these vignettes. Both Ovid and Horace wrote for an elite audience, who in their social and communicative space were able to build and challenge the features of their world.¹³ That is to say, the poets in their vignettes of sacrifice possessed the ability to share private practices and contradict the emperor's public and official avoidance of direct divinity from either outside of or within the sphere of imperial sponsorship. The poets did not create these rituals in order to comment upon Augustus' status, much like Ovid did not

¹¹ Rüpke, *On Roman Religion*, 44 describing his theory of lived religion as filtering scattered evidence "by relating it to individual agents, their use of space and time, their formation of social coalitions, their negotiation with religious specialists or providers, and their attempts to make sense of religion in a situational manner and thus render religion effective." Since there was no official dogma for the imperial cult, individuals respond to each other to determine its function for their local groups.

¹² Rüpke, *On Roman Religion*, 90, 94-96 on the reader/narrator relationship in the *Fasti*. The *Fasti*'s narrator educates the reader with his possible explanations, but the reader may accept or disregard those explanations: "rather, it is an informed and sympathetic observer or bystander, embedded in a structured society, but free to exercise his or her own choices, knowing the possible limits of individual innovation..." (95).

¹³ Rüpke, *On Roman Religion*, 84ff. Rüpke argues that lived religion in poetry allowed the elite readers to inform their view of the world.

create the *Caristia*, but I affirm that their insertion of the emperor into domestic scenes of sacrifice communicates to an elite reader the prevalence of Augustus' private *vivus* cult. I will demonstrate here and in the following chapters that the worship of the living emperor becomes inclusive (available to elites and non-elites alike) when these scenes of sacrifice for an elite audience are placed in context with cult places and cultic statues for the *vivus* Augustus. Within the topography of Rome, I argue that a heterogeneous audience (citizens, senators, and freedmen) was able to interact with statements and presentations of Augustus' status in much the same way as elite readers of poetry.

IB. Historical Context

In order to evaluate these scenes in poetry, I locate them within the historical context of sacrifices to and on behalf of the emperor. Although the publication of the *Res Gestae* and Dio Cassius' *Historiae Romanae* post-date Augustus' deification in 14 CE, the former documents practices during Augustus' lifetime, and the latter offers a later perspective of those practices from an outside observer (i.e. not the emperor himself). I utilize these two texts to document in this section the official and unofficial interpretations of sacrifices to the living emperor. Offerings of libations, incense, and prayers originated during the emperor's lifetime, and these sources capture the similarity of practice yet difference in language.

Private individuals most often perform libations and offerings of incense and prayers within a domestic space, but libations and certain prayers, not incense, are official acts of worship (sanctioned by the senate). Both the *Res Gestae* and Dio Cassius' later history

date the advent of libations and prayers on behalf of and to Augustus to 30 BCE. Latin versions of the *Res Gestae* record:

<p>Vota pro salute mea suscipi per consules et sacerdotes quinto quoque anno senatus decrevit.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Privatim etiam et municipatim universi cives uno animo continenter apud omnia pulvinaria pro valetudine mea supplicaverunt.¹⁴</p>	<p>The senate decreed that every fifth year vows for my good health be undertaken by the consuls and the priests.</p> <p>...</p> <p>Moreover, citizens all together, in private and as a municipality have, with one accord, continuously offered prayers for my good health at all sacred spaces.</p>
---	--

The *Res Gestae* makes no specific mention of libations, but the setting of “*pulvinaria*; all sacred spaces,” for their prayers suggests a cultic location. Christopher Van Den Berg elaborates on the different meanings of *pulvinaria* in Roman religion, specifically the *pulvinar* as a part of religious rites where libations were poured, and the *Pulvinar ad Circum Maximum*, where the divinity of the deified emperor became a primary focus.¹⁵ Even though the text does not mention libations, the association between *pulvinaria* and libations suggests that libations accompanied the prayers. I do not read the typically public nature of these prayers and libations at the *pulvinaria* (both *pulvinaria* and *Pulvinar ad Circum Maximum*) to suggest that no private sacrifices occurred.

Additionally, Alison Cooley suggests the translation “supplicaverunt; offered prayers” without specific comment; the verb can refer to petitioning or imploring a person or

¹⁴ *Res Gestae* 9.1-2, the omitted section describes games held in fulfillment of these vows during Augustus’ lifetime (Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 68).

¹⁵ Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 145-7 notes that “*pulvinaria* refer to public feasts given on religious occasions. This phrase is omitted in the Greek version, since no equivalent could be found in a Greek cultural context.” Christopher Van Den Berg, “The ‘Pulvinar’ in Roman Culture,” *TAPA* 138, no. 2 (2008): 240, 242, 261, 265 clarifies the uses of the word, listing four meanings: “1) divine couch, 2) sacred marriage-bed, 3) sacred edifice or space (similar to *aedes*, *fanum* or *templum*), including the *Pulvinar* in the Circus Maximus, and 4) *lectisternium* (a sacrificial meal for a god,” (240). He elaborates that the *pulvinar* “was a central element in the religious rites of the *supplicatio* and the *lectisternium*... At such ceremonies Romans would typically offer wine and incense to the gods on the allotted day (or days)” (242). The *Pulvinar ad Circum Maximum* in contrast “...emphasized the imperial family’s reverence for those traditional Roman values that formed a key element of imperial self-representation” (265). Following Van Der Berg’s argument, the translation “sacred spaces” is preferred to Cooley’s “public feasts.”

deity,¹⁶ or even to make propitiatory offerings.¹⁷ The correlating verb in the Greek text, “ἔθυσαν; sacrifice or offered sacrifice,” can include burned or poured offerings (even cheese at *Odyssey* 9.231).¹⁸ The Greek and Latin taken together with the location of the *pulvinaria* suggest prayers and libations. The *Res Gestae* documents Augustus’ official honors, not the unofficial actions of private citizens. In this way, the *pulvinaria* may be the setting of an official practice, sanctioned by the emperor and the Roman state.

As a much later source, Dio Cassius’ description captures the distinction between official and unofficial practice, those sanctioned by the state and emperor and those performed by individuals and collectives without explicit approval. He uses two separate words, ὑπὲρ and αὐτῷ, to indicate the difference between the official practices, as outlined in the *Res Gestae*, and unofficial interpretations of it:

... τοὺς τε ἱερέας καὶ τὰς ἱερεΐας ἐν ταῖς ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς βουλῆς εὐχαῖς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου ὁμοίως εὐχεσθαι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς συσσιτίοις οὐχ ὅτι τοῖς κοινοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις πάντα αὐτῷ σπένδειν ἐκέλευσαν. ¹⁹	... priest and priestess were to pray for him (Augustus) likewise, on behalf of the people and senate, and at meals, not only public but also private meals, they urged all to pour libations to him.
--	---

I read the use of the prepositions *pro* and ὑπὲρ for the prayers in both sources as capturing the official stance on Augustus’ divinity (i.e. that he himself is not divine). Offerings with these prepositions are offered on his behalf, not to him, invalidating them as acts of worship.²⁰ In fact, the majority of epigraphic evidence for prayers to the

¹⁶ OLD s.v. III. “to petition or implore (a person, deity).”

¹⁷ OLD s.v. II.A. “to make propitiatory offerings (to a deity).”

¹⁸ LSJ s.v. I.A. for “offer by burning meat or drink to the gods.”

¹⁹ *Historiae Romanae* 51.19.7. I translate εὐχεσθαι to mean “to pray for someone,” following LSJ s.v. I.A.3, where the accusative τε is Augustus.

²⁰ Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 102 n. 31 correctly states that sacrifice on behalf of a person does not indicate or equal a cult for that person.

emperor specifically denote ‘on behalf of the emperor.’²¹ Simon Price reads this idiosyncrasy of language (the use of the preposition) as a deliberate act of ambiguity, “a way of evading precision as to the relationship between the emperor and the gods.”²² As an official account of practice, I read the preposition as the emperor’s and senate’s side of the negotiation concerning Augustus’ *vivus* cult, where there is no correction on practice, but there is also no explicit indication that Augustus’ more-than-human status places him *much* closer to the divine.

Dio Cassius does, however, preserve the other side of the negotiation. As a later source utilizing materials contemporary to Augustus’ reign, I read his use of the dative οὐτῷ as the unofficial interpretation by private individuals of Augustus’ status.²³ I take this word as a dative of dedication, indicating one of the ways in which private individuals represented Augustus’ divinity to themselves. In Dio’s account, private individuals

²¹ Price, “Between Man and God,” 28-33 lists and explains examples of sacrifices given ‘on behalf of the emperor,’ from provincial contexts.

²² “Between Man and God,” 33, elaborating on the statement that a lack of distinction between the man and the gods is similarly expressed in sacrificial practices.

²³ Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 26-29 on Dio as a source. Dio’s exact sources are unknown, but he does document here practice not preserved in the *Res Gestae* but does survive in literary accounts. Additionally, Dio elsewhere modifies or ignores the statements of the *Res Gestae* to give an alternative account that is corroborated by epigraphic practice. The example I have in mind is when the *Res Gestae* (24.1-2) records that private individuals dedicated silver statues of the emperor in the city of Rome, but Augustus removed the statues, and from the money dedicated golden gifts (*dona aurea*) in the Temple of Apollo, preserving the names of the original dedicators and adding his own. Dio later reports (53.22.3-4) a different motivation for Augustus’ act: coining money to pay for road repairs as will be addressed in a future project (as presented in Chapter 4, sections IIIC and V). Dio’s account preserves the practice of *stips* or *strena*, a monetary gift to the *princeps* from groups of citizens on the first day of the new year, which Augustus used to pay for expensive new statues of gods “that he set up as his own gifts in the local neighborhoods, labeled with his own name but also with the year of each *stips*,” (Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 263-4, 264 for quote, cf. Chapter 3, section III, n. 59). This exchange of money for statues is unique to Augustus and Dio connects it to the people’s wish to have statues of Augustus in the city (Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 265; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 73-80). Dio then is aware of the events of the *Res Gestae* but presents his own rationale from a unique Augustan practice.

partake in these meals, prayers, and sacrifices as a way of anticipating and negotiating the terms of Augustus' divinity.²⁴

If we look at the events of both accounts in terms of private and official practice, we can then see similarities of practice and the differences in the language used to describe those practices in the sources. Both the *Res Gestae* and Dio describe prayers and vows; the former has priests and consuls offer vows on behalf of his good health, and also prayers on behalf of his health initiated by individuals and municipalities; in the latter, prayers are the directive of priests and priestess. Dio's inclusion of the libations could draw from their suggestion in the language of *pulvinaria* in the *Res Gestae*, or from literary accounts of libations, but he describes private and public libations poured out to the emperor, not on his behalf.

As a later source, I read Dio as presenting the differences in practice to his reader.²⁵ The repetition of private and public initiative in both texts ("*Privatim etiam et municipatim; οὐχ ὅτι τοῖς κοινοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις*") I read as signaling to Dio's reader, who would have additionally been able to read the *Res Gestae*, that there was an official and unofficial custom. Officially, as Augustus recorded, prayers (and libations) were offered on behalf of the emperor's health at private and public expense.

Unofficially, there were also libations (and presumably the accompanying prayers)

²⁴ It must be noted that private prayers were not a requirement of the imperial cult. The emperor was recognized as divine beyond the wording of prayers. As Price, "Gods and Emperors," 91-2 correctly identifies, the idea that private prayers are a requirement of religion is particular to Christianity, and should not be mapped onto the imperial cult or any other non-Christian religion. The imperial cult is founded on negotiation rather than a *do ut des* contract.

²⁵ Although Dio is a later source, in terms of practice and trends, I do not read Dio as introducing anachronistic trends into his history. Cf. Chapter 1, n. 27 for Flower, "The Tradition of the Spolia Opima," 52-3 that in specific instances we should not assume Dio introduced anachronistic elements "based on practices or expectations current in his own day." For Dio's accounts of Augustan practice, he demonstrates his knowledge of unique elements to Augustus' reign (cf. n. 23 *supra* for his knowledge of *stips*). To discount Dio's libations as anachronistic overlook the presence of the practice in other contemporary sources as private and unofficial practice.

offered to Augustus' person at private and public expense. Therefore the later text describes both sides of the negotiation of practice between citizens and *princeps*; the unofficial practice of libations and prayers offered to the emperor's person. Private and public groups performed both the official and unofficial acts, so we cannot say that the one was entirely separate from the other. Since the imperial cult, both before and after Augustus' deification in 14 CE, had no set or documented rules of engagement, where the emperor and senate dictated what the imperial cult was and the practices that it consists of, municipalities and individuals functioning on their own (i.e. privately) were able to interpret official and public practice to meet their local needs. I argue below in my analyses and examinations of Horace and Ovid that private individuals interpreted the more-than-human status and divine qualities of the emperor in domestic banquet scenes as part of the negotiation of the emperor's imperial cult.

Therefore prayers and sacrifices, those in domestic as well as civic settings, offered on behalf of the emperor are representations of the emperor's and state's official stance on living divinity; prayers may be spoken on Augustus' behalf as one who is favored by the gods, but not in a way that equates him to the gods. These prayers with the 'official wording' still feature in the multifarious nature of the imperial cult, since they do emphasize his divine qualities, more-than-human status, and a cause-effect relationship between the emperor and the Roman populace, but they are not the only kind of prayer.

I must note here that, despite their presence, private prayers were not a requirement of the imperial cult. The wording of the prayers supplement the sacrifices depicted but they do not hold the same weight in terms of the imperial cult. As Simon Price correctly identifies, the idea that private prayers are a requirement of religion is particular to

Christianity, and should not be mapped onto the imperial cult or any other non-Christian religion.²⁶ Therefore my analyses of prayers, especially sections III and IIIA below, address them as documenting Augustus' status, but not as an essential proof of his cult.

II. Horace: Libation and Prayers

In the following paragraphs I review libations and prayers offered to Augustus in the works of Horace. I read these Horatian scenes as creating an image of both the emperor's living divinity and the ways in which private individuals worshipped it with sacrifices. The specific features of sacrifices and prayers comprise Horace's understanding of Augustus' living divinity in Rome, as it is presented in a mythological context; through the company Augustus keeps as a divine figure, it is possible to understand how the poet interprets the nature of Augustus' divinity to a private audience. Horace's repeated emphasis on men who became gods, and the honors due to them, anticipate the public cult of Augustus. The poet's language in addressing these characters reveals that the libations offered to Augustus' person are neither reverence nor homage due to a fully divine and warlike king, but are sacrifices fit for a peaceful and moral ruler who is more-than-human. I first examine Horace's *Carmen* 4.5 as a scene of sacrifice at a domestic banquet, comparing it to the near contemporary *Epistle* 2.1. I address the reference to Greek practices in *Carmen* 4.5 and the repetition of similar gods in *Epistle* 2.1, placing them in a tradition of men who became gods in section IIA. Next, I analyze in section IIB the *Carmen* and *Epistle* as a whole, identifying the poet's position as an Augustan

²⁶ "Gods and Emperors," 91-2 the idea that private prayers are a requirement of religion is particular to Christianity, and should not be mapped onto the imperial cult or any other non-Christian religion (cf. n. 24 *supra*). Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*," 427 states that such arguments "verrät eher die Verarbeitung der eigenen Lebensumstände als Verständnis der Antike; betrays the processing of one's own circumstances rather than understanding the ancient world."

sponsored poet, and his use of genre to advise his reader how to worship Augustus. I finally assess the poet's use of *numen* in both *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1 as well as the modern scholarship, which suggests a reference to the *genius Augusti* in *Carmen* 4.5. I read Augustus' *numen* as a divine metonymy, where the man as the possessor of the quality is always inferred. My focus is a close reading of the texts, then a larger view of their context in Augustan poetry and literature.

In *Carmen* 4.5, during the final course of a domestic banquet, the diners led by a rustic *quisque* worship the living emperor with libations and prayers. The guests are gathered in a symposium setting to celebrate Augustus' safe return from Gaul in 16 BCE:²⁷

Condit quisque diem collibus in suis et vitem viduas ducit ad arbores; hinc ad vina redit laetus et alteris te mensis adhibet deum; te multa prece, te prosequitur mero defuso pateris et Laribus tuum miscet numen, uti Graecia Castoris et magni memor Herculis.	30	Whoever spends the day in his own hills and weds the vine to the bereft trees; from there, happy he returns to his wine and he invites you as a god at the dessert course; he attends you with honors in many a prayer, with wine poured out and joins your <i>numen</i> with the <i>Lares</i> , as Greece does	35
“Longas o utinam, dux bone, ferias praestes Hesperiae!” Dicimus integro sicci mane die, dicimus uvidi, cum sol Oceano subest. ²⁸	40	mindful of Castor and great Hercules. “Excellent leader, protector, ensure a continuous peace for Italy!” We say in the morning with dry mouths, we say with wine, when the sun sets under the ocean.	40

The rustic *quisque* culminates his day of work by inviting Augustus to the vignette as a god, *te mensis adhibet deum*. His subsequent actions (the prayer, libation, and the addition of Augustus' *numen* to the *Lares* as Greece does Castor and Hercules) utilize

²⁷ Richard F. Thomas, *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, ed. by Richard F. Thomas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 151 reads from *incolumi* (line 27) “the celebration in fact occurs not on the occasion of any return, but as a symptom of Caesar's being safe, which keeps Rome safe from foreign foes, with whom he is engaged.” I address below at n. 57 how this engagement with foreign foes fits into a narrative of Augustan peace.

²⁸ Lines 29-40. Michael Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1986), 111 rightly characterizes this as a private event, not happening in a civic setting. That does not, however, imply that the characters are provincial and are unfamiliar with Roman practices and customs towards the emperor. Price, “Gods and Emperors,” 92 identifies lines 31-6 as a prayer to Augustus, making no mention of lines 37-40 in his argument on prayers for the emperor.

Ciceronian and Theocritian understandings of divine status to recognize the divine aspects of the *vivus* emperor. In my analysis of the text, outlined below, the *quisque* does not provide parameters for Augustus to join the meal as a god, but does so in response to Augustus' peaceful actions on earth.

I link *Carmen* 4.5 to the near contemporary *Epistle* 2.1, dedicated to Augustus, in which Horace advises his reader to again locate Augustus among demi-gods and to set up altars where people may swear by the authority of Augustus' *numen*. In the *Epistle* there is neither a banquet scene nor a libation to the emperor, but Horace's continued use of divine exempla encourages the reader to add Augustus' name to the list:

<p>Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux, 5 post ingentia facta deorum in templa recepti, dum terras hominumque colunt genus, aspera bella componunt, agros assignant, oppida condunt, ... praesenti tibi maturos largimur honores, 15 iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras, nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale fatentes.²⁹</p>	<p>Romulus, Father Liber, and Pollux with Castor, 5 were received after great deeds in the temples of the gods, while they cared for the earth and the race of men, they opposed harsh wars, allotted fields, founded cities, ... We lavish you, while you're here, with timely honors, 15 and set up altars, to swear oaths at by the authority of your <i>numen</i>, others acknowledging that none such has arisen nor will arise.</p>
--	---

I connect the repeated members of the pantheon (Hercules, Castor, Pollux, Liber, and Romulus), and the honors they have received to those given to Augustus. Both here in *Epistle* 2.1 and *Carmen* 4.5, these are responses to Augustus' deeds on earth. I note for the reader that none of these honors, here in *Epistle* 2.1 and the libation and prayer at *Carmen* 4.5, are given on Augustus' behalf, but to and by the authority of his *numen* directly (*tibi* and *tuum per numen*). I argue below that Horace utilizes Hellenistic and Homeric themes to undermine interpretations of Augustus as a Greek ruler or hero with a

²⁹ *Epistle* 2.1.5-8, 15-17.

cult. He additionally guides his reader in how to understand Augustus' role and status and how to properly recognize them in sacrifices. Horace is seemingly aware of the official and unofficial interpretations of Augustus (sacrifices on his behalf versus sacrifices to his person or *numen*), and from his status as an imperial sponsored poet he presents the best ways to honor the emperor.

IIA. Horace: Greek Practices

In the following three sections, I address the Greek practices Horace's *quisque* character mentions, placing them in a Ciceronian understanding of men who become gods.³⁰ I then trace Cicero's understanding to Theocritus, whose *Idyll* 17 Horace responds to in an effort to impart to his reader that private sacrifices to Augustus differ from Greek ruler cult, but the practices and roles of the poets are similar. Both poets use their poetry to recognize the divine aspects of their patrons, but Horace emphasizes that his patron will be a Roman god.

Within *Carmen* 4.5, Horace states that his *quisque* "*Laribus tuum miscet numen, uti Graecia Castoris et magni memor Herculis*; joins your *numen* with the *Lares*, as Greece does mindful of Castor and great Hercules."³¹ The *Lares* had no Greek equivalent, so we cannot read these lines as a mere comparison;³² Horace directs his reader towards a larger

³⁰ Line 29. It is impossible to determine if the *quisque* of 4.5 is the same as the one from *Carmen* 3.24.25. M. Dyson, "Horace *Carmina* 4.5.36-37," *CPh* 86.2 (1991): 127 argues that this use of *quisque* is necessary to link Horace to the people, especially farmers who wish for the emperor's return. I take the suggestion Horace, *Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, 161 for lines 35-6, which gives a Greek precedence to Augustus' aspirations. The presence of Castor and Hercules varies Horace's earlier divine company for the emperor in *Carmen* 3.3.9-12, where Pollux and Hercules accompany a future vision of Augustus (Michael Putnam, *Horace's Carmen Saeculare: Ritual Magic and the Poet's Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 46-7).

³¹ Lines 34-6.

³² Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 269 n. 15 argues that in the context of *Res Gestae* 19.2, "ναοὺς... ἡρώων πρὸς τῇ ἱερᾷ ὁδῷ...; temples... of the heroes next to the Sacred Way..." ἡρώες is a

tradition of men who have become gods. Castor and Hercules, in particular, place Augustus within a tradition of men with divine qualities and more-than-human status who officially became gods after death. Cicero in the *Natura Deorum* includes these gods in his assessment of men who have become divine, specifying that they have done so on account of them meeting civic obligations and parameters. Cicero's rationale for these parameters, as I examined in the previous chapter, are to limit Caesar's divine ambitions, encouraging him to progress toward divinity through his good works and civic duties, rather than assume it fully. A progression towards divinity, rather than assumptions of divine qualities like *divina sapientia* and *divina virtus*, allows Cicero and the reader to share in the agency of Caesar's divine ambitions.³³ Cicero lists mortals whose deeds met and surpassed such obligations as precedents for Romulus' Roman divinity:

<p>Suscepit autem vita hominum consuetudoque communis ut beneficiis excellentis viros in caelum fama ac voluntate tollerent. Hinc Hercules hinc Castor et Pollux hinc Aesculapius hinc Liber etiam... hinc etiam Romulum, quem quidam eundem esse Quirinum putant. Quorum cum remanerent animi atque aeternitate fruerentur, rite di sunt habiti, cum et optimi essent et aeterni.³⁴</p>	<p>Moreover human experience and common custom have begun to elevate, by free-will and in story, men into heaven on account of their excellent deeds. Hence Hercules, Castor and Pollux, Aesculapius, and even Liber... hence even Romulus, who certain men think is the same as Quirinus. Of these men, they have duly been made gods because their souls endured and they enjoyed eternal life, since both they were the best and immortal.</p>
--	--

synonym for the *Lares Augusti*. His reading is problematic for multiple reasons, addressed more fully in Chapter 3, section III (cf. n. 28), but the *Lares* (whether domestic or the *Lares Augusti* of the *vici*) were not equivalent with Greek hero cults, since the *Lares* were gods of place and the heroes were not, following Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, x, 9, 22, 54; Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 191.

³³ Cf. Chapter 1, section VA for my discussion of Cicero's use of *divinus* for Pompey and Caesar.

³⁴ *Natura Deorum* 2.62, cf. *de Legibus* 2.19 for the worship of these gods. Cicero uses this list of men, who because of their achievements have become gods, as a counter to Euhemerus' humanizing of the Olympian pantheon. These gods were once men, so a discussion of their death and their worship is not taboo to Cicero (Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 154-6 cf. A. B. Bosworth, "Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis," *JRS* 89 (1999): 11). Horace does not mention Aesclepius by name in his extant works.

Cicero emphasizes to his late-Republican audience that the exceptional deeds and qualities of these mythic figures made them gods, a concept which I read in Horace to explain the private worship of Augustus. Augustus in Horace as a *dux bonus* (*Carmen* 4.5.37) has the résumé Cicero requires for Roman divinity and his divine *numen* is therefore welcomed as a god to the feast. The topic at hand in Horace's *Carmen* is not posthumous divinity; there is no delay for prayers by the authority of his *numen* on par with Castor and Hercules.

I do not mean to say that the sacrifices to Augustus in Horace honor the emperor specifically in a Greek manner. Here I analyze some of the implications of *Carmen* 4.5 *uti Graecia* in a Roman context, and later address them in terms of Hellenistic and Homeric traditions. Cicero uses Greek exempla to discuss the phenomenon of making men into gods, but at Rome both Hercules and Castor possessed temples.³⁵ The Temple of Hercules Victor in the Forum Boarium dates to the second century BCE, and the dictator Postumius vowed the *Aedes Castoris* in the Forum Romanum in 484 BCE.³⁶ Within Augustus' lifetime, Tiberius and his deceased brother Drusus restored and rededicated the *Aedes Castoris* in the Forum Romanum in 6 CE. I read Horace's simile as placing Augustus' divine status within a tradition most recently utilized by Cicero's interpretation of men who have been added to the Roman pantheon and possess Roman temples. I caution that Horace is not rejecting Greek practices, but establishing the Roman adaptation. Horace's audience would have been familiar with the Greek origins of

³⁵ Cf. Chapter 1, section V, n. 77. Koortbojian argues that there was no cult for Quirinus, although he did possess a shrine.

³⁶ The dictator Postumius had originally vowed to build the temple in 484 BCE, and its *cella* occasionally housed the senate (Geoffrey Sumi, "Monuments and Memory: the Aedes Castoris in the Formation of Augustan Ideology," *CQ* 59, no.1 (2009): 169-73; Edward Champlin, "Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins," *JRS* no. 101 (2011)); Birte Poulsen, "Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology," *SO* 66 (1991):126 does not believe that Tiberius was the original initiator of the restoration, since Gaius and Lucius were still alive when Suetonius *Tib.*, 20 claims that Tiberius promised to restore both the Temple of Concordia and Castor and Pollux.

these figures, but at Rome they were not treated as foreign cults;³⁷ they were familiar figures of worship both to Roman domestic and civic audiences. As I address in section IIB, his readers would also have read the marked differences in Horace's treatment versus Greek encomia. The phrase *uti Graecia* does not refer to foreign cults, but to extant Roman adaptations of foreign cults, drawing a distinction for the reader through the simile. These Roman adaptations make Horace's description of Augustus' worship Roman yet still directed at the living man.

Additionally in *Epistle* 2.1, Horace again recalls Cicero and also Theocritus to establish a generic tradition for his choice of the phrase *uti Graecia*. I connect Horace's repeated members of the pantheon (Hercules, Castor, Pollux, Liber, and Romulus),³⁸ the honors they have received, and their literary tradition to Augustus' status in Rome. Both here and at *Carmen* 4.5, the honors are collective responses to Augustus' deeds on earth. The phrase *praesenti tibi*, (line 15) also recalls Horace's similar designation of Augustus as *praesens divus* in *Carmen* 3.5.2, so that the reader of this *Epistle* can thereby ascribe the altars, oaths, and acknowledgement of greatness to Augustus without directly mentioning his name.³⁹

³⁷ Even if we take a hyper-literal view of Dio Cassius' assertion (53.2.4) that Augustus did not allow Egyptian rites (and thus foreign cults) to be practiced within the *pomerium*, these public cult places existed within the *pomerium*. Eric Orlin, "Octavian and Egyptian Cults: Redrawing the Boundaries of Romanness," *AJPh* 129, no. 2 (2008): 235, 241-2 asserts that the *pomerium* had not previously been a definitive religious boundary, and that the banning of Egyptian rites there in actuality did not ban Egyptian rites from the city as a whole, nor did it ban Egyptian culture from the Roman viewer.

³⁸ Although Cicero includes the god in his divine exempla, Horace does not mention Aesclepius by name in his extant works.

³⁹ Horace uses *praesens* three times for Augustus "with the implication that he has some sort of divine status already," i.e. *Carmen* 3.5.2; 4.14.43; *Epistle* 2.1.15-17 (Thomas, *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, 161). Ellen Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 151 states for *Carmen* 3.5.2 that *praesens* is often used of a god ready to help, but does not read Augustus as a living god. James Ker, "Roman *Representatio*," *AJPh* 128, no. 3 (2007): 349 in his philological study determines this is a common understanding of '*praesens deus*' (i.e. immanent and helpful), but finds '*praesens*' as a term connotes "salience, immediacy, face-to-face contact, concern, readiness, efficacy, and availability," all of which are addressed in greater detail in the conclusion of this

IIB. Horace: Imperial Poet

In this section, I examine Horace's role as an insider to the Augustan regime from his position as an imperially sponsored poet. I focus my analysis on the repeated features of Horace's *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1, and identify those features in other Horatian *carmina* without ritual elements. I use these elements and the poet's relationship with the emperor to establish one of the ways Horace utilizes Hellenistic encomiastic poetry to present Augustus' more-than-human status to his Roman readers.⁴⁰ As a member of Augustus' inner circle, Horace is not a casual observer of practice. His presentation of the emperor as a character in his poetry and his awareness of Hellenistic and Homeric treatments of divine royalty reveals what I see as not only a statement of Augustus' exceptionalism and great deeds, but also how the poet's and his readers' practices differ from their Hellenistic counterparts.

Horace does not shy away from addressing the emperor or his divine qualities throughout his four books of *Carmina* and the *Carmen Saeculare*. I first examine the emperor as a figure in Horace's poetry, and then his relationship with the emperor.

Secondly I address Horace's repeated themes of Augustus' more-than-human status and

project. Thomas also finds the sentiment of *Epistle* 2.1 at odds with *Carmen* 4.5, but when considered with the Ciceronian model and the repeated figures, the two demonstrate recognition of the *vivus* Augustus' divinity.

⁴⁰ The presence of encomiastic elements in these works of Horace (and also the *Carmen Saeculare*) has been noted by Patricia J. Johnson, *Ovid Before Exile: Art and Punishment in the Metamorphoses* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008), 16. I say "one of the ways," because Horace utilizes Hellenistic poetic elements in various ways throughout his poetry, and I caution my reader that this is not the only way Horace incorporates these elements, or even that Theocritus (analyzed below) is the only poet: cf. Alex Hardie, "The Pindaric Sources of Horace 'Odes 1.12,'" *HSPH* 101 (2003): 371-404; William H. Race, "Horace's Debt to Pindar," in *A Companion to Horace*, ed. by Gregson Davis (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 147-73; Johnson, *Ovid Before Exile*, 57-8 on the allusions to Hesiod's *Theogony* in Horace's *Carmen* 3.4; Alessandro Barchiesi, "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's 'Odes,'" *ClAnt* 15, no. 1 (1996): 5-47 for his analysis of "a Simonidean influence besides, and counter to, a Pindaric influence," (7).

the mythological exempla he utilizes to explain that status to his elite readers, as I introduced from a Republican context in section IIA. Horace constructs these themes over the course of his *carmina*; I continue in my examination of Augustus in *Carmen* 4.5, and *Epistle* 2.1, and add *Carmen* 3.3, with the aim of analyzing how Horace presents to his reader that Augustus, on account of his actions, should be worshipped in a Roman way because he will become a Roman god. To do this, I argue that Horace employs and invokes Hellenistic encomia, particularly Theocritus' *Idyll* 17, an encomium to Ptolemy Philadelphus, in order to use the tradition as a marked point of diversion for his readers.

Within his poetry, Horace addresses Augustus directly but we cannot say that his tone derives from a place of superiority, moral or otherwise. I read his advising tone or direct address as not actually persuading the emperor to do anything he did not already have a mind to do, but rather advising his reader on how to interpret Augustus' actions.⁴¹ Horace owed his freedom to Augustus, and, while he could use his poetic persona to give advice and direction to the emperor, I do not believe his stance should be read as a Ciceronian figure (who tried to actually advise and censure the young Octavian and other members of the second Triumvirate). The man behind Horace's persona here and elsewhere is only speculation, but we do know that he felt strongly enough about his political opinions to fight at Philippi, even if he accepted Augustus' patronage after his pardon.⁴² Throughout

⁴¹ My reading builds upon Richard Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 54, where the poet "speaks both for himself and for the community," allowing the poet to have a double voice. Hunter continues that archaic Greek poetry is the source for this tradition with "its 'private' settings and 'public' themes," which we see in these public sacrifices in terms of 'private' and 'domestic' settings and 'public' in that it relates to the emperor, but in our case is not supported by public statements of the emperor's divinity.

⁴² Steele Commager, "Horace, *Carmina*, I, 2," *AJPh* 80, no. 1 (1959): 49-50, and Niall Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, ed. by Niall Rudd (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 2 read *Carmen* 1.2 as Horace's plead for mercy after Philippi. Others read more generally Horace's repeated requests for peaceful gods in the *Carmen Saeculare* as those of a man wishing

the course of the books of his *Carmina*, Horace through his persona advises his readers about Augustus' political, social, and military policy, while further alluding to the emperor's *vivus* cult.⁴³ I do not read every allusion as documenting practice, as is the case in *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1, but I do read them as Horace presenting the Roman mindset for private emperor worship.

Horace repeatedly depicts Augustus in relation to the divine, where he is either like a god, receives help from a god, or will reside with the gods: *Carmen* 1.2.41ff, he is a Mercury on Earth; *Carmen* 1.21.13-15, Apollo and Diana will drive “*hic bellum lacrimosum, hic miseram famem pestemque*; away tearful war, away wretched famine and plague,” from the people of Rome and Augustus; *Carmen* 3.3.9-12, he will recline with the gods on Olympus; *Carmen* 4.5.1, he is “*Divis orte bonis*; born from divine stock.” Above in section IIB, I identified the Ciceronian exempla in *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1, where Horace adds Augustus to the list of men who will become divine on account of their virtues, deeds, and qualities. Horace names Castor and Hercules (*Carmen* 4.5.35-6) and Romulus, Father Liber, and Pollux with Castor (*Epistle* 2.1.5). Before *Carmen* 4.5, Horace identifies in *Carmen* 3.3 Hercules, Pollux, Bacchus, and Romulus as men who resisted the people's calls for what is wrong and immoral, and one day for this same reason, Augustus will in the future recline with them, drinking nectar:

for an end to civil wars: Putnam, *Artifices of Eternity*, 17; Oliensis, *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, 105-6; Commager, “Horace, *Carmina*, I, 2,” 51.

⁴³ Examples of social and legal policy in allusions to Augustus' *leges Iuliae* of 18BCE: *Carmen* 3.6.45-8; *Carmen Saeculare*, 17-20; *Carmen* 4.3.20-24. For the dating of the *Carmina* and that of the *leges Iuliae*, Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 37 places the publication of book 3 to 23 BCE and book 4 to 13 BCE, and we know the *Carmen Saeculare* was performed in 17 BCE, as confirmed by David West, *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 37. For the two books of *Carmina*, we should not forget Augustus' first attempt at marriage legislation in 28 BCE, which he was forced to withdraw (Gordon Williams, “Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome,” *JRS* 52, no. 1&2 (1962): 28-9). Examples of military policy and action: *Carmen* 1.2.49-52 on the Medes; *Carmen* 2.13.15-19 on the Parthians; *Carmen* 3.3.41-44 on the Medes; *Carmen Saeculare* 61-64 on the Medes, Scythians, and Indians; *Carmen* 4.14.41-52 on Rome's many subdued enemies during Augustus' reign.

Hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules enisus arces attigit igneas, 10 quos inter Augustus recumbens purpureo bibet ore nectar; hac te merentem, Bacche pater, tuae vexere tigres indocili iugum collo trahentes; hac Quirinus 15 Martis equis Acheronta fugit.... ⁴⁴	By this skill [virtus] Pollux and wandering Hercules after a struggle they achieved the fiery citadels, and Augustus will recline between them, drinking nectar from purple lips; for this reason, father Bacchus, your tigers drew you, pulling at the yokes on their untamed necks, for this reason, Quirinus, escaped with Mars' horses from Acheron....
--	--

I do not read Horace in these passages as composing panegyric or writing his own encomia. I argue instead that Horace is pointing out to his readers the ways that Augustus' living divinity (i.e. his divine aspects) differs from Hellenistic counterparts, asserting that he will be a Roman god. Horace's use of the future tense is an essential element to this reading, where Augustus *bibet* in line 12, symbolizing that Horace is not already equating Augustus with full divinity, but recognizes his divine qualities.

In light of my reading, Horace participates in a tradition in which he links Augustus' more-than-human status and divine qualities to divine exempla. He emends this tradition to emphasize the narrative theme of mortal morality.⁴⁵ One of Horace's possible sources for this tradition is Theocritus, who in *Idyll* 17 honors the *καλὰ ἔργα* of the deified Ptolemy Philadelphus in the language of a hymn. In *Carmen* 3.3, Horace employs some of Theocritus' imagery, utilizing Hercules, the divine feast, nectar, and even an escape from Acheron.⁴⁶ The repeated imagery serves to justify the sacrifices and recognition of Augustus' divine aspects, but they do not make Augustus a Hellenistic or Greek god, or even a Hellenistic king. Theocritus begins by honoring Philadelphus' *καλὰ ἔργα* as other

⁴⁴ 3.3.9-16.

⁴⁵ *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989): xvii-xix that we should not question why Horace is saying these things, or whether or not he could say anything else, but rather that Horace boils down Augustan politics to moral developments.

⁴⁶ I have not included this *Carmen* in my above analysis since it does not include elements of sacrifice to the emperor. Theocritus, *Idyll* 17.20-23 for Herakles feasting; 29 for the consumption of nectar; 46-47 for Berenike not crossing Acheron. Horace in one other *Carmen* names Acheron (1.3.36), where "*perrupit Acheronta Herculeus labor*, Hercules' labor broke through Acheron" refers to Vergil, not Augustus.

poets have done before him (line 6), but Horace's aim in *Carmen* 3.3 is to praise the *moderatio* of Rome and Augustus as Rome's leader, who rises above the *civium ardor* and prevents the excesses of Troy from being rebuilt at Rome.⁴⁷ In the following paragraphs, I address the different perspectives on divine rulers and ruler cult that appear in the works of Horace and Theocritus' *Idyll* 17.

Both Horace and Theocritus see the rulers in their poems as men who lie between mortals and gods, but their genres dictate different aims for those rulers. Theocritus assures Philadelphus that he will sit at a feast, as Homeric heroes do, and will receive honors from the gods: “θεοὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐτίμησαν βασιλῆων; gods honor the best of kings.”⁴⁸ Contrary to Theocritus, Horace advises Augustus (and thus his reader) in *Carmen* 3.3 to avoid Homeric excess, reclining in the not-Homeric way among these gods with Roman cults (*Augustus recumbens*, line 11).⁴⁹ Since Horace is actually addressing his reader more than the emperor, I interpret this as Horace not advising his reader to honor Augustus because of his divine honors alone, but because of his and his people's moral uprightness and prosperity.⁵⁰ This difference fits with the distinctions between Hellenistic ruler cult and the imperial cult, where the former is granted by the people (and in this case the gods) and confirmed by their sacrifices (and Theocritus' encomium), but in the latter the people respond to the emperor's actions and events

⁴⁷ Lines 2 and 56-68, respectively.

⁴⁸ Line 12. Richard Hunter, *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, ed. and trans. by Richard Hunter (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 114 on the specificity of ἐδρίαι in line 19 identifying the fact that Homeric heroes sat, and did not recline.

⁴⁹ I say “not-Homeric” since both Greeks and Romans reclined while dining. Richard Allen Tomlinson, “Dining-rooms,” in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Stephen Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 469-70: “Reclining on couches while dining was introduced in Greece from the near east, probably around 700 BC... In later Hellenistic times the arrangement called a *triclinium* developed.”

⁵⁰ Hunter, *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 107 reads ἐτίμησαν at line 12 as part of Ptolemaic practice, where “gods reward the king's services with victory, health, stability in the kingdom, etc.”

during his lifetime, and is confirmed by the senate.⁵¹ Horace imparts to his readers that the emperor's actions on earth warrant their sacrifices. Augustus, on account of his actions and morality on earth, should be recognized as more-than-human and sacrifices should be offered to his divine aspects.

As a member of Augustus' poetic circle, Horace and his poetry contribute to the public and official image of the emperor.⁵² Modern scholars find no difficulty asserting that Horace was a close reader of Hellenistic poetry, particularly Theocritus' *Idyll* 17.⁵³ I argue that Horace adopts elements of Theocritus' encomium in his presentation of both official and unofficial elements of the emperor's living cult. Both Cicero and Theocritus establish that there is a tradition of men who became gods on account of their deeds, but Theocritus emphasizes that these are *καλὰ ἔργα* and *μέγα ἔργον* in the Homeric sense, calling Ptolemy Philadelphus "*αἰχμητὰ Πτολεμαῖε*; warrior Ptolemy."⁵⁴ In Cicero, these figures are certainly men (*viri*) who the people freely elevate on account of their excellent

⁵¹ Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 17 on the negotiation of the Roman imperial cult versus the Hellenistic *do ut des* contract, and the chart on p. 8.

⁵² Hunter, *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 45 on the role of poet and patron in Roman and Hellenistic models.

⁵³ R. G. M Nisbet and Margaret Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989), xvii-xix; Hunter, *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 31, 39, 44, 95-6, 154; Hans Peter Syndikus, "The Roman Odes," in *A Companion to Horace*, trans. Gregson Davis and Christophe Fricker, ed. Gregson Davis (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 198 n. 25. Barchiesi, "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage," 14 laments the under-estimation of Theocritus in book 4 of the *Carmina*. He finds *Idyll* 17 as a depiction of a harmonious relationship between poet and patron, even if this relationship is undermined in *Idyll* 16. Hardie, "The Pindaric Sources of Horace 'Odes 1.12'," 373-6 and Hunter, *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 95-6 reads elements of Theocritus' *Idyll* 17.5 ("ἦρωες, τοὶ πρόσθεν ἀφ' ἡμυθέων...") and Pindar's *Olympian* 2.2 ("τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἦρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα...") in *Carmen* 1.12.1 ("Quem virum aut heroa..."). Hunter suggests this shows Horace's recognition of "the special relationship between Theocritus and Pindar," (96). Hardie reads Horace as "Pindarising," possibly to draw similarities and distinctions between his Hellenistic counterpart and himself (Hardie cautions that Horace's goals in utilizing Pindar, while important, cannot be easily boiled down. *Carmen* 1.12 additionally mentions similar gods to *Carmina* 3.3, 4.5, and *Epistle* 2.1: Bacchus at line 22, Hercules and the Dioscuri at line 25, Romulus at line 33. Syndikus reads the six "Roman odes" of Horace's third book of *Carmina* as drawing heavily upon Hellenistic panegyric, citing Theocritus *Idyll* 17.16-33.

⁵⁴ Line 56, where αἰχμητὰ is a Homeric warrior, especially opposed to an archer (e.g. *Iliad* 2.543, *Odyssey* 2.19; cf. *LSJ* "αἰχμητής" s.v. A. Hunter, *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, 102, 110 identifies καλὰ ἔργα in line 6 as references to Pindar and not Homeric, but μέγα ἔργον (referring to Ptolemy Soter) in line 13 is Homeric. He also notes that for αἰχμητὰ, Philadelphus did not quite live up to this heroic and Homeric title (141-2).

deeds, making no reference to their warlike qualities.⁵⁵ Horace utilizes both Roman Republican and Hellenistic practices and poetics to present Augustus as a good ruler in *Carmen* 3.3, 4.5, and *Epistle* 2.1, who, on account of his and his people's morality and his great deeds, possesses a divine *numen* and will be received into heaven as a Roman god. I read this view in the lines before Horace mentions Augustus' timely honors in *Epistle* 2.1, where he repeats the divine exempla: "*Romulus et Liber pater et cum Castore Pollux, post ingentia facta deorum in templa recepti, dum terras hominumque colunt genus, aspera bella componunt, agros assignant, oppida condunt*"; Romulus, Father Liber, and Pollux with Castor, were received after great deeds in the temples of the gods, while they cared for the earth and the race of men, they opposed harsh wars, allotted fields, founded cities...."⁵⁶ Horace here, just like *Carmina* 3.3 and 4.5, neither praises the Homeric or Hellenistic qualities of these men-who-became-gods, nor their divine victories or attributes, but instead he praises their abilities to rule on earth. Rather than emphasize the militaristic elements, he mentions "*aspera bella componunt*"; they opposed harsh wars."⁵⁷ I see this as Horace documenting Augustus' unofficial cult, where the people recognize that the divine is housed with the man (his *numen*), on account of his earthly deeds (his governance, his peace, his morality), as opposed to Homeric warlike qualities. The people in this way negotiate and participate in the emperor's cult, but do not recognize the man in and of himself to be divine (i.e. his *numen* is not synonymous, but a metonymy, see section IIC below).

When Horace documents sacrifices to the emperor in *Carmen* 4.5 and by his *numen* in *Epistle* 2.1, I argue that his commentary on Greek practice and these repeated examples

⁵⁵ Cf. section IIA, n. 34 for passage *Natura Deorum* 2.62 "...beneficiis excellentis viros."

⁵⁶ Lines 5-8.

⁵⁷ Lines 7-8.

of Greek hero-gods (plus Romulus) simultaneously establish for his elite reader the framework for Augustus' living cult and its unofficial stance, as well as how this differs from its Greek counterparts.⁵⁸ In the context of *Carmen* 4.5, Horace's *quisque* is able to enjoy his *otium* (his own hills and his wine) because of Augustus and Augustus' peace. I follow Duncan Kennedy that while this may not be the same *otium* and *libertas* of the Republic, the meaning has changed to indicate "not 'freedom' (from a *rex*), but 'freedom' (through a *princeps*)."⁵⁹ Horace begins the poem wishing for Augustus' safe return from Gaul, not wishing him to the realm of the gods, so we must read his *quisque* as worshipping the living emperor when he pours his libation and utters his prayer.⁶⁰ Augustus' presence is a requirement for Augustan peace and the peaceful actions of the *quisque*, so any reference to Homeric warlike qualities would invalidate that peace and prevent the avoidance of a second Troy. Additionally, Horace's description of *otium* places him in a larger tradition of Augustan patronage: "*Otium* may in some cases be bestowed by a patron, but it is ideologically a form of positive freedom in which the poet is directed by his own desires and his own choices."⁶¹ Therefore Horace's description of *otium* in the event of Augustus' return is his own generic choice.

⁵⁸ Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 for the interweaving and infusion of Augustus into existing cultic framework.

⁵⁹ Duncan F. Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference," in *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, ed. by Anton Powell (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992): 31-5, where Republican themes encapsulated in words like '*libertas*' and '*otium*' that appear in Horace (specifically to his argument the *Sermones*) have changed but the words stay the same. In this way, Horace references both the old and the new themes with a single word.

⁶⁰ Horace may have been ironic in wishing the emperor's return from Gaul (a military campaign), but following Thomas, *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, 151 in n. 24 *supra*, I see this as the understanding of Augustan peace in action, where peace is secured through the engagement with foreign foes. In this way, both Augustus and Rome are safe and peace is secured through acts of war. Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus*, 61-2 identifies a similar practice in *Res Gestae* 26, where the ruler extends the boundaries of the land to ensure the safety of the people within it. He traces this practice to pharaohs and the Ptolemies and their poets (cf. Theocritus 17.86).

⁶¹ Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus*, 130 specifically addressing Horace's *Epistles*, but I think the same view applies here.

The lines “*uti Graecia Castori et magni memor Herculis*; as Greece does mindful of Castor and great Hercules,”⁶² situate the reader in the development of practice, where men become gods, but alter this practice in the ways in which these men are recognized as gods. Horace’s repeated emphasis on achievements and peace counter the tradition’s Greek and Hellenistic origins and emphasize to the reader how Augustus is different. Horace additionally clarifies to his reader that he possesses a new kind of *libertas* through his imperial patron to discuss these practices in his own generic way.

In *Epistle* 2.1 Horace has a different poetic intent in naming the emperor, but his commentary on practice remains the same. Horace again addresses the emperor, but *Epistle* 2.1 was written after the fourth book of *Carmina* and the *Carmen Saeculare*.⁶³ The topic of the *Epistle* is not praise or the emperor’s morality, but poetry and its usefulness to the state. He compares Greek and Latin poetry, finding Latin poets wanting in comparison to their counterparts (e.g. Ennius to Homer, lines 50-52). Horace believes that it is the role of the poet to educate children, praise good deeds to promote morality and compose public prayers.⁶⁴ Moreover, Augustus should take note of poets (like Horace) who rely on their readers so his library in the Temple of Apollo Palatinus will be filled.⁶⁵ Without this kind of poetry, i.e. Horace’s, Augustus is doomed to be forgotten.

I read this treatise on poetry as a commentary on the poet’s and patron’s roles in the imperial cult. Horace is a member of the inner circle but is also a private citizen, so he is

⁶² *Carmen* 4.5.35-6, Cf. sections II, n. 28 *supra* for text and IIA for my discussion.

⁶³ Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 1 for the dating of early 12 BCE.

⁶⁴ Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 5, 96 reads lines 132-33, “*Castis cum pueris ignara puella mariti disceret unde preces, uatem ni Musa dedisset*; from whom would innocent boys and unmarried girls have learned their prayers, if the Muse had not given them a *vatis*?” as a direct reference to Horace’s role in the *Carmen Saeculare*, a role which Horace repeated again in *Carmen* 4.6.29-44.

⁶⁵ Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 9 reads this as a “continual obligation.”

positioned to pivot between both, working as an intermediary between his patron and readers.⁶⁶ When Horace in *Epistle* 2.1.214-31 and 260-3 cautions Augustus on the kind of poetry he should sponsor, as well as the messages those poems should contain, I see this as Horace's awareness of the relationship between reader and poet in the presentation of ritual, where the reader may or may not accept the poet's representation and explanation of sacrifice to the living emperor.⁶⁷ The poet cautions his readers to avoid the novelty of Augustus, creating bad, obtrusive poetry to honor him: "*sedulitas autem stulte quem diligit urget, praecipue cum se numeris commendat et arte; discit enim citius meminitque libentius illud quod quis deridet, quam quod probat et veneratur*"; moreover obtrusiveness, which foolishly vexes those it esteems, particularly when it recommends itself by volume and by skill; for he learns more quickly and more cheerfully remembers that which someone derides, than that which is credible and revered."⁶⁸ Horace as a poet represents himself as the middle road; he is not an encomiast and Augustus is not fully a god. The readers should recognize their roles and encourage others to follow suit by reading Horace. I tie this back to Horace's comment on Greek practice in *Carmen* 4.5.35-6 (*supra*) and the differences between Homeric and Hellenistic kings and Augustus (*Carmen* 3.3); Augustus is honored in a Roman way by his Roman people, and the poet follows and reports on this trend.

⁶⁶ Hunter, *The Shadow of Callimachus*, 53-4 adds the *amicus* Maecenas, "and this added layer allowed the poets a greater tonal range." If we follow the dating of Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 37 for the publication of book 3 in 23 BCE and Thomas, *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, 12 that Maecenas disappears from Augustus' inner circle after that date (23 or 22 BCE is the range he gives), Maecenas did not have the same impact on tonal range in the fourth book of *Carmina* and second book of *Epistles* as he had had in the first three and the first book of *Epistles*. This suggests that the tonal range originated with and was sustained by Horace himself.

⁶⁷ Cf. n. 11 and 12 *supra* for Rüpke on the negotiation of practice between specialists and individuals, and the reader/narrator relationship in the *Fasti* when religious practice is described.

⁶⁸ Lines 260-3.

Moreover, I do not see Horace's use of *veneratur* in line 263 as accidental. Besides *Epistle* 2.1.263, the verb appears only five other times in Horace's corpus: only once to a goddess (in a bawdy joke), once to a moral in a hypothetical situation, twice about poetry and poets, once to Augustus, and once in making a prayer.⁶⁹ In three of the six uses, Horace references the 'good' kind of poetry and poet (*Epistle* 2.1.263 and 2.2.106-7) and Augustus himself receiving this action of reverence and worship (*Carmen* 4.14.51-2). I read this as Horace giving a clue to both his reader and the emperor, that his poetry achieves this aim: revering and worshipping the emperor in the 'correct' way.

In documenting official and unofficial stances on the emperor's *vivus* cult, Horace positions himself as presenting what is right for both (emperor and his citizens). His contrast between warlike Homeric and Hellenistic rulers and Augustus places Augustus' feet firmly on the ground, where his deeds will have the greatest impact. The poet utilizes Hellenistic and Homeric models from which he may highlight contrasts in the Roman process and practice of Augustus' cult. I read his scenes of sacrifice as being contained within his greater scheme of worshipping and writing about the worship of the emperor in the 'correct' way, keeping the balance between encomiastic and obtrusive praise on the one hand, and his Muse on the other.

II.C. Horace: *Numen* and *Genius*

⁶⁹ Cf. n. 7 *supra* for the distinction I draw between veneration and worship. To Ceres: *Sermon* 2.2.124 "*ac venerata Ceres, ita culmo surget alto*: and worshipping Ceres, so that she may rise high on a stalk." To Augustus: *Carmen* 4.14.51-2 "*te caede gaudentes Sygambri compositis venerantur armis*; the Sygambri, who rejoice in slaughter, after setting aside their weapons they worship you." To mortals: *Sermon* 2.5.14 "*ante Larem gustet venerabilior Lare dives*: let the rich man eat before [your] *Lar* [and] more to be revered than the *Lar* is he;" *Epistle* 2.2.106-7 "*verum gaudent scribentes et se venerantur*; truly they enjoy writing and worshipping themselves." In a prayer: *Sermon* 2.6.8 "*si veneror stultus nihil horum*: if I as a fool offer no such [prayers] as these."

A similar feature of both *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1, besides the divine exempla, is the emperor's *numen*. In *Carmen* 4.5, twice daily, once with wine and once without, Horace's rustic *quisque* joins the emperor's *numen* to the *Lares* (*Laribus tuum miscet numen*, lines 34-5) and honors his *numen* with many a prayer and a libation.⁷⁰ In *Epistle* 2.1, Augustus' has the authority to grant or deny petitions (*iurandasque tuum per numen ponimus aras*, line 16). Richard Thomas reads *Carmen* 4.5 as describing an image of the emperor that has been added to the domestic *lararium*.⁷¹ This does not fit for *numen*, however, since the *numen Augusti* was not represented as an image.⁷² Augustus' *numen* in the *Carmen* is then joined with the *Lares* not in a physical location, but in receiving the sacrificial offerings.⁷³ The *numen*, unlike the household *Lares*, had no specific connection to the family cult of the ancestors or the household as a place, making the two are separate entities and their cults not infused together.⁷⁴ Augustus *vivus*, welcomed as a god, then receives the *quisque*'s sacrifices along with the *Lares* in a manner similar to how the Greeks honored Castor and Hercules. His *numen* additionally has the authority to ensure oaths. I read Augustus' *numen* and *genius* (although the latter is not treated the same as the former) as the emperor's constituent divine aspects. Horace and Ovid use these, specifically his *numen*, as a divine metonymy for the man, in whom these are housed. In the following paragraphs, I examine the language and practice surrounding

⁷⁰ Specifically, it is the addition of *tuum numen*, Augustus' *numen* to the *Lares* that Horace compares to Greek practices in 4.5, but in the *Epistle* there is neither mention of Greek practices nor of the *Lares*.

⁷¹ "...presumably images of Augustus are brought out along with the *Lares* at the libation offering," (*Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, 161).

⁷² Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," 362 on the absence of pictures of the *numen Augusti*: "... there are no pictures of the *numen Augusti*; nor could there be." Fishwick uses this fact as part of his argument, which will be addressed below, that the *numen* here in the *Epistle* and in *Carmen* 4.5 refers to Augustus' *genius*.

⁷³ As I analyze in detail in Chapter 3, the household *Lares* should not be confused with the *Lares Augusti* of the *vici*, cf. section I, IIA and III-III A. Augustus' *numen* is joined with the *Lares*, but that does not warrant the addition of the adjective-cum-epithet *Augusti* to their name.

⁷⁴ Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I, 207.

Augustus' *numen* in Horace. I compare what I read the text as actually describing to modern scholarship on Augustus' *numen*. I counter the readings of modern scholars, like Duncan Fishwick, Ittai Gradel, and Lily Ross Taylor, that the Augustus' *numen* in Horace implies his *genius*.

The terms employed for Augustus' constituent divine aspects, his *numen* and *genius*, often complicate any discussion of worship of the living emperor. Scholars agree that the emperor's *numen* received worship in Rome during his lifetime, but separate the *numen Augusti* fully from the man Augustus.⁷⁵ If his *numen* was housed in his person and belongs to the man (as shown by the genitive *Augusti*), then I counter that the *numen Augusti* cannot be separated or treated as distinct from the man. I find that their argument, that the *numen* and *genius* were connected to the man yet distinct from him, is not present in the sources. Additionally, *numen* is not a synonym for Augustus; it represents the emperor's divine will. To add clarity to the debate, I in the paragraphs below address the arguments of Fishwick and Gradel to establish the aspects of Augustus' living divinity and the worship it received in Horace's sacrificial vignettes.

Drawing upon the same *Carmen* of Horace, Fishwick, following Lily Ross Taylor, reads Horace's use of *numen* in 4.5 as referring to the *genius Augusti*.⁷⁶ Taylor asserted that the cult of the *genius Augusti* was prevalent in Rome and that Romans worshipped the emperor's *genius* by pouring libations to it.⁷⁷ *Contra* Fishwick and Taylor, I find that any connection between the *genius* and libations poured for the emperor is tenuous at

⁷⁵ Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I, 207 "the *numen*, or divine power of Augustus also received public honours in Rome.

⁷⁶ Cf. n. 5 *supra* for Fishwick's assertion in "Genius and Numen," 357: "... but the libation is clearly to the *genius* of the emperor, here termed *numen*," cites Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 182. Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 9 also cites Taylor for this reading.

⁷⁷ Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime," 124, and *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 150-2 cites *Carmen* 4.5.31-5 as evidence for libations being poured out to the emperor's *genius* at public and private banquets, as per senatorial decree.

best, and we should neither separate the emperor's *numen* from his person and from sacrifices directed towards it, consider it as a synonym for the man, nor connect it to his *genius*. When the *Res Gestae* and Cassius Dio recorded the honor, neither specified a particular aspect or quality of the emperor. Given Dio's later date and other clarifications of official and unofficial practice, I believe his *Historiae Romanae* would have included such an emendation.

Much like the use of ὑπὲρ and *pro* in the historical texts, which invalidate prayers and sacrifices as acts of worship, I find that scholars utilize the addition of and supposed reference to the *genius Augusti* in an attempt to isolate the worship of the quality from the man, and deny living worship and the cult of Augustus. Gradel identifies this incongruity (reading *genius* in *numen*), tracing its origin to Theodor Mommsen's inference of the *genius* in the rituals mentioned.⁷⁸ Gradel does not read the *genius Augusti* in any of the ancient sources referring to a libation for the living emperor. His reading of *Carmen* 4.5, specifically *te mensis adhibet deum*, (line 32) "unequivocally describes the worship as directed to Augustus himself."⁷⁹ His assertion, however, overlooks Horace's specific mention of the emperor's *numen* in the *Carmen*. I agree that his *genius* is absent, but clarify that the *numen* is the part that represents the man, not the man in and of himself. The terms *numen* and *genius* refer to specific qualities or aspects of the living man that are divine (his divine will and divine nature), but they do not in and of themselves make Augustus divine; as a metonymy I argue that they reflect and represent the man's inherent

⁷⁸ Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 209 citing T. Mommsen, "Die Letteraturbriefe des Horaz," *Hermes* 15 (1880): 107ff. Gradel complicates the matter of worship by dating the establishment of the *genius Augusti* in the state cult to 7 BCE and the reorganization of the *compita* cults, rather than 14-12 BCE when Augustus became Pontifex Maximus as Fishwick argues in "Genius and Numen." As I argue in Chapter 3, section IV, the *genius* had nothing to do with compital altars.

⁷⁹ 4.5.32-3, Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 209.

divinity.⁸⁰ My reading allows for a living cult of Augustus that does not make him immortal, but rather allows him to progress towards heaven while his citizens recognize that eventuality and the aspects of him that are already divine. This fits with visual representations of Augustus in private media, where the man is not visually shown as divine, but possesses divine qualities and a more-than-human status.⁸¹ That is not to say that the line *te... adhibet deum*, cannot and should not be read in the way Gradel suggests. Rather, that Horace refers to the divine aspect of Augustus that is housed within the living man. Horace does not assert to his reader that Augustus is a god; he recognizes that the emperor is a man with divine qualities and more-than-human status, whose divine components and achievements should be honored on earth.

Given the complex relationship between Augustus' person, his *genius*, and his *numen*, and sacrifices directed at his person and *numen*, modern scholars often contradict themselves in outlining this relationship. An example of this contradiction is in Fishwick's analyses of the *genius* and *numen*. Fishwick repeatedly asserts that the *numen* and *genius* of the emperor were not identical, but holds that in the context of Horace's *Carmen* 4.5, the use of *numen* clearly refers to the *genius*, since libations were poured for the *genius Augusti*.⁸² Fishwick's assertion that the two concepts were separate and not equivalent makes sense given the evidence and different uses of the terms, but his

⁸⁰ Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I, 207 unhelpfully states "there must have been, in other words, all the difference (and yet almost none at all) between worshipping Augustus himself and worshipping his *numen*." Since the *numen* was a divine component of Augustus, I assert that the worship of his *numen* was a metonymy for worshipping the man, not an alternative or synonym. Cf., Chapter 3, section IV, n. 100 for Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 308 making the assertion that a *genius* was not special like a *numen*; anyone could have a *genius*.

⁸¹ Cf. my analysis of the altar of the *Vicus Sandaliarius* in Chapter 3, section IIIA.

⁸² "Genius and Numen," 357: "... but the libation is clearly to the *genius* of the emperor, here termed *numen*." Both "Genius and Numen," and Fishwick, "Numen Augustum," 250 argue that a *numen* is not equivalent to *genius* and that there is a clear distinction between the two. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 209 misreads Fishwick's "Genius and Numen," argument that the *genius* and *numen* are separate but he is correct in the circular nature of his reading of *Carmen* 4.5.

treatment of them as synonyms in Horace undermines that statement. Additionally, as noted above, sources prior to Mommsen do not justify any interpretation that the *genius* had a function in the libations to the emperor. *Contra* to Fishwick, the *genius Augusti* would eventually have a role in the worship of the living emperor, just not in the way he suggests; libations and prayers to both the *numen Augusti* and the emperor's person existed outside the official actions of state cults, gaining legitimacy years later during Caligula's reign when the practices became pervasive.⁸³

Horace adds another element of Augustus' private *vivus* cult for his readers. Augustus in *Epistle* 2.1 receives honors and is called upon to witness an oath. As the witness of an oath, the force of the phrase *per numen* bears consideration. Since the preposition *pro* follows the official understanding of the emperor's living divinity (i.e., that he himself is not divine) and discounts prayers offered on the emperor's behalf as acts of worship, I evaluate here this preposition and the nature of oaths sworn to a god. I suggest translating *per* in this instance as calling on Augustus' *numen* as a witness to the oath as well as indicating his *numen*'s authority to guarantee the oath.⁸⁴ This grants the living emperor's *numen* the supernatural ability to witness the oath and punish perjury. A later example of my reading, but still contemporary with Augustus' lifetime, exists in Ovid's *Tristia* 2.1.53-4, in which the poet beseeches the emperor as one who has the authority to punish him if he lies: "*per mare, per terras, per tertia numina iuro, per te praesentem conspicuumque deum*"; I swear by the sea, by the land, by the three *numina*, and by you, a

⁸³ John Scheid, "To Honor the Princeps and Venerate the Gods: Public Cult, Neighbourhood Cults and Imperial Cult in Augustan Rome," in *Augustus*, ed. and trans. by Jonathan Edmondson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 281 does not find sacrifices to the *genius Augusti* until the reign of Caligula.

⁸⁴ *OLD* s.v. "per" 9 as the latter and 10 as the former.

present and visible god.”⁸⁵ Ovid calls upon these forces (sea, land, Capitoline triad) and the emperor as a *praesens deus* not only as a witness to his oath, but also so that they may punish him if his statements are false.⁸⁶ In terms of the emperor’s private cult, the use of *per* with the emperor or his divine *numen* proves his more-than-human status as one who may ensure an oath, but it gives no indication of how such a thing would happen (i.e. how he would enforce the oath).

The altars at which the oaths are sworn additionally bears consideration. I do not read these to be the compital altars of the *Lares Augusti*, which I analyze in detail in the next chapter, since those altars make no mention of the emperor’s *numen*. Horace in the *Epistle* does not provide any specific location for the setting of the altars, so we cannot rule out domestic or civic settings. These altars could refer to the altar of the *numen Augusti*, which Tiberius dedicated on the Palatine between 5-9 CE.⁸⁷ No other description of this altar exists outside the *Fasti Praenestini*, but it was an altar in Rome dedicated to the emperor’s *numen*, just as the *Epistle* describes. The only problem with this reading is that Horace died in 8 BCE, predating the earliest accepted date for the altar by thirteen years. Rather than crediting Horace with the power of clairvoyance, I believe these altars

⁸⁵ Jo-Marie Claassen, “Tristia,” in *A Companion to Ovid*, ed. by Peter E. Knox (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2009), 174 that Ovid wrote *Tristia* 1 and 2 between 8 and 9 CE.

⁸⁶ In the case of Rubrius in Tacitus, *Ann.*, 1.73.2-4, where Tiberius dismisses the charge of perjury against the *numen Augusti* on account of the oath being sworn during the emperor’s lifetime, Tiberius takes an official, public position on private oaths: oaths to *Divus* Augustus have the same weight as Jupiter and *deorum iniurias dis curae*; crimes done against the gods are the concern of the gods (Scheid, *The Gods, the State, and the Individual*,” 102-3). Tiberius leaves it to *Divus* Augustus to punish any wrongs made to the *vivus*.

⁸⁷ Fishwick, “Genius and Numen,” 357; Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I, 207 describe the altar: “Although, strictly speaking, there was no official public cult in the city of the living Augustus as a god, Tiberius did dedicate (probably in A.D. 6) an altar on the Palatine next to the house of Augustus, at which the four main priestly colleges sacrificed to his *numen*.” The altar of the *numen Augusti* is preserved in A. Degraffi, “Fasti Consulares et Triumphales,” *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.1 (1947): XIII.2, p. 115. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 236-8 incorrectly posits that the N is an M, but his argument is refuted by Fishwick, “Numen Augustum,” 248-9. I examine this *Ara Numinis Augusti* in further detail below, section IV, cf. n. 156 and also Chapter 3, section IV, n. 144.

by which ‘we’ may swear by Augustus’ *numen* are part of Horace’s poetic narrative. As I stated earlier, poetic vignettes of sacrifice do not necessarily depict actual events or locations; Horace here in my view creates fictional altars where we as his readers and participants in Augustus’ cult may swear *tuum per numen*. Horace carefully does not make any oaths in either *Carmen* 4.5 or *Epistle* 2.1, but his allusion to both the altars and the oaths invites his reader to place them within her mental landscape of Augustus’ cult. The fact that just such a public altar post-dates Horace’s fictional one suggests that his narrative was not too far-fetched.

Therefore, Horace’s inclusion of the emperor’s *numen* in both *Carmen* 4.5 and *Epistle* 2.1 emphasizes Augustus’ divine quality, a necessary component of the imperial cult, but the *numen* is neither used in the poems nor in practice as a way to direct sacrifices away from the emperor’s person. In sacrificing to and swearing oaths by Augustus’ *numen*, the man as the possessor of the quality is always inferred, but he has not already been admitted to the pantheon.

III. Sacrifice in Ovid: Libation and Prayers

Ovid, in a similar way to Horace, engages with the living Augustus’ divinity in domestic settings, but because Ovid outlived both Horace and Augustus, his poetry provides greater insight into the development and change from private to public worship. As I discuss in detail below in section IIID, Ovid differed from Horace in his relationship with the emperor and his poetic treatments of official and public practice. Whereas Horace used Augustan peace to comment on Augustan war, and the avoidance of a new Troy, Ovid follows the logic of Horace’s presentation to their conclusion in his present

circumstances. I do not read Ovid from a pro- or anti-Augustan stance, since this limits the applications and interpretations to a single point of view.⁸⁸ I employ the following selections from Ovid's corpus to first address his use of libations and incense as sacrifices to the emperor within their own poetic context as well as in comparison to those of Horace. I examine Ovid's presentation of Augustus' authority on earth, and the differences in the poets' debts to tradition in Ovid's *Fasti*. I then analyze Ovid's use of incense in his exilic sacrifices and incense as a marker of proper treatment of the divine throughout his corpus. The comparison of the two demonstrates to Ovid's reader the difficulties in making men gods. Next I assess the younger poet's use of the word *numen* in terms of private worship for the *vivus* and *Divus* Augustus. Finally, I examine Ovid's status as an exile in documenting unofficial practices.

My first example of sacrifice in Ovid joins Augustus' *vivus* cult with other established, official cults in the *Caristia*, but he does not fully combine them where the latter provides the cultic basis for the former. Unlike the sacrifices of Horace, Ovid does not utilize Hellenistic and Homeric traditions here to emphasize distinctions between Greek and Roman practices. Despite the obvious reference to a generic and cultic tradition, Ovid in the *Fasti* connects sacrifices to the living emperor with the *Caristia*:

<p>Dis generis date tura boni (Concordia fertur illa praecipue mitis adesse die) et libate dapes, ut, grati pignus honoris, nutriat incinctos missa patella Lares. iamque ubi suadebit placidos nox humida somnos, 635 larga precaturi sumite vina manu, et 'bene vos, bene te, patriae pater, optime Caesar!' dicite suffuso per sacra verba mero.⁸⁹</p>	<p>Good men offer incense to the gods of the family (Gentle Concordia is said to be there especially on this day) and offer a meal, so that, as a token of esteemed honor, the set platter may feed the crowned <i>Lares</i>. And now, when humid night persuades (me) to gentle sleep, (635) take up in your hand the full cup of wine for prayer, and say "to you (the <i>Lares</i>), to you, Father of the Country, Caesar the Good!" with holy words at the pouring of wine.</p>
--	--

⁸⁸ As Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference," 26-58, especially 40-8, convincingly argued.

⁸⁹ 2.631-8.

First, good men (*boni*) offer incense to the *Penates* (*dis generis*), then they offer food to the household *Lares*, and finally they give libations accompanied with a prayer to the *Lares* and the emperor in the evening. Much like Horace in *Carmen* 4.5, Ovid's inclusion of an evening prayer and libation are not on the emperor's behalf (*pro*), but to him in a direct address.⁹⁰ I read no linguistic distinction between the emperor, *Penates*, and *Lares*, thereby placing the emperor on the same level as the gods honored in the *Caristia*, but a separate entity. He does not combine the two cults together, where the presence of the former is justified by the latter established cults.⁹¹ I argue that Augustus' presence in the *Caristia* signifies to the reader that he is similarly able to support and promote the family, but his manifested support is not contingent upon the presence of the other gods.

Augustus as *pater patriae* and *optimus Caesar* (637) extends beyond the ritual moment of the *Caristia*, but it is emphasized there for the reader.

I add that Ovid's prayers to the *vivus* emperor are part of his larger discussion on the emperor's divine authority. Ovid describes the living emperor's power on earth as like that of Jupiter in heaven: *Fasti* 1.608, "*hoc tu per terras, quod in aethere Iuppiter alto, nomen habes: hominum tu pater, ille deum*, you have the name of Jupiter: he is the father of the gods in heaven, you are the father of men throughout the earth;" *Metamorphoses* 15.858-60, "*Iuppiter arces temperat aetherias et mundi regna triformis, terra sub Augusto est; pater est et rector uterque*, Jupiter rules the citadel of heaven and the kingdoms of the tri-formed world, earth lies under Augustus; both are father and ruler."⁹²

⁹⁰ 4.5.37: "*longas o utinam, dux bone...*" with the vocative.

⁹¹ Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 for interweaving, infusion, and incorporation in the imperial cult.

⁹² Both passages cited by McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 72-3; Horace additionally likens Augustus' power on earth to Jupiter's in heaven (*Carmen* 1.12.49-60), as cited by McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 67, 72. McGowan

Ovid presents an Augustus, who in receiving prayers as a *vivus*, possesses the ability to address those prayers on earth with the same authority that Jupiter answers prayers in heaven, much like his ability to ensure oaths in Horace (see section IIC *supra*). The distinction I read in Ovid's characterization is that Augustus *vivus* is a *praesens deus* in the way that Ellen Oliensis defines *praesens*, as "often used of a god 'present' to help."⁹³ Augustus may not be able to respond to prayers in a supernatural way, but he is still 'present' with the authority of a Jupiter-on-Earth. I stress again that the reality of Ovid's prayers live within the mental landscape of his genre, mixing together imagined, real, or exaggerated actions in a heterogeneous blend, in a presentation of what prayers and sacrifices to the living emperor entailed and explanations of their utility. The reader may or may not accept the poet's representation and explanation of sacrifice to the living emperor.⁹⁴

I read Ovid in documenting his treatment of Augustus as a Jupiter-on-Earth, who addresses prayers and receives libations, as inviting his reader to consider the pervasive power of the emperor. One does not need to believe that Augustus is a Jupiter-on-Earth, but only that his power is absolute, like that of Jupiter. Kennedy, while he does not

characterizes Augustus as a Jupiter-on-Earth but does not find a correlation between Jupiter's practiced cult and rites and those for Augustus, denying "readily identifiable religious rites that could have been practiced and observed in public" (78). McGowan uses a different interpretation of 'public' than this study. Dennis Feeney, *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of Classical Tradition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991) 217-224, reads Augustus as a potential rival to Jupiter but Ovid's prayers to Augustus are not *instead of* prayers to Jupiter.

⁹³ *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*, 151 is an unintentional defense of prayers to the living emperor. Augustus may not be able to supernaturally address prayers, but he is still 'present' to help as only a god can, cf. section IIA, n. 39. McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 84-92 following Philip Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 9, find Ovid's prayers as a plea to be saved but as Hardie says "the reality may be no more than the spectacle." Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 212 argues against all prayers to Augustus: "It must be emphasized that no one appears to have said his prayers or did sacrifice to the living Augustus or any other living king in the hope of supernatural blessings." I counter that Nock's view requires Augustus' response to be binary (as a mortal or as a god), and does not allow for the nuance present in Ovid's prayer.

⁹⁴ Cf. section IA, n. 12 *supra* for Rüpke on the reader/narrator relationship in the *Fasti* when religious practice is described.

comment on this passage of Ovid directly, interprets Augustan authority in this way:

“The power of Augustus was a collective invention, the symbolic embodiment of the conflicting desires, incompatible ambitions and aggression of the Romans, the instrumental expression of a complex network of dependency, repression and fear.”⁹⁵ As a collective invention, the emperor’s authority circulates in much the same way as the imperial cult: a bottom-up process where the people react to the emperor and are the driving agents of his cult. The inherent contradictions of the emperor’s authority (ambition, dependency, aggression, fear) provide ample fodder for a poet like Ovid. His treatment of Augustus as sharing in the festival of the *Caristia* makes the emperor present within every domestic *lararia*, thus his power and authority extend into even the household of the collective that sustains it. I see Ovid as softening this realization for the reader, and also checking the emperor’s reach through the ritual focus of the *Caristia*, a gathering of the entire family so that conflicts may be put aside and replaced reconciliation and feasting.⁹⁶ Ovid suggests to his reader that the only way to truly set aside familial differences is to exclude certain members (e.g. line 627: “*Tantalidae fratres absint et Iasonis uxor*; be absent the Tantalides, Atreus and Thyestes, and Jason’s wife Medea.”). Ovid makes multiple references to the emperor and his power: the festival is the perfect occasion for the emperor with his absolute power to forgive old disagreements, and Ovid’s suggested exclusions to call to mind Augustus’ own exile of his family members.

More so than his presentation of the emperor’s authority, Ovid’s scene of sacrifice in the *Fasti* additionally responds to Horace’s domestic sacrifices in *Carmen* 4.5. Within the

⁹⁵ Kennedy, “‘Augustan’ and ‘Anti-Augustan’: Reflections on Terms of Reference,” 35.

⁹⁶ Christopher Michael McDonough, “The Hag and the Household Gods: Silence, Speech, and the Family in Mid-February (Ovid *Fasti* 2.533–638),” *CPh* 99, no. 4 (2004) 363–4, citing Valerius Maximus 2.1.8.

domestic settings of both poems, a private, unnamed collective group offers libations and prayers to the emperor (*boni* in Ovid, the inherent ‘we’ of *dicimus* in *Carmen* 4.5).⁹⁷ The repeated pattern of libation and prayer in a domestic setting frames a Roman routine for private worship of Augustus; however, Ovid makes no mention of Greek practices or gods. The later poet associates the emperor’s worship with that of the household gods, but does not connect the three beyond the occasion, nor does Ovid here mention the emperor’s *numen*. We cannot know whether Ovid’s later poem responds to Horace’s, or whether Ovid is similarly commenting on private practice, but I find the latter to be a more appealing reading. Ovid does not utilize the same Hellenistic and Homeric tradition to describe the cult of *vivus* Augustus; he mentions none of the divine exempla or uses similar language about great deeds. Additionally, Ovid’s inclusion of Augustus in the *Caristia* has no direct link to Greek practices.

III.A. Sacrifice in Ovid: Prayers at the *Sacrum Caesaris* to the *Divus*

Ovid adds another element to his depiction of Augustus’ private cult and unofficial practices. In Ovid’s *Epistulae ex Ponto* (henceforth *Ex Ponto*), the poet sacrifices incense to the newly deceased emperor and his family. The burning of incense is private and unofficial worship in a domestic space yet recognizes Augustus’ divinity in the same way as the libations in Horace’s *Carmen* 4.5. The two ritual acts (libation and incense) build upon the official and public statements that libations and prayers should be given on Augustus’ behalf, but both are directed towards Augustus’ person and his divine *numen* in the unofficial practice. Unlike Horace, who could only anticipate the official public

⁹⁷ Matthew Robinson, *Ovid Fasti Book 2*, ed. Matthew Robinson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 404-5 in Horace, grateful subjects offer prayers whereas in Ovid, the *boni* pray to the emperor.

cult of the emperor, Ovid experiences and comments upon both the *vivus* and *Divus* cult of Augustus; I read the similarities in language used before and after the emperor's formal deification in 14 CE to demonstrate for the reader the changes in practice from the *vivus* to the *Divus*. I use incense in Ovid's corpus as a signifier of Ovid's presentation of the dialogue concerning the divinity of the emperor (pre- and post-14 CE). The acts of worship directed unofficially to the *vivus* in a private setting become public and official worship in Rome. In the paragraphs below I analyze Ovid's exilic sacrifices and his use of incense throughout his corpus to argue that Ovid is able to comment on ritual practice from an outsider's perspective, providing his reader with a greater sense of the progression and possible transgressions involved in worshipping the emperor.

In *Ex Ponto* 4.9, the Ovid describes a shrine in his house to the deified Augustus and members of his family. Scholars often propose that this passage is a sign of Ovid's sycophantic behavior during his exile, but my examination of the specifics of Ovid's worship towards the imperial household, living and dead, looks beyond the question of his sincerity. The following lines present his personal and private sacrifice to his readers:

<p>Nec pietas ignota mea est: videt hospita terra 105 in nostra sacrum Caesaris esse domo. Stant pariter natusque pius coniunxque sacerdos, numina iam facto non leviora deo. Neu desit pars ulla domus, stat uterque nepotum, hic aviae lateri proximus, ille patris. 110 His ego do totiens cum ture precantia verba, Eoo quotiens surgit ab orbe dies.⁹⁸</p>	<p>Nor is my piety unknown: this foreign land sees (105) the shrine to Caesar in my home. His virtuous son (Tiberius) and priestess- widow (Livia) stand as well, their <i>numen</i> no less now he's become a god. So none of his House are absent, the grandsons (Drusus and Germanicus) are there, one by his grandmother's side, one by his father's (110). I offer incense to them and words of prayer, every time the sun rises in the East.</p>
---	---

⁹⁸ Lines 105-112.

The silver statuettes that populate Ovid's shrine were a gift from Cotta Maximus in *Ex Ponto* 2.8, while Augustus was still alive.⁹⁹ These statuettes depict Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia, and the new additions, in an unknown medium, of Drusus and Germanicus completed the set. I will address the statuettes as the focus of Ovid's sacrifices in Chapter 4, but here my focus is the sacrifice they receive.

In this section, I examine the sacrifice (incense and a prayer) Ovid directs to the statuettes. Evaluating each as worship of the *Divus* clarifies Ovid's practices for the living emperor. I begin with the prayer, addressing the modern scholarship on prayers to Augustus in Ovid and countering these with my own readings based on the prayer in Horace's *Carmen* 4.5. I argue that this prayer in Ovid, like the prayer in *Fasti* 2 and their Horatian counterpart, addresses Augustus as a *praesens* god who is ready and able to help. In contrast to my reading, Fishwick argues that Ovid's prayers in *Ex Ponto* 4.9 and elsewhere in his corpus are consistent in terms of Augustus' mortality and divinity; deceased mortals did not receive prayers but the deified emperor could.¹⁰⁰ Fishwick believes "there is no reason to think that prayers were ever addressed to the living, [*vivus*] emperor as one who might answer in a supernatural way."¹⁰¹ I dispute Fishwick's view,

⁹⁹ Following the chronology of Luigi Galasso, "Epistulae ex Ponto," in *A Companion to Ovid*, ed. by Peter E. Knox (Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2009), 195 that the first three *Epistulae Ex Ponto* cannot be dated after 13 CE. Garth Tissol, *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*, ed. by Garth Tissol (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 1 supports this dating. For the statuettes given in 2.8 as objects of worship in 4.9: Tissol, *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*, 111; McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 105; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 202-4; Fergus Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East, Volume 1: The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*, ed. Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers (North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 65.

¹⁰⁰ Duncan Fishwick, "Ovid and the Divus Augustus," *CPh* 86, no. 1 (1991): 36-7, in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid imagines the deified emperor listening to prayers (Fishwick misnumbers *Met.* 15.868-70): "*tarda sit illa dies et nostro serior aevo qua caput Augustum, quem temperat, orbe relicto accedat caelo faveatque precantibus absens*: may the day be slow and a later than our generation when the Augustan head will rule, after he has left this earth let him be added to heaven and while absent from us let him indulge our prayers."

¹⁰¹ "Ovid and the Divus Augustus," 40 echoed in other contexts, cf. "Genius and Numen," 365; "Votive Offerings to the Emperor?" *ZPE* 80 (1990): 130.

asserting that it overlooks the intended relationship in the prayers of the poet to the living emperor, the emperor's authority in Ovid as a Jupiter-on-Earth, and the negotiation inherent in the imperial cult. Neither Ovid's prayers nor Horace's for that matter, make a supernatural request of the living emperor; their prayers ask Augustus for continuous peace for Italy (Horace, *Carmen*, 4.5.38-40, once in the morning and once in the evening), and are given to the emperor directly (Ovid, *Fasti*, 2.637). Later to the *Divus*, Ovid simply offers "words of prayer" (Ovid, *Ex Ponto*, 4.9.111).¹⁰² None of these prayers ask the emperor to do anything extraordinary, but they do recognize the extraordinary status of the emperor. This is not to say that no prayer ever addressed to Augustus made a supernatural request, but that the relationship between sacrifice and prayer to the *vivus* Augustus recognizes his developing status as an eventual *Divus*; the poet's private prayers make no distinction between the two.

I read the intriguing differences in Ovid's prayer to the *Divus* at *Ex Ponto* 4.9 to be the absence of a libation and the timing of the prayer. Both Horace's second prayer in *Carmen* 4.5 and Ovid in *Fasti* 2 pour their libations and offer their prayers to the *vivus* in the evening. Ovid's morning petition to the *Divus* in 4.9, with the absence of wine, recalls Horace's first prayer to the *vivus*; Horace's rustic *quisque* presents a prayer in the morning with a dry mouth, repeating the petition in the evening with wine.¹⁰³ *Contra* Fishwick, the poets do not seek a supernatural response from the *vivus* emperor. Rather, I argue that their prayers and sacrifices recognize the divinity of the emperor before and after it became official and public. Indeed, the poet's recognition participates in the negotiation between citizen and emperor; their sacrifices and prayers beseech the

¹⁰² Cf. section II, n. 28 *supra* for *Carmen* 4.5, and section III, n. 89 for *Fasti* 2.

¹⁰³ *Carmen* 4.5.38-40: "dicimus integro sicci mane die, dicimus uvidi, cum sol Oceano subest."

emperor in a way that evokes his presence. Although Ovid in his *Epistulae* drew on Horace's *Epistles*, especially the first book, for the generic tradition, I do not believe Ovid is directly responding to *Carmen* 4.5, since the contexts of their scenes do not match.¹⁰⁴ I hold that they are both commenting on private practices since the elements (private, wine, prayers) shared between them are similar.

IIIB. Sacrifice in Ovid: For Whom the Incense Burns

Furthermore, the incense offered at the shrine, in conjunction with the prayer, reveals more about Ovid's worship of both the *vivus* and *Divus*. Ovid uses *tus* for incense seventy-nine times in his entire corpus.¹⁰⁵ He uses the word in offerings to unnamed gods,¹⁰⁶ to members of the pantheon,¹⁰⁷ and as offerings to or on behalf of the emperor and his family.¹⁰⁸ I analyze Ovid's use of incense here in *Ex Ponto* 4.9 and also incense elsewhere in Ovid's corpus to establish Ovid's description of the emperor's progression towards divinity and the significance of making sacrifices to the *vivus* and *Divus*.

Earlier in the *Ex Ponto*, Ovid makes a similar exilic sacrifice to the imperial family at 1.4.55-6, "*turaque Caesaribus cum coniuge Caesare digna, dis veris, memori debita ferre manu*, offer with grateful hand incense owed to the Caesars, real gods, together with a wife worthy of Caesar." Ovid also gives incense on Augustus' behalf twice in the *Tristia*: 1.2.103-4, "*proque Caesare tura pius Caesaribusque dedi*, I give incense in devotion on

¹⁰⁴ Tissol, *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*, 2-6.

¹⁰⁵ Two uses in the adjectival form *turea* at *Met.* 4.255 and *Fasti* 4.410. Horace in comparison uses *tus* ten times in his entire corpus: three times for Venus (*Carmen* 1.19.14, 1.30.3, 4.1.22); four to unnamed gods (*Carmen* 1.36.1, 3.8.2, 4.2.52, *Sermon* 1.5.99); twice without any sacrifice (*Epistle* 1.14.23, 2.1.269); once for the *Lares* (*Carmen* 3.23.3). Horace does describe sacrifices of incense to or on behalf of Augustus.

¹⁰⁶ E.g. *Ars Amatoria* 1.638; *Amores* 3.3.33; *Met.* 9.159.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. *Amores* 3.13.9 (Juno); *Met.* 3.733 (Bacchus); *Met.* 6.161 (Latona, Apollo, Diana); *Fasti* 4.411 (Ceres); *Fasti* 5.302 (Jupiter).

¹⁰⁸ E.g. *Fasti* 1.719; *Fasti* 2.631; *Fasti* 3.418 (as priest of Vesta); *Tristia* 1.2.104.

behalf of Caesar and the family of Caesars;” 2.1.57-60, “*pia tura dedi pro te*, I give pious incense on your behalf.” These in the *Tristia*, like the prayers and libation in the *Res Gestae*, are not worship.¹⁰⁹ I examine in the following paragraphs the similarities between Ovid’s treatments of the emperor before and after his deification (from *Fasti* 2.631-8, *Ex Ponto* 1.4.55-6, and *Ex Ponto* 4.9.111) to demonstrate that Ovid is consistent in his presentation of practice, if not his language.¹¹⁰ The poet tells us in the *Fasti* that *dis generis date tura boni*, which becomes incense offered to the emperor (*vivus* and *Divus*) in *Ex Ponto*.¹¹¹ I read this shift in practice, from giving incense to the *Penates* to also giving incense to the emperor, in the context of Ovid’s relationship with the emperor; his exilic sacrifices capture Ovid’s and his reader’s changed views. I first briefly assess Ovid’s other applications of incense (*tus*) to identify this progression of practice.

In the *Metamorphoses*, I view two scenes of mortals demanding and refusing incense as calling to mind Augustan themes for the reader. Niobe and the Sybil demand and refuse incense, respectively, which I believe is a deliberate choice of the poet, recalling

¹⁰⁹ As listed by McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 102-3, whose focus is on the formulae *pro Caesare/Caesaribus*, and Ovid’s representation of the emperor as a god, not the use of *tura*. McGowan reasons that Ovid’s exiled position allowed him to challenge Augustus’ denials of divinity. On the contrary, Ovid is not challenging the emperor’s divinity but commenting on private practice that existed in Rome. Gaertner, *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*, 303 incorrectly identifies “*proque Caesare tura...*” of *Tristia* 1.2.103-4 as part of the imperial cult, but it was not worship of the emperor, cf. Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 102 n. 31; as was the case in Dio Cassius’ later account of libations (51.19.7), where libations are poured ἀντὶ. Taking the dative in *Ex Ponto* 1.4.55-6 as a dative of dedication, names Augustus and his family the recipients of the sacrifice, but whether the dedication is ‘for Caesar’ or ‘to Caesar’ cannot be unambiguously answered. As Price, “Between Man and God,” 38 observed: “the dative seems to have been used in this context, as Nock saw, to create fundamental unclarity as to the status of the king and the purpose of the sacrifices.” Price cites Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, Vol. I*, 219-20. In my reading, the use of *pro* elsewhere in contemporary literature suggests that the dative should be translated as ‘to.’

¹¹⁰ Following the chronology of Galasso, “Epistulae ex Ponto,” 195, that the first three *Epistulae Ex Ponto* cannot be dated after 13 CE, and Claasen, “Tristia,” 174 that Ovid wrote *Tristia* 1 and 2 between 8 and 9 CE. The mention of the *Fasti* in *Tristia* 2.549ff suggests at least a version of the *Fasti* that was completed during the emperor’s lifetime.

¹¹¹ Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 99 argues that sacrifice (blood, burnt offerings, or libations) are proof of cultic worship. Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 30 and also section IV, n. 62.

the doors of the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine.¹¹² Ovid employs these two exempla and their artistic representations as a metaphor for those who come too close to the divine. Through their interactions with incense, Ovid, in my reading, uses *tus* to invite his reader to question the implications of emperor worship. For example, Niobe in *Metamorphoses* book six demands, in part, an offering of incense to her as a *numen* on earth rather than to Latona:

<p>“Quis furor, auditos” inquit “praeponere visis 170 caelestes? Aut cur colitur Latona per aras, numen adhuc sine ture meum est? Mihi Tantalus auctor, cui licuit soli superiorum tangere mensas, Pleiadum soror est genetrix mea, maximus Atlas est avus, aetherium qui fert cervicibus axem; 175 ... In quamcumque domus adverti lumina partem, 180 immensae spectantur opes. Accedit eodem digna dea facies. Huc natas adice septem et totidem iuvenes et mox generosque nurusque.”¹¹³</p>	<p>“What madness,” she said “to prefer the gods you’ve heard about to the ones you see? (170) Otherwise why is Latona worshipped at altars, while my <i>numen</i> is without incense? Tantalus is my father, who is the only man permitted to eat the food of the gods, my mother is the sister of the Pleiades, and great Atlas is my grandfather, who bears the celestial axis on his shoulders; (175) ... In whichever part of the palace I turn my eyes, (180) I see immense wealth. Augment it with my beauty, worthy of a goddess. Add to these my seven daughters, as many sons, and soon as many sons and daughters-in-law.</p>
---	--

Niobe’s hubris, her unjust demand for divine honors, results in the death of her children.

When Latona calls upon Apollo and Diana to punish Niobe,¹¹⁴ the goddess does not specifically mention incense as part of Niobe’s crimes. The goddesses’ concern is due punishment for Niobe’s claims, and she does not repeat each of the woman’s crimes for the reader. As Ovid’s sacrifices at the *Caristia* recalled Horace’s in *Carmen* 4.5, where the emperor’s *numen* was joined to the household *Lares*, Niobe’s professed *numen* is the

¹¹² Propertius 2.31.12-14: “et valvae, Libyci nobile dentis opus, altera deiectos Parnasi vertice Gallos, altera maerebat funera Tantalidos; and the celebrated doors of Libyan ivory, one mourned the Gauls thrown down from the peak of Parnassus, the other the funeral of the Tantalids.” Andrew Feldherr, *Playing Gods: Ovid’s Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010): 294, 298 notes Niobe on the doors, but not the Sybil and their connection to incense.

¹¹³ Lines 170-183. The omitted lines continue Niobe’s divine pedigree and what the Phrygian people owe her and her husband.

¹¹⁴ 6.204-17.

basis of her claim; we as readers are never told whether or not her claim is valid. Within this poetic landscape, Ovid asks his reader to observe the consequences of wrongly demanding *tus* and an asserted *numen*. The poet gives his reader no clues about his own views, only raising the question.

Later in the *Metamorphoses*, the doors of Apollo's temple are again called to mind as the Sybil, a loyal servant of the god, is offered incense. In book fourteen, Aeneas wishes to honor the Sybil in two ways: "*templa tibi statuam, tribuam tibi turis honores*; I will build you a temple, I will offer you sacrifices of incense."¹¹⁵ The Sybil thwarts his bestowal of divine honors with the reply: "*nec dea sum*" *dixit* "*nec sacri turis honore humanum dignare caput*"; 'I am neither a goddess,' she said, 'nor is a human head worthy of the honor of sacred incense.'"¹¹⁶ Ovid's Sybil distinctly categorizes the proposed offering of *tus* as something belonging only to the gods. I note for the reader that no incense was actually burned in either case;¹¹⁷ Ovid raises the question, adds parameters, and links both exempla to Augustus and his patron god.

The thread of incense connects Niobe and the Sybil to Augustus, who shared the Palatine with Apollo's temple; Ovid does not identify the emperor as a Niobe, who demands, or a Sybil, who refused. The private nature of Ovid's sacrifices and the absence of official statements regarding incense prevent the modern reader from discerning Ovid's 'true' meaning, but we as readers can still respond to Ovid's exempla as a social negotiation of practice.¹¹⁸ Ovid, to me, is suggesting the possible transgression in people

¹¹⁵ *Met.* 14.128.

¹¹⁶ *Met.* 14.130-131.

¹¹⁷ Marie Louise von Glinski, *Simile and Identity in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), misreads this distinction, stating that Niobe received the honors she demanded.

¹¹⁸ Cf. section IA, n. 11 and 12 *supra* for Rüpke on the negotiation of practice between specialists and individuals, and the reader/narrator relationship in the *Fasti* when religious practice is described.

burning incense to *vivus* Augustus, but he does not deny that incense is an offering worthy of the gods. In terms of the negotiation of the imperial cult, I argue that Ovid's presentation of incense in the *Metamorphoses* is a commentary on practice, and he invites his readers to participate in the dialogue. Although incense is unofficial worship, private individuals use incense (rightly or wrongly) to recognize the emperor's elevated status as he progresses from *vivus* to *Divus*.

In terms of his own sacrifices of incense to the emperor, we can date Ovid's incense in *Ex Ponto* 1.4.55-6 to Augustus' lifetime.¹¹⁹ In that letter, Ovid tells his wife how he has suffered under Caesar's anger, "*Caesaris ira mihi nocuit, quem solis ab ortu solis ad occasus utraque terra tremit*; the anger of Caesars has hurt me, at whom the earth trembles from the sun's rising to its setting, both."¹²⁰ His offering of incense is a response to the imagined circumstance of Augustus' anger abating and him returning home to his wife. In this context, Ovid's sacrifice comments upon Augustus' authority on earth in a similar way to *Fasti* 2 and the inclusion of Augustus in the *Caristia*, but without any more references to the emperor's own family.¹²¹ His exilic incense recalls the *Caristia* in that it imagines the emperor's forgiveness, but now Ovid is away from his family and cannot participate in the festival. The incense recognizes Augustus' absolute authority as a Jupiter-on-earth, but is supported by Ovid's position of fear.¹²² With his treatment of *tus* in the *Metamorphoses* as a backdrop, I believe that Ovid's exilic sacrifices utilize his

¹¹⁹ Cf. section IIIA, n. 99 that the first three *Epistulae Ex Ponto* cannot be dated after 13 CE; Galasso, "Epistulae ex Ponto," 195.

¹²⁰ *Ex Ponto* 1.4.29-30. McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 206 reads this line as demonstrating Augustus' "boundless anger" and "divine wrath." Gaertner, *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*, 290 reads "Augustus' wrath is one of the principal themes of Ovid's exile poetry."

¹²¹ The two references of the *Caristia* as the perfect occasion for the emperor to forgive; second, Augustus' own exile of his family members. Cf. section III, n. 95 for Kennedy's discussion of Augustus' authority and for my analysis of that authority in Ovid's *Fasti* 2.

¹²² Fear of Augustus' *ira*, as noted by Gaertner, *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*, 9: (all from *Ex Ponto*) 1.2.89,96; 1.4.29; 1.8.69; 1.9.23, 28; 1.10. 20, 42, 43.

position as an outsider to comment upon the collective treatment of Augustus' divine authority.¹²³ His exilic sacrifices to the emperor derive not from a mindset of *libertas*, as Horace had in *Carmen* 4.5 as a member of the emperor's inner circle, but from the periphery as an exile who fears and has suffered under the emperor's divine authority. Ovid recognizes the divine authority of Augustus in his poetry in a similar way to Horace's recognition of the emperor's divine aspects, but Horace composes from a place of sponsorship and safety whereas Ovid's response derives from fear and exclusion.¹²⁴ The two poets present two perspectives of Augustus, both of which result in the offering of sacrifices to the emperor. In the same way that no incense is actually burned in the *Metamorphoses* for Niobe or the Sybil, Ovid's sacrifices to Augustus, *vivus* and *Divus*, take place in his poetic landscape where we cannot assume that incense was actually burned, but the commentary to the reader is not an illusion.

I read Ovid's addition of incense to the prayers and libation, as presented in Horace's *Carmen* 4.5,¹²⁵ as demonstrating to his reader the logical progression of Horace's treatment of the emperor as more-than-human and possessing divine aspects. If private individuals believe that the living emperor, on account of his deeds, is deserving of divine honors, then it follows that these same individuals would present the emperor, who wields divine authority, with offerings reserved for the gods. What Horace warns his reader against in *Epistle* 2.1.260-3, obtrusive flattery, Ovid demonstrates that fear and

¹²³ Feldherr, *Playing Gods*, 7 notes about the *Metamorphoses* in a parenthetical "If relatively few episodes in the poem refer directly or transparently to Augustus, it is surprising how many hinge on inequalities in power relations more generally, as superiors and inferiors alternately punish, exploit, confer benefits on, and deceive one another."

¹²⁴ McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 205 observes a revelation in Ovid's tone, where he becomes "in verse what Augustus had forced him to become in life." Johnson, *Ovid Before Exile*, 19 citing Elaine Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996): 122, notes the absence of other poetic voices besides Ovid's from the last decade of Augustus' life (Livy kept to neutral history). Both suggest that Augustan patronage and Augustan censorship seem to go hand in hand.

¹²⁵ Cf. section II, n. 28 *supra* for full text.

repression, more so than flattery, motivate this response. Sacrifices to the emperor and his family prove the divine authority of the emperor even before his public deification.

Ovid's exile did not end after the emperor's deification so he continues to recognize the same implications of divine status through his sacrifices of incense. I read Ovid's practice of burning incense as not altering after the emperor's official and public deification in 14 CE because both sacrifices to the *vivus* and those to the *Divus* demonstrate the same motivations of practice.

III.C. Ovid: *Numen* and *numina*

In this section I examine Ovid's use of the emperor's *numen* and the inclusion of the *numina* of imperial family members to further demonstrate Ovid's development of private practice. We should not read Ovid's sacrifices of incense to the *vivus* and *Divus* as replacing the incense due to the household gods, as was given in the *Caristia*. In *Ex Ponto* 4.9, his *sacrum Caesaris* does not include, as far as he describes, the *Lares* or *Penates* that were mentioned in *Fasti* 2, or the *Lares* mentioned by Horace in *Carmen* 4.5. Both his *Penates* and *Lares* could accompany him in exile to Tomis, but their omission indicates that the ritual focus of Ovid's shrine is the imperial family alone, their *numina*.¹²⁶ Although incense was an acceptable offering to the *Lares*, he does not include them in his statement of piety.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Bodel, "Cicero's Minerva, *Penates*, and the Mother of the *Lares*," 264 on the *Lares* and *Penates* as portable from one location to another outside the *domus*. Ovid may not be ignoring his duties to the household gods, but it is possible to have multiple locations of worship within the *domus*. Bodel, "Cicero's Minerva, *Penates*, and the Mother of the *Lares*," 264 cites homes that have multiple *lararia* for a single home; Ovid may have his *sacrum Caesaris* in a separate location from his *lararia*.

¹²⁷ Ovid, *Ovid Fasti Book 2*, 402 on line 631 lists *tura* as a common offering to the *Lares*.

Ovid in *Ex Ponto* 4.9 recognizes the *numina* of all members of the *Domus Augusta* (Livia, Tiberius, Drusus, and Germanicus), but singles out Augustus as a *factus deus* (line 108). I do not read any specific information in Ovid's term *sacrum Caesaris* (line 106) that would indicate whether Ovid constructed this shrine for the *Divus* Augustus or *vivus* Augustus, although Cotta Maximus' gift of the statuettes in *Ex Ponto* 2.8 makes the initial dedicatees the *vivus* and his family. Augustus' *numen*, as the quality that makes a god a god, cannot become more divine in its nature, therefore Ovid worships the *numen* of the *vivus* the same as he does the *Divus*.¹²⁸ Ovid is not consistent in his presentation of the emperor's *numen*, since sometimes it receives his sacrifices and others it does not (*Fasti* 2 and *Ex Ponto* 1.4 have no mention of the emperor's *numen*, but *Ex Ponto* 4.9 does). I read the emperor's authority to be the poet's greater concern, so consistency in his application and identification of the emperor's *numen* is not his poetic theme. Ovid's treatment of the emperor's and family's *numina* at *Ex Ponto* 4.9 does reveal a similar practice to Horace's treatment of the *numen*-aspect of the *vivus*. Both poets do not use the *numen Augusti* as if it were synonymous for the man, and neither mean *genius* when they wrote *numen*.¹²⁹ Although they have different perspectives on the emperor's divinity, where Horace composes from a place of sponsorship and safety but Ovid's response derives from fear and exclusion,¹³⁰ the two poets both engage in sacrifices and worship of the living emperor. I assert that their sacrifices counter the argument that if Augustus'

¹²⁸ As it was for Horace. Duncan Fishwick, "Numinibus Domus Divinae," *ZPE* 159 (2007): 294 "Attribution of *numen* to Augustus gave him the quality that makes a god a god, the highest possible honor on the scale of *isothēoi timae*." Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," 361 traces the use of *numen* in Augustan literature as a metonymy for god but does not follow the argument to assert Augustus' living divinity in Rome.

¹²⁹ Interestingly, there is little to no scholarly debate on Ovid meaning *genius* when he describes the emperor's *numen*.

¹³⁰ Cf. section IIIB, n. 122 for Gaertner, *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*, 9 on Ovid's fear of Augustus' *ira*; n. 120 Feldherr, *Playing Gods*, 7 on the inequalities in the *Metamorphoses*; and also section IIB, n. 121 McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 205 on Ovid's change in tone.

numen was worshipped with a cult during his lifetime, then there would be no need to formally deify him.¹³¹ Ovid viewed the *numen* of the *vivus* and Augustus' senate-decreed divinity as representations of the divinity and divine authority of one man. The former was expressed unofficially, the latter officially, but the poet regarded and feared both with the similar acts of worship. The movement from unofficial to official practices follows the progression from private to public cult; however, due to his exile, Ovid could not directly participate in public worship at Rome.

IIID. Ovid: Poet on the Outside

In this section, I briefly assess modern arguments about Ovid's relationship with Augustus and how this relationship impacts the reading of his texts. Although I argued above that Ovid interpreted the emperor's authority more from a place of fear than of *encomia*, I caution against readings that require sincerity and belief on the poet's part. More so than Horace's, scholars often consider Ovid's views on the emperor to be insincere and artificial; these assertions make their interpretations of imperial divinity in Ovid debatable at best: Duncan Fishwick deems Ovid's prayers to the emperor poetic license or "inflated language inspired by Hellenistic models;"¹³² Ittai Gradel calls Ovid's offerings to images of the emperor and his family "pathetic;"¹³³ Matthew McGowan

¹³¹ Fishwick, "Numen Augustum," 255 claims that Augustus never moved from possessing a *numen* to being a *numen*, and if he had and was openly worshipped as a divinity both in Rome and the provinces, "why bother to deify him?" *Contra* Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 41, 157 argues for a continuity, in some senses, between the once-living Augustus and his new *Divus* status. If worshipping the *numen* invalidated formal deification, then the function of *iam* to signal that now their *numina* greater because Augustus became a god, allows for the two concepts of divinity to coexist. Additionally, Niobe's claim to *numen* in *Met.* 6.172 alone is not enough to earn her incense; her divine quality alone does not make her a god.

¹³² "Ovid and the Divus Augustus," 40.

¹³³ *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 204.

characterizes the entirety of Ovid's sacrifice in *Ex Ponto* 4.9 as "presumably the product of his fertile and playfully irreverent imagination;"¹³⁴ Jan Felix Gaertner suggests that Ovid "primarily exploited it [emperor worship] to present his conflict with the emperor in a more dramatic, even epic fashion."¹³⁵ Many of these same criticisms could be leveled against Horace, who did use Hellenistic models and inserted Augustus into imagined, mythical settings. I suggest that Ovid in Rome and Ovid in exile both participate in the Augustan discourse on the divinity of the emperor. As I have argued, worship of Augustus during his lifetime as a god in Rome is a progression within the imperial cult from private to public worship. Relegating Ovid's actions of worship, regardless of motivation, to pro-Augustan or anti-Augustan readings overlooks the possibilities for the poet as a source, requiring belief on his part that we do not also require of his contemporaries.¹³⁶ Therefore, I do not consider Ovid's accounts of worship within Rome and in his private home during exile solely as the "pathetic" actions of a brownnoser desperate to come home. Ovid does desire to rejoin his family in *Ex Ponto* 1.4, but I hold that his presentation of Augustus' divine authority extends beyond his own wants and needs. Modern scrutiny of Ovid simultaneously allows and robs the poet of his work's ability to make men gods: "*di quoque carminibus, si fas est dicere, fiunt, tantaque maiestas ore canentis eget*; the gods are made by songs, if it is *fas* to say, and such divine majesty needs a singing voice."¹³⁷ This overcritical understanding of Ovid is a dismissal of his commentary on practice. It was not Ovid's goal in the *Fasti*, or any other work

¹³⁴ *Ovid in Exile*, 105 on *Ex Ponto* 4.9.106ff.

¹³⁵ *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*, 14, adding that he "seems not to have taken the worship of the emperor over-seriously."

¹³⁶ Cf. section III, n. 88 for Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference," 26-58 on how this limits interpretations and analyses.

¹³⁷ *Ex Ponto* 4.8.55-6. Levene, "Defining the Divine at Rome," 76 on poetry in general being "fuzzy," where concepts relating to the emperor's divinity that were unexpressed elsewhere could be addressed; on Ovid specifically: McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 111-2; Scott "Emperor Worship in Ovid," 68.

featuring ritual, to provide a manual for repeating that ritual.¹³⁸ I do not read his sacrificial vignettes as instructions for worshipping the *vivus* and *Divus* emperor, but rather as visions of the implications of such worship.

My interpretation counters the statements of Fishwick, who finds Ovid's exilic portrayal of *Divus* Augustus, "is unsupported by further evidence of the period," but allows other contemporary authors to make similar claims.¹³⁹ McGowan echoing Fishwick's criticism reads Ovid's exile poetry, particularly his depiction of the *vivus* and *Divus* emperor, as products of his location on the margins of the Roman world.¹⁴⁰ McGowan's argument makes Ovid's Roman-ness, that he partakes in Roman practices and ritual, dependent on him being *in Rome*. I counter that Ovid's place on the periphery allows him greater range of engagement than Horace, who was limited by his position between emperor and reader. Ovid from exile is able to address the larger implications of private worship. Ovid as an outsider from both Rome is able to observe and comment upon the changes surrounding the imperial family and the divinity of the emperor from a distance where greater trends are apparent.¹⁴¹ As a source, then, Ovid does not need to be in Rome, nor only give an account of the emperor's public cult after his death; the poet is able to negotiate with his reader the gap between private and public worship of the emperor through, in part, his vignettes of sacrifice.

¹³⁸ Rüpke, *On Roman Religion*, 90-1 on the *Fasti*: "Religion as lived in Ovid is not characterized by the accurate reproduction of scripted rituals. The connected reader is not admonished to fulfill ritual duties, nor is regular participation in public cult a didactic aim of the text."

¹³⁹ "Ovid and *Divus* Augustus," 40; the other authors are Livy, Vergil, and Valerius Maximus. Fishwick concludes that Ovid plays with popular belief in Rome of the emperor's divinity in an effort to be recalled from exile.

¹⁴⁰ *Ovid in Exile*, 61 stating the imperial cult had a stronger foothold outside of Rome.

¹⁴¹ Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East, Volume I*, 348 on Ovid as rejected "insider" and provincial "outsider." Ovid mentions his Greek surroundings once in *Ex Ponto* 4.14.47-8.

IV. Conclusion

The sacrifices to the *vivus* Augustus captured in poetry continue beyond the confines of the genre as public offerings to the *Divus*. The elements of Horace and Ovid's sacrifices (libation and incense) appear in visual representations of Augustus' senate-decreed divinity after 14 CE. While we cannot know the readers' immediate response to poetic depictions of sacrifice, I argue that the appearance of similar sacrifices in other, later media demonstrate their acceptance of practice and the movement from private to public cult.¹⁴² Both libations and incense offered to the emperor (his person and his *numen*) become markers of his *vivus* and *Divus* cult that continually anticipate and affirm his senate-decreed divinity after 14 CE. I in this conclusion briefly provide examples of both libations and burnt offerings given to *Divus* Augustus in other media that echo the sentiments of the poets.

Libations poured out to Augustus, and their accompanying prayers are momentary actions, but the accoutrements of the sacrifice are preserved in coins minted in Rome spanning Augustus' lifetime. I assert that these coins demonstrate that private libations to Augustus, not on his behalf, were prevalent outside of poetry. As Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has shown, both the obverse and reverse images of coins confirm the people's acceptance of the emperor's authority; the two sides communicate with the emperor in giving and confirming information he already possessed.¹⁴³ This makes images on coins part of the private sphere, not the public where the emperor and senate dictate the visual

¹⁴² Cf. section IA, n. 11 and 12 *supra* for Rüpke on the negotiation of practice between specialists and individuals, and the reader/narrator relationship in the *Fasti* when religious practice is described, and my discussion in that same section.

¹⁴³ Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus," *JRS* 76 (1986): 68-70 on the obverse and reverse as a whole communicating a message of authority, while at the same time being value-laden, persuasive, and serving both an economic and non-economic purpose.

language. Both Horace and Ovid poured libations to Augustus which recognized his authority on earth and his more-than-human status. I examine in the paragraphs below three *denarii* featuring the accoutrements of sacrifice, and one *aureus* with a sacrifice on Augustus' behalf in order to prove that sacrifices to Augustus in the unofficial way (i.e. to his person) were prevalent in Rome alongside official sacrifices (i.e. on his behalf). The two spheres of unofficial and official practice coexisted within Rome. Additionally, the combination of sacrificial images and a public goddess intertwine private and public practice, where participants were able to move between these spheres without denying or negating proper obeisance to Roman gods. Finally, I identify offerings of incense to *Divus* Augustus in monumental imagery and historical accounts of practice to show that Ovid did not create this kind of sacrifice, but rather his private accounts translated into public practice.

Three *denarii* minted in Rome during Augustus' lifetime have reverses with the *instrumenta sacra*: *simpulum*, *lituus*, tripod, and *patera*.¹⁴⁴ All four of these items are used in sacrifices: a *simpulum* for libations, a *lituus* for marking ritual space, a tripod symbolizing the oracles of Apollo and the Sibylline Books, and the *patera* for libations as well. Additionally, the four *instrumenta sacra* are each associated with one of the four Roman priestly colleges: the pontiffs, augurs, *quindecimviri*, and *septemviri epulonum*, respectively.¹⁴⁵ Since these accoutrements of sacrifice only appear together on these three

¹⁴⁴ RIC I² 367, 368 with Venus, and 410 with Augustus, dating from 16-13 BCE. Both the Venus and Augustus types were issued by moneyers from the *gens Antistia*, with C. Antistius Vetus issuing the Venus type in 16 BCE, and Regulus Antistius issuing the Augustus type in 13 BCE. For images: (RIC I² 367) http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0367.jpg; (RIC I² 368) http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0368.jpg; (RIC I² 410) http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1595.html#RIC_0410.

¹⁴⁵ Susan Ludi Blevins, "Rhetoric, Repetition, and Identity in the Frieze of Sacred Objects on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus," in *Gods, Objects, and Ritual Practice*, ed. Sandra Blakely (Georgia: Lockwood Press, 2017), 236; Laetitia La Follette, "Parsing Piety: The Sacred Still Life in Roman Relief

denarii, their obverses offer the best guide for their interpretation. Two of the three obverses feature Venus looking to the right, wearing a beaded necklace and diadem,¹⁴⁶ and the third obverse shows Augustus bare-headed and clean-shaven, looking to the right.¹⁴⁷

The reverse inscriptions make no mention of the libations awarded by the senate in 30 BCE, and Augustus is not named in a direct dedication (i.e., the dative). I argue that the unique combination of *instrumenta sacra* with Augustus and Venus suggest an exchange of private and public interpretations; the private cult of Augustus and his family (as Ovid sacrificed to in *Ex Ponto* 1.4 and 4.9) shared in the ritual membership of the four priestly colleges. Individuals who participated in the public sacrifices of the latter also engaged in the private cult of the former. My reading of these coins combines both that of Susan Ludi Blevins and Wallace-Hadrill; Blevins argues the *instrumenta sacra* on all three link items of Augustus' personal piety to that of the state (his image and family goddess to the four priestly colleges),¹⁴⁸ and Wallace-Hadrill's argument that coins are part of the private sphere. In this way, when these *instrumenta sacra* accompany Venus, a public goddess, the private cult of Augustus shares in the public cult of Venus. Venus evoked the *gens Iuliae* and the dynasty of the Julio-Claudians, whereas Augustus served as the living representative of that dynasty, so both reverses participate in the same presentation of private cult. This interweaving of gods and accoutrements of sacrifices serves to

Sculpture," *MAAR* 56/57 (2011/2012), 15 identify the four items with the four colleges (*simpulum*=pontifs, *lituus*=augurs, tripod=*quindecimviri*, *patera*=*septemviri epulonum*).

¹⁴⁶ RIC I² 367, 368, dated to 16 BCE, cf. n. 144 *supra*. The main differences between 367 and 368 are that the reverse inscription on 367 reads "COS IMP CAESAR AVGV XI," whereas the inscription on 386 "COS IMP CAESAR AVGVVS XI."

¹⁴⁷ RIC I² 410, dated to 13 BCE, cf. n. 144 *supra*.

¹⁴⁸ Blevins, "Rhetoric, Repetition, and Identity," 237 connects the items to Augustus' personal piety to the state gods as well as membership in the colleges.

stabilize the private cult of the emperor by linking it to public practice, as well as by recognizing that the same groups of individuals could participate in both.

A fourth coin contemporary to these *denarii* furthers my reading of interweaving and shared participation. The *aureus* RIC I² 369 features a winged Victory on the obverse and a scene of sacrifice on the reverse: a priest holding a *patera* stands over an altar and a *victimarius* holding a knife leads a bull towards them.¹⁴⁹ I argue that the imagery of this coin further shows shared participation between public and official and private and unofficial worship, and the interweaving of Augustus' cult with established practices. The reverse scene does not directly invoke the emperor, but its accompanying inscription "PRO VALETVDINE CAESARIS S P Q R," gives the sacrifice a purpose. As I stated above, a sacrifice on the emperor's behalf is not an act of worship, and the preposition represents the official reading of the emperor's more-than-human status.¹⁵⁰ A significant feature is that the legend recalls the prayers and sacrifices described in the posthumously published *Res Gestae*: "*vota pro salute mea... pro valetudine mea supplicaverunt.*"¹⁵¹ I note that *Salus* and *Valetudo* were not interchangeable divine qualities, so while both refer to the health of the emperor, they are not describing the same action or ritual.¹⁵² The reverse image depicts a sacrifice that follows the public and official representation of

¹⁴⁹ I note that the same moneyer minted all four coins: C. Antistius Vetus. His coins regularly feature scenes of sacrifices and sacrificial implements. For image: (RIC I² 369) [http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1\(2\).aug.369](http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1(2).aug.369).

¹⁵⁰ Cf. section IB *supra* for the official reading of libations and prayers to Augustus, and Chapter 1, section III for my definition of the term.

¹⁵¹ *Res Gestae* 9.1-2, cf. section IB, n. 14 for full passage; I say later since the *Res Gestae* was published after Augustus' death. Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 31; Price, "Between Man and God," 28-33.

¹⁵² Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, argues that the *Res Gestae* and RIC I² 369 commemorate the same event, but the divine quality of *valetudo* is not the same as *salus*. Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 153, 158-9 clarifies this distinction: a *denarius* of 49 BCE (RRC 442/1a) features *Salus* on the obverse with SALVTIS, and *Valetudo* on the reverse with VALEV. The two deified abstractions share the aspect of healing, but were not interchangeable. Moreover, *Salus* had a cult and temple in Rome, whereas there is no evidence that *Valetudo* possessed either (but did have a cult in Italy and the provinces).

Augustus' divinity, i.e., that he himself is not divine, but prayers and sacrifices may be given on his behalf, or on behalf of his well-being. Additionally, this sacrifice is not a libation in a private setting, but a public ritual. I argue that the imagery confirms the people's acceptance of the emperor's more-than-human status and divine qualities, and also the infusion of Augustus' divine status with public practice. In this way, although the coin does not utilize the unofficial language of sacrifice (i.e. sacrifices to him or to his *numen*), it shows that the presence of Augustus was pervasive throughout Rome. The same ritual participants who collectively make sacrifices in public on Augustus' behalf would also make sacrifices in private domestic settings to his person. Because of the shared participants, the coins invoke both public and private rituals without one negating the other.

These coins proved that private practices existed beyond scenes in poetry, but I also link poetic practices to actual sacrifices to the *Divus* Augustus. In the following paragraphs, I identify incense in sacrifices to deified emperors in order to show that this practice was widespread outside of Ovid's exilic scenes. Individuals participating in sacrifices after 14 CE do not need to differentiate between the emperor's unofficial and official cult in public and private acts of worship. I argue that Ovid's use of incense in his poetic worship of the emperor and his family captures what would become standard practice in public rituals honoring the emperor.

Paul Rehak traces incense as a common offering to deified emperors after Augustus in architectural friezes to *Divus* Antonius and *Diva* Faustina,¹⁵³ but Pliny the Elder identifies

¹⁵³ Paul Rehak, "Livia's Dedication in the Temple of *Divus* Augustus," *Latoma* 49 (1990): 121 n. 22, a flaming *turibula* appearing in the monumental frieze of the Temple of the *Divus* Antonius and *Diva* Faustina, as well as on the porch of the pantheon of Hadrian.

the practice with Livia, as the *flaminica Augustalis*, depositing a cinnamon root on the Palatine:

Radicem eius magni ponderis vidimus in palatii templo, quod fecerat Divo Augusto coniunx augusta, aureae paterae inpositam, ex qua guttae editae annis omnibus in grana durabantur, donec id delubrum incendio consumptum est. ¹⁵⁴	We see a root of a great weight in the Palatine temple, which his wife Augusta dedicated to the <i>Divus</i> Augustus, setting it on a golden <i>patera</i> , the drops emanating from this root harden into grains, until is burned at the temple.
---	---

Livia's offering is not incense, but it similarly produces a fragrant resin that is burned as a sacrifice to Augustus. As an offering to *Divus* Augustus, Livia's cinnamon root and Ovid's incense establish "the new status of Augustus as *divus* among the gods of Rome."¹⁵⁵ Although Livia does not burn incense (*tus*), I interpret her sacrifices on the Palatine recalling Ovid's exempla of incense and analysis of Augustus' authority; Pliny does not comment on the pervasive authority of Augustus, even after his deification, but I suggest reading Livia's offering next to Ovid's discourse. Ovid demonstrates the fear due to an awesome god like Augustus by offering him and his family incense, an offering fit for a god. Livia's odorous sacrifice on the Palatine unintentionally comments upon Ovid's exempla of Niobe and the Sybil in the *Metamorphoses*, and the allusion to their presence in another Palatine temple to Apollo. Claudia Cecamore argues Livia's sacrifice took place at the *Ara Numinis Augusti*, near the Temple of Apollo but not part of that Temple.¹⁵⁶ The senate has confirmed Augustus' *Divus* status, but his divine authority had

¹⁵⁴ *Naturalis Historia* 12.42.94.

¹⁵⁵ Rehak, "Livia's Dedication in the Temple of *Divus* Augustus," 124-5 does not mention Ovid in conjunction with Livia.

¹⁵⁶ Claudia Cecamore, *Palatium: Topografia storica del Palatino tra III sec. a.C. e I sec. d.C.*, *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma. Supplementi*, 9 (Roma : L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2002), 205, 207 argues that Livia sacrifices at the *Ara Numinis Augusti* on the Palatine, which served as a place of worship for *Divus* Augustus until his temple was completed in 37 CE. She assesses from literary evidence that the *Ara Numinis Augusti* became the altar of the temple, "l'ara dedicata da Tiberio potrebbe essere diventata, dopo il 37 d.C., l'altare del tempio," (207). Fishwick, "On the Temple of *Divus* 'Augustus'," 232, 245-55 argues that this temple is the Temple of *Divus* Augustus, not some other shrine,

already been proven by the collective actions of his citizens, like Ovid. Ovid writing from exile participated in a narrative of Augustus' authority and divine status, which Livia's posthumous sacrifices verified and validated by continuing the private trend of burning incense.

In conclusion, the sacrifices I have analyzed here to the *vivus* and *Divus* encapsulate the different perspectives of practice in Horace and Ovid. Both poets present similar private sacrifices in domestic settings, using unofficial language to comment on official practice. I have demonstrated that the status of the two poets as inside and outside of Augustus' inner circle allows them different generic points of views on the practices of private individuals in worshipping Augustus. Horace utilized private sacrifices to differentiate the cult of Augustus from Greek cults and Hellenistic ruler cult, emphasizing to his reader the kind of poetry and sacrifices the divine *numen* of Augustus should receive, i.e. his own. Ovid throughout his corpus commented on the implications of the view Horace presents, that if Augustus possessed the aspects of a god, he also possesses the divine authority and anger of a god. Ovid invites his reader to question the implications of unofficial sacrifices; if private individuals continue to recognize Augustus as a god, his divine authority then infuses and becomes pervasive in all private practice. Both poets, moreover, show the movement from private to public cult, and the interplay between official and unofficial practice, recognizing that the same individuals participated in these spheres. I find that the language found in poetry for elite, domestic

but Cecamore, *Palatium*, 205-7 counters that this is not the case; Livia sacrificed on the Palatine but not at the Temple of Apollo. Although Caligula dedicated the Temple of *Divus* Augustus, it was financed and construction was begun by Tiberius and Livia. Cf. section IIC, n. 87 *supra* for the *Ara Numinis Augusti*, and also Chapter 3, section VI, n. 144.

readers captures the negotiation surrounding the emperor's divinity; the participants in sacrifices must first prove *vivus* Augustus' divinity with their sacrifices before the senate may formally deify him as a *divus*. The genre of poetry allowed for interplay between the official bestowal of libations and unofficial sacrifices in a medium that endured beyond the ritual moment. The next chapter places these sacrifices in domestic and civic settings within the city of Rome, where participants both conferred and verified the emperor's divinity during his lifetime.

Chapter 3 A CITY OF MARBLE: ALTARS AND CULT PLACES FOR THE LIVING EMPEROR IN ROME

In this chapter, I will analyze cult places in Rome where the worship of the living emperor was localized in civic settings. These places transformed without physical renovation and iconographic revision after the emperor's death and deification to cult places for the *Divus* Augustus. Contrary to the *communis opinio*, that Augustus was not worshipped in Rome during his lifetime, I argue that cult places to the *vivus* Augustus existed within the city. My goal in this chapter is to prove that cult places to the *vivus* Augustus existed, that they shared a visual language, utilized the emperor's adjective-cum-epithet *Augustus* to invoke the emperor's presence and interweave and incorporate his private cult into extant cult places, and that these cult places to the *vivus* transitioned into cult places for the *Divus* after 14 CE without renovation.

I follow Ton Derks' definition of cult places: they "are spaces intended for the worship of one or more cosmological powers, separate from the profane world, in which the members of the cult community regularly gather in order to perform their personal or collective rituals before a ritual focus."¹ Cult places do not necessitate temples, a fact that allows my analysis of them to center on how individuals utilized the features and proximity of these monuments to recognize and participate in the cult of *vivus* Augustus. My study of cult places aims to place the participants in sacrifices (libations, prayers, incense) in the previous chapter within the topography of Rome.

Whereas sacrifices are proof of cultic worship, cult places disperse the participants of these sacrifices within the landscape of Rome, with participants' goal of making the

¹ Derks, *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices*, 133 provides the definition.

emperor present there.² Despite differences in style or scale, individuals visiting these cult places engaged in the ongoing dialogue between the emperor and his citizens about the divinity of the living emperor through the intersecting spheres of state financed public and privately funded worship (by individuals or collectives). Their dialogue (between *princeps* and citizens) establishes the features of his posthumous cult. I argue that the monuments of the northern Campus Martius and the compital altars in Roman *vici* are civic cult places (as opposed to domestic) where participation in the private and unofficial cult of *vivus* Augustus is incorporated into the existing cults of the city.³ This incorporation (Augustus sharing space with an official god) legitimizes and allows viewers to recognize the emperor's place as more-than-human. Like the goddess Vesta existing both in her temple and in every hearth, the cult places of the *vivus* Augustus cohabitate in Rome, creating a multilocular cult to meet the multifarious needs of the participants. Just as it had in the provinces, the infusion and incorporation of Augustus into the existing cultic framework demonstrates the dedicator's and viewer's awareness of public practice while also adapting the public god to meet their own needs.⁴ I will show that the practice and imagery associated with the shift from private to public worship is consistent, although the language used to describe that shift may vary. The presence of *vivus* cult establishes a map of Augustus' divinity in Rome and the people's

² Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 30 and also section IV, n. 62, Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 99, 102 n.31 on the difference between sacrifices on behalf of a person and to a person, where the former is not proof of cultic worship but the latter is. Cf. Chapter 1, section II, that the progression of worship maintains that private individuals participating in the *vivus* cult made the emperor present throughout the city, establishing local and individual relationships with the emperor.

³ Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 for the interweaving and infusion of Augustus' cult into existing cults as a feature of the imperial cult throughout the empire. I say interweaving and infusion because Augustus is neither equal to, nor subsumed by the official public cult, but they are woven into each other. Additionally I do not use 'share' since this again implies equal footing between the two.

⁴ Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 146-7 on the significance of provincial cults using the adjective-*cum*-epithet Augustus. Lott argues for provincial awareness of Rome and Augustan policy, but I assert that the same practice occurs in Rome.

interpretations of that divinity. My argument counters the assertions of J. Bert Lott and Harriet Flower, who do not interpret these locations as cult places and whose conclusions do not support the living cult of Augustus.

In section I, Place, Ritual, and Worship, I introduce the relationships between people moving through a cult place and the monuments that populate that place. I build upon this in section II with a discussion of the *Res Gestae* and specific terminology. These preliminary sections are crucial for closer analysis in the three sections on the *Lares* in Rome, the *genius Augusti*, and monuments of the Campus Martius. I will show that the private cult places and Augustan gods fulfilled the ritual functions of both the *vivus* and *Divus* Augustus for Romans in the city as they had in the provinces; these places transformed from private to public cult as the participants moved from unofficial to official worship. In the conclusion, I address how these spaces became cult places to the *Divus*, utilizing a non-linear chronology of events, in which Augustus *vivus* both is/was worshipped with living cult and Augustus *Divus* will be/is.

I. Place, Ritual, and Worship

Given the haziness of sacred space throughout Rome, the classification of a space or place as sacred is not enough to make an act there into an act of worship.⁵ I follow the

⁵ Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, 100: “A fundamental behavioural and performative definition of sacred space is space in which religious ritual is performed.” These rituals are not limited to temple boundaries (e.g. ritual processions in the streets of Rome). Simply said, using sacred space as a marker of worship is a circular argument. I generally consider space, place, and landscape in terms of the viewer: “an undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it,” following Y.-F. Tuan, *Passing Strange and Wonderful: Aesthetics, Nature and Culture* (Washington DC: Island Press, 1993), 6 as cited by Kate Gilhuly and Nancy Worman, “Introduction,” in *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*, ed. Kate Gilhuly and Nancy Worman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 6-7. A place implies individual identities, whereas a space implies ontological categories that affect a viewer, like spaces that are inhabited by monsters, following Gilhuly and Worman, “Introduction,” 9-10, or in terms of this study a domestic or civic space, which implies the ontological categories of social

interpretations of landscape and ritual put forth by Deena Ragavan and Kathleen Ashley. As Ragavan explains, “Temples and shrines were not constructed in isolation, but existed as part of what may be termed a ritual landscape, where ritualized movement within individual buildings, temple complexes, and the city as a whole shaped their function and meaning.”⁶ A viewer moving through Rome participated in shaping the function and meaning of cult places to the *vivus* Augustus. This viewer’s navigation of space is a reenactment of the navigation of private cult; the viewer and emperor are engaged in a negotiation and progression of status. As the viewer walks through the space, she witnesses Augustus’ lifetime achievements and is able to interpret and react to monumental statements of those achievements. Ashley connects ritual and art in the negotiations of place, ritual, and cult, in such a way that ritual performance directs the viewer’s eyes to monuments and artworks: “The relation between them [the viewer and the artwork] is not unidirectional (art used in ritual) but reciprocal; ritual creates its artworks while the art or architecture also enables ritual activity.”⁷ The cult places enable ritual to Augustus to take place there, even if evidence of these private rituals does not survive.⁸ I assert that monumental cult places, like the shrines and monuments of the *triumviri*, become mnemonic devices in the cultural and cultic memory of Romans.⁹ They recall both the *vivus* and *Divus*, with the result that Augustus as a god exists outside of

hierarchy. A landscape in terms of the viewer, implies someone surveying a geographical area, so the landscape of the Campus Martius requires a viewer to interact with this landscape for it to be so (Gilhuly and Worman, “Introduction,” 10). Cf. Chapter 1, n. 2 Levene, “Defining the Divine,” 76, on the “fuzzy” boundaries of poetry, and n. 99 on how ‘fuzzy-ness’ or haziness prevented an official rulebook for Julio-Claudian emperors. Also cf. Chapter 1, section III, n. 58 on the different types of sacred spaces in the city.

⁶ Ragavan, “Heaven on Earth,” 1, cf. Chapter 1, section II, especially n. 32 for my reconstruction of ritual in a place.

⁷ Kathleen Ashley, “Art in Ritual Context: Introduction,” *JRS* 5 (1992): 10.

⁸ Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 31 for Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 96 on the absence of this kind of evidence in Hellenistic sources.

⁹ Cf. Chapter 1, section V, n. 74-6 on Popkin, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph*, citing Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, and also my discussion in section VA of that chapter.

time. As the negotiation develops during the emperor's lifetime and continues after his death, I view these sites as anchoring his cult within the topography of the city and in the minds of its inhabitants. Since no recorded rituals to the *vivus* Augustus occurred at these cult places, I examine in this chapter the art, architecture, and cult places within the city where participants' movement and negotiation of the space enabled a living cult.

If monumental cult places supported the private *vivus* cult of Augustus, then the inherent negotiation of the imperial cult (how the populace represents the emperor's more-than-human status and divine qualities to themselves) should occur throughout the city. In order to demonstrate the connections between civic architecture and the prevalence of cult places to the *vivus* Augustus in Rome, I first assess privately commissioned compital altars of the *Lares Augusti* in Roman *vici*. The language and iconography of the altars publicize private interpretations of and reactions to Augustan programs and Augustus' divine status. Then I consider the civic monuments of the Campus Martius in the same terms as the compital altars, suggesting that the status of each as a cult place situates it within a dialogue of living cult. Finally, I examine the status of these civic cult places for the *vivus* after Augustus' deification in 14 CE; cult places for the *vivus* become cult places for the *Divus* with little editing. The movement from private to public cult in this chapter displays greater reciprocity between the emperor and official narratives with the citizens as viewers and readers than the vignettes of sacrifice. This is, in part, because the actions and reactions of either point of view are more easily (though not without difficulty) recreated in the extant evidence.

Whereas Horace and Ovid in the previous chapter utilized the relationship between poet, emperor, and reader,¹⁰ creating scenes of sacrifice where the emperor's living divinity was expressed in private libations, offerings, and prayers, cult places populated the actual topography of Rome. There, the categories of public and official, private and unofficial required visual elements to guide a reader and/or viewer through the tenets of private worship. The private imagery of compital altars in the streets of Rome localizes Augustus and his achievements, which are correspondingly depicted in public monumental works such as the Campus Martius program and the Palatine temple to Apollo; both public and private monuments engage in visual narrative that transitions into the public cult of the *Divus*. The emperor as a *vivus* and *Divus* would reside everywhere in Rome as his cult places populate the city. Lott suggests this practice of multilocular cult occurred during Augustus' lifetime; after his reforms of the *regiones* and *vici* the emperor became a member of every *vicus*, which I view as making his divine status as tangible as that of other gods who bridged the gap between public and private cult.¹¹ I take Lott's position further, asserting that in the absence of a temple to the *vivus*, Augustus' private worship, like that of Vesta, Aesclepius, and the *Lares*, attaches to places where his worshippers gathered (even if he never, rarely, or only on one occasion visited those places).¹² My emphasis on place weaves the emperor's cult into the extant

¹⁰ Cf. Chapter 2, section IA, n. 11 and 12 *supra* for Rüpke on the negotiation of practice between specialists and individuals, and the reader/narrator relationship in the *Fasti* when religious practice is described.

¹¹ *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 121 counters Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 180-91, that the *Lares Augusti* were the emperor's household *Lares* made public. Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones* ('*Ars Poetica*'), 9 also makes this claim. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 289-90 expands Lott's argument to include the symbolic chaos of taking domestic *Lares* out of the home (e.g. Suetonius, *Caligula*, 5, where in 19 CE the domestic *Lares* were thrown into the streets in reaction to the death of Germanicus, Tiberius' heir).

¹² Shelley Hales, *The Roman House and Social Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 18, 141 on Vesta's presence in her public temple as well as in private hearths; Gil H. Renberg, "Public and Private Places of Worship in the Cult of Asclepius at Rome," *MAAR* 51/52, (2006/2007): 88-90 on the

ritual fabric of the city; no new cult places were created without a mythic precedent of apotheosis, or without an Augustan god (official or private) to legitimize the viewer's interpretation. My assertion recognizes the multilocular nature of his lifetime cult in Rome, which resembles his cult throughout the provinces before and after his deification; local populations adapt and interpret imperial imagery to participate in the larger, public cult via private and local means. The Augustus *vivus* honored at cult places in the provinces is the same Augustus honored by the *vicomagistri* at the compital altars in Rome; inconsistencies and individuality of local practice are to be expected given the official and public avoidance of Augustus' solo cult.

II. Historical Context: *Res Gestae*

In order to situate my argument within the historical context of Augustus' lifetime, I begin with the *Res Gestae* as evidence for the relationship between the emperor and his people. Although the *Res Gestae* was published after 14 CE, the text is unique in documenting the negotiations of cult. These multiple private cult places of Augustus throughout the city illustrate to me a process similar to the repetition of the adjective *universus* in the *Res Gestae*. As they performed sacrifices on the emperor's behalf in the previous chapter, "*privatim etiam et municipatim universi cives unanimiter continenter*

introduction of Aesclepius to Roman religion during the plague of 293 BCE, his permanent sanctuary on Tiber Island (built in 291 BCE), and subsequent absence from public ritual and increase in private worship after 180 BCE; Flower *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, x, 9, 22 for the *Lares* as gods of place; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 87 clarifies that the *Lares* of Augustus' household and his personal connection with Vesta as the Pontifex Maximus remained separate from those of the Roman people.

apud omnia pulvinaria pro valetudine mea supplicaverunt,”¹³ the *universi cives* gather at cult places throughout the city, both individually and as municipalities (*privatim et municipatim*), to worship the emperor.¹⁴ I take *universus* and its forms to mean “the whole, entire, complete in all its parts,”¹⁵ so that the adjective conveys Augustus’ own observation of his power-base as well as the citizens’ negotiations of and reactions to his more-than-human status and divine qualities. As participants in these cult places, the *populi universi Romani* were not the elite of poetic scenes of sacrifices, but senators and freedmen, and all those who fell somewhere between. As *universi*, they all engaged in the negotiation of Augustus’ cult; their recognition of Augustus’ authority and status allowed for disparity and variance in their local representations of him.

In order to argue for the cult places of *vivus* Augustus in the civic spaces of Rome, I, in what follows, locate the private and communal offerings of the *universi* Roman citizenry to Augustus in cult places throughout the city. At both the compital altars and

¹³ *Res Gestae* 9.2, “moreover, citizens all together, in private and as a municipality have, with one accord, continuously offered prayers for my good health at all sacred spaces.” Cf. Chapter 2, section IB, n. 14 for full passage.

¹⁴ The sacrifices described in the *Res Gestae* capture the official and public stance on Augustus’ divinity (i.e. that he himself is not divine). *Municipatim* suggests Italian *municipia*, but the text was circulated beyond Italy.

¹⁵ *OLD* s.v. 1b. The adjective is used four other times in the Latin text: in 22 BCE Augustus freed all members of the community from fear during a food shortage (*Res Gestae* 5, “... *ut intra paucos dies metu et periculo praesenti populum universum liberarem impensa et cura mea*”), all the Roman equites honored Gaius and Lucius (*Res Gestae* 14, “*Equites autem Romani universi principem iuventutis utrumque eorum parvis et hastis argenteis donatum appellaverunt*.” The adjective here is not as inclusive as other instances, since it is limited to the *equites* and is in honor of Gaius and Lucius Caesar), in 28-27 BCE after Augustus attained all things “*per consensum universorum*,” he gave all his power to the Senate and People of Rome (*Res Gestae* 34, “*In consulatu sexto et septimo, postquam bella civilia extinxeram, per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium, rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli*”), and in 2 BCE “*senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus* named him *Pater Patriae*” (*Res Gestae* 35, “... *senatus et equester ordo populusque Romanus universus appellavit me patrem patriae*...”). Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, 131-174, addresses the term *consensus* as the ideological thread that connected Roman social groups and classes. He asserts that “it was precisely this universal *consensus* that separated the *auctoritas* of the *princeps* from the *imperium* of the magistrate” (146-7). I concede that the *Res Gestae* may use the adjective as an exaggeration in some instances, but given the thriving image of the emperor throughout Rome, I hold that the force of the adjective not be overlooked. The adjective (even if it is an exaggeration) reveals part of the negotiation taking place between emperor and *populi*; *universus* can be attributed to actions on both sides.

the monuments of the northern Campus Martius, repeated materials and images create a narrative of private worship that connects private and public monuments. These materials encourage a viewer to locate Augustus in cult places to official gods, interweaving the two cults to enhance the private worship of the emperor without impeding or limiting the official god his due worship.

IIA. Historical Context: Terminology

Prior to Augustus' reforms of the *vici* and *regiones* in 7 BCE, the games and festival (although there was no single location or ritual to designate it) celebrated at each compital altar and *vicus*, the *ludi Compitalicii* and *Compitalia* were dissolved during periods of civic unrest and civil war by Caesar and Octavian in an effort to suppress violence.¹⁶ Augustus, through the restoration of these and the reforms of the *vici*, permitted local populations to reinstate and reaffirm their local identities. I do not believe, however, that he dictated specific parameters and features to each. Before I begin an analysis of neighborhood cult places for Augustus, I must explain and define certain terms and names that are relevant to the argument: *vicus*, *compitum*, the different types of *Lares*, and the *vicomagistri*. I then identify and briefly elaborate upon the context of each in Augustan Rome.

In Rome, each *regio* consisted of several *vici* or neighborhoods. The number of *regiones* expanded from four to fourteen with Augustus' reforms in 7 BCE, but the exact

¹⁶ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 55-6, 61-64. Lott does not suggest that the *vici* were not useful administrative units, but rather that local *collegia* promoted factionalism and violence during these times, and official decrees and laws aimed at dissolving neighborhood groups. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 246 on the features of the *Compitalia*, adding there was no "single celebrant 'in charge' of the festival," like a consul or aedile; 243-8, she counters the views of Lott, using Cicero's speech against L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus about an unsanctioned *Compitalia* in 58 BCE. She finds that the *collegia* in general were not to blame for the festival's ban, but only subversive *collegia*.

number of *vici* at the time is unknown, since a *vicus* had no physical boundary defining it as a fixed space.¹⁷ Ancient sources vary in their tally of *vici*: Vergil recorded three hundred *vici* in Rome, Ovid five hundred, and Pliny the Elder two hundred sixty-five. I find Pliny's number from 73 CE to be the most accurate tally of the three since his number is the most specific, but the fire in 64 and chaos of 69 CE prevent its application without adjustment to Augustan *vici*.¹⁸

Each *vicus* had a specific crossroads, called a *compitum*, where the members of the *vicus* practiced sacrifices to their *Lares* and where these gods resided during festivals.¹⁹ A compital altar is the physical residence for these *Lares*, who are also called the *Lares Compitales*.²⁰ The *Lares Compitales* after 7 BCE become synonymous with the *Lares Augusti*, but they are not the same as the *Lares Publici*, the household *Lares*, or the *Lares* on the Sacred Way. Flower emphasizes that *Lares* are gods of place, so consistency in practice cannot be assumed from place to place or *Lares* to *Lares*.²¹

The *vicomagistri* were the freedmen who oversaw the worship of the *Lares Compitales* in each *vicus*. These four men were annually chosen, but Lott in his study of Augustan neighborhoods does not believe that Augustus himself selected them (as there would have been hundreds), but that they were chosen locally by some unknown

¹⁷ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 26 commenting on the lack of *vici*, finds the lack of monumental focus a hindrance for allocating one space from the other for non-residents.

¹⁸ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 119; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 15 citing Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, 3.66-7, Ovid, *Fasti*, 5.145-6, and Vergil, *Aeneid*, 8.116-7. Modern sources like Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. I*, 184 uses Pliny's number for Augustan *vici* without comment on the fire or other disasters that occurred between 7 BCE and 73 CE.

¹⁹ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 14.

²⁰ I capitalizes *Lares* when they are connected to a specific place (even if the specific location of that place is unknown).

²¹ *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, x, 9, 22, 54; Flower argues convincingly that *Lares* are gods of place, but the relationship between each *Lar* and a particular place is never explained in ancient sources. She adds that the *Lares* of Pompeii and Campania cannot be considered as the same as the *Lares* of Rome.

means.²² Lott continues “since we know most of the attested *magistri vici* from their expensive inscribed gifts to their neighborhoods, wealth may certainly have been a prerequisite for selection as a *magister*.”²³ I supplement Lott’s view, specifically his statement on “unknown means,” to suggest that the residents of a *vicus*, in conjunction with the previous year’s *magistri*, selected and approved of candidates.²⁴ These were neither the wealthiest of freedmen, nor the most influential; moreover, none of these freedmen-*vicomagistri* were from the imperial *familiae*.²⁵ These four *vicomagistri* would have privately commissioned compital altars and sacrifices for public display in their *vicus*. Lott arguing from his analyses of extant altars finds “the altars were not of any standard, mandated composition. Rather they combined, arranged, and emphasized their consistent elements in different ways, as well as incorporating unique elements related to

²² *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 90 speculating that during a local election, they were chosen by the previous year’s *magistri*, or were appointed by magistrates with *cura regionum*.

²³ *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 90; Lott posits that private monuments of the Republic left a void that these *vicomagistri* filled, but Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 249 does not believe that such a vacuum existed.

²⁴ I follow Diane Favro, “‘Pater urbis’: Augustus as City Father of Rome,” *JSAH* 51, no. 1 (Mar., 1992): 68, where she argues for a Republican tradition of nomination by the residents.

²⁵ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 303; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 97; analyzing the eighty-six officers known *vicomagistri* from Augustus’ lifetime finds only four “clearly free-born” members. Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 46-8 on the supposed prevalence of freedmen in the *Augustales*, which Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West, Vol.II.1*, 609-16 asserts as the largest members of the group, but Laird, *Civic Monuments and the Augustales*, 6-7 has found that membership varied from region to region and cannot be singularly characterized by that status. Laird asserts that “the ‘freedman’ aspect of the institution [of *Augustales*] only insofar as this status often precluded members of these groups from attaining a true municipal magistracy.” Laird, *Civic Monuments and the Augustales*, 9 n. 28 points out that the scholiasts of Horace, Pseudo Acron and Porphyryon, *ad Horati Sermones*, 2.3.281 misidentify, conflate, and confuse the groups of the *Augustales* with the *vicomagistri*. Ryberg, “Rites of State Religion,” 98 and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome’s Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 278-9 state the *Augustales* and *vicomagistri* were nearly similar, one in the Latin West and the other in Rome. Wallace-Hadrill addresses their use of symbolism (oak wreath, laurels, shield of victory, cf. n. 80-2 below in section IIIA) but he incorrectly identifies the *Augustales* as priests, which they were not. They performed no ritual function, unlike the *vicomagistri*. He calls the *Lares Augusti* “some sort of cult of the Emperor at a pervasive street-corner level,” but connects this to a population of slaves and freedmen, rather than the entirety of the *vicus*. He deliberately avoids reading a master-slave relationship between Augustus and the residents of the *vicus*, but Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 172-3 reads the worship of the *Lares* at the *Compitalia* as meeting several needs of the community, not just those of slaves and freedmen.

the individual neighborhoods in which they stood or important current events.”²⁶ The absence of direct imperial influence in their election also suggests that there was no imperially-assigned design program for the *Lares Augusti* or their altars. The following sections contain my examinations of trends in images and materials used for Augustan compital altars in order to determine developments in Augustus’ cult. Due to the nature of the evidence, I locate the *vivus* cult at these cult places and extrapolate practices from the language, images, and materials of the altars.

III. *Lares in Rome: Whose Lares?*

The *Lares Augusti* reside in the compital altars of the city, but scholars like Michael Koortbojian, Lott, and Flower (addressed below) credit Augustus with the designation of their adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augusti*. Koortbojian cites the problematic Vatican Altar from an unknown *vicus*, but possibly from the Caelian in *Regio* II, as his evidence;²⁷ Lott calls the adjective-*cum*-epithet eponymous but does not provide evidence for the emperor giving his name.²⁸ I counter that the adjective-*cum*-epithet is better explained as the product of the private sphere. There is neither mention of the *Lares Augusti* of the *vici* in the *Res Gestae*, nor in the majority of Augustan poets.²⁹ Their omission may be due to

²⁶ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 10, 101; 136-7 *contra* Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, does not believe that there was a limited number of dedicated workshops to provide compital altars.

²⁷ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus* 269 n. 15, 140-2, which appears in Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, cat. no. 7 (Rome, Vatican, Museo Pio-Clementino, *Salle delle Muse*, inv. 311; *CIL* 6.445; *ILS* 3613, cf. n. 93, section IV below) as evidence for the *Lares Augusti* as a gift from Augustus. The altar is problematic following Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 304-6 who proves that the altar cannot and does not document a cult of the *genius Augusti*, cf. section IV, especially n. 96.

²⁸ Lott, “The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome,” calls the adjective eponymous throughout, but gives no argument for public credit in the epithet. Cf. also n. 32 below.

²⁹ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 259 allows their absence from Horace, Vergil, Propertius, and Tibullus since all four died before Augustus’ reform of the *vici* in 7 BCE.

space or brevity, but, to either a local resident or visitor, the prevalence of the *Lares Augusti* was as obvious as the larger monumental building projects throughout the city.³⁰ More so than other gods, the public and private *Lares* of Rome would have greeted a visitor in both civic and domestic settings.³¹ Of these *Lares*, only the compital *Lares* were called *Augusti*, making the emperor also present in their cult. I interpret the *Lares Augusti* in terms of Augustus' private *vivus* cult, where the citizens of each *vicus* were able to engage with a version of the emperor that meets their local needs.

The compital altars as cult places depend on both the attribution of the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augusti* and visual connections to public monuments of Augustan gods. Flower and Lott describe the emperor himself as administering in an official capacity (as both emperor and a representative of the senate) the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augusti* to the *Lares*.³² Given the significance of such an event, however, the adjective-*cum*-epithet is neither universally used outside of Rome nor in literary sources.³³ I analyze below both

Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 269 n. 15 reads restoration of temples in the Greek version of *Res Gestae* 19.2, “ναοὺς... ἡρώων πρὸς τῇ ἱερᾷ ὁδῷ...; temples... of the heroes next to the Sacred Way...” using ἡρώες as a synonym for the *Lares Augusti*. Koortbojian's reading is problematic in that the passage does not refer to the *Lares Augusti* in the *vici*, but a public temple of the *Lares* on the Sacred Way. Additionally, Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 191 argues that the odd use of ἡρώες is explicable “in the absence of any equivalent deities in the Greek world.” Cooley asserts that the *Lares Augusti* and the *Lares* mentioned in the *Res Gestae* are not the same.

³⁰Jaś Elsner, “Inventing Imperium: Texts and the Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome,” in *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, ed. Jaś Elsner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 39 arguing that the experience of standing in front of the *Res Gestae* is inseparable from the monuments of the northern Campus Martius.

³¹ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 76. Due to the variance in representations of domestic *Lares* and the lack of contemporary evidence in Rome, I do not analyze domestic *Lares* and *lararia*.

³² Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, xi credits Augustus himself with renaming the *Lares Compitales* the *Lares Augusti*. Lott, “The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome,” 135, “In 7 BCE Augustus revived Rome's old neighborhood societies and supplied each of the city's neighborhoods with a new pair of *Lares Augusti* as the focus of compital cult;” building upon Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 81-125, where he argues that Augustus “personally provided new cult statuettes of the *Lares Augusti* for each neighborhood shrine,” (103). The theses of both of Lott's works depend on the adjective being eponymous.

³³ Ovid, however, alludes to it in *Fasti* 5.145 (discussed in detail below), where Augustus is the subject of *qui tradidit illos*. The problematic nature of the passage as a source for ritual makes it difficult to suppose

aspects (attribution and visual connections) to demonstrate a private and unofficial attribution of the term rather than an official one, and then address the visual relationship between the *Lares Augusti* and monumental, public monuments to other Augustan gods.

Flower states that Augustus added his name when he reformed the *vici* and gave the *vicomagistri* statues of the *Lares*, but there is substantial evidence that the adjective-*cum*-epithet was privately applied by the *vicomagistri* to other *Augusti* gods without imperial approval. Further, Augustus himself did not name other, private gods *Augustus* when he gifted them to the *vici*. Flower argues that these *vicomagistri* extended the use the adjective-*cum*-epithet to other gods in order to promote other existing shrines in their *vici*;³⁴ however, if the *vicomagistri* were able to share the adjective-*cum*-epithet of the emperor with other gods and without imperial permission, it may be the case that their uses of the adjective-*cum*-epithet with the *Lares* were private attributions as well.

I argue below that the term *Augusti* was a privately motivated response to the emperor's reforms of the *vici*. Categorizing the adjective-*cum*-epithet as private (not given by the emperor or state) then makes the *vicomagistri* and the residents of each *vici* active participants in the negotiation of the emperor's cult. In a similar practice to provincial cities, where private monuments display cognizance of imperial talking-points

an actual event where Augustus gave the *Lares* or a general statement of events. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 46 states about Pompeii "despite the first princeps' patronage of the town, there is no evidence of a subsequent Augustan reform of these compital cults: no *lares augusti* are to be found at the street corners."

³⁴ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 329-20, citing Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 183-4, 188, 191, 192-193, 198, 202 for *Diana Augusta* (no. 5, *CIL* 6.128 from 7-6 BCE; no. 24, *CIL* 6.129), *Mercurius Augustus* (no. 6, *CIL* 6.283; no. 17, *CIL* 6.34 from 3-2 BCE), *Stata Mater Augusta* (no. 13, *CIL* 6.764; no. 19, *CIL* 6.802), *Apollo Augustus* (no. 21, *CIL* 6.33 from 2-1 BCE), and *Stata Fortuna Augusta* (no. 30, *CIL* 6.761), all dedicated during Augustus' lifetime.

in local imagery,³⁵ local Romans demonstrate their awareness of imperial events and Augustus' more-than-human status in the images of the compital altars; they as a collective connect their *Lares* to the imperial program as a bottom-up response. Just as they created *Augusti* gods who did not have public equivalents in the city, like Apollo *Augustus* and Diana *Augusta*,³⁶ they added the emperor's adjective-*cum*-epithet to the *Lares*. My overview in the following paragraphs of modern arguments and ancient sources for the adjective-*cum*-epithet in Rome establishes a private source for the term, confirmed in the inscriptions. It is difficult to determine from the surviving thirteen compital altars dated to Augustus' lifetime and the five official Augustan gods the historicity of the adjective-*cum*-epithet,³⁷ but my conclusions based upon these altar's surviving inscriptions, reliefs, and the general practices of the *vicomagistri* call into question modern assumptions of official and public attribution.

Koortbojian, Flower, and Lott ascribe the adjective-*cum*-epithet of the *Lares Compitales* to Augustus himself, but the evidence is not definitive.³⁸ While Augustus did reorganize the *vici* and reinvigorate the festival of the *Compitalia* and the *ludi Compitalicii*, I do not believe he assigned parameters and features to the *vici*. Literary sources that post-date Augustus' deification refer to these *Lares* as *Compitales* rather than *Augusti*: Suetonius, *DA* 31.5, "*Compitales Lares ornari bis anno instituit uernis floribus*

³⁵ Cf. n. 3 and 4 *supra* at the beginning of the chapter on the interweaving and infusion of cults and Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 146-7 on provincial awareness of Rome and Augustan policy, but I assert that the same practice occurs in Rome.

³⁶ Cf. n. 34 *supra* for Diana *Augusta* (no. 5, *CIL* 6.128 from 7-6 BCE; no. 24, *CIL* 6.129) and Apollo *Augustus* (no. 21, *CIL* 6.33 from 2-1 BCE) dedicated by the *vicomagistri*.

³⁷ Cf. n. 67 below for the thirteen altars (five certain and eight fragmentary possibilities) and cf. n. 44 below for the five official Augustan gods in Rome.

³⁸ Cf. n. 27 and 32 *supra*. Those who say Augustus himself renamed the *Lares*: Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus* 269 n. 15, 140-2; Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 102-3, 147; Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, xi. Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 81-125, 147 and his argument in Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," make the adjective eponymous.

et aestiuis; he [Augustus] instituted that the *Lares Compitales* be provided twice a year with spring and summer flowers;” Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 3.66, “*ipsa dividitur in regiones XIII, compita Larum CCLXV*; this is divided into fourteen regions, two hundred sixty-five *compita* of the *Lares*.” The phrasing of these later examples suggests that such an auspicious honor of the emperor’s adjective-*cum*-epithet either died out when the emperor was deified, or that the adjective-*cum*-epithet was not an official designation given by the state. Flower, describing Suetonius’ use of *Compitales Lares*, asserts that the irregularity of the term in the sources, “indicate[s] that the epithet *augustus* was essentially an addition rather than a substitution for the descriptive epithet of place *compitales*,” and that the traditional *Compitales* references both the location and function of these *Lares*.³⁹ Flower follows this point with the observation that the adjective was unusual, but that the *vicomagistri* “transformed and embellished that famous crossroads area in a way that consciously memorialized the reform of 7 BC[E].”⁴⁰ She concludes that the irregularity of the adjective-*cum*-epithet is because Augustus was not “unsubtle” in his act; “he [Augustus] was not enforcing a new creed or requiring assent to a dogma, but adding a special adjective of his own, which was now very familiar, to beloved local deities.”⁴¹

I base my private attribution of the adjective-*cum*-epithet, in part, on Flower’s last point: Augustus did not enforce the new designation for the *Lares* and the frequency for his addition of the adjective in other instances. Elsewhere when the senate added the adjective-*cum*-epithet to a god, like *Pax Augusta*, the god was recreated in Augustus’ own

³⁹ *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 289.

⁴⁰ *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 289, 290 she adds that the *compita* function remained after the *Lares* became *Augusti*, so the traditional name remained.

⁴¹ *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 291.

name. *Pax Augusta* was the first public deity to become an Augustan god when the *Ara Pacis Augustae* was commissioned by the senate in 13 BCE and dedicated in 9 BCE.⁴² Unlike the *Lares*, there is no evidence that Pax had a cult in Republican Rome.⁴³ Pax and the other four official and public *Augusti* gods were related to the emperor's qualities and achievements: *Pax Augusta* in the Campus Martius, *Concordia Augusta* in the Forum, *Providentia Augusta* in the Campus Agrippae, *Ops Augusta* in the *Vicus Iugarius*, and *Iustitia Augusta* in the Circus Flaminius.⁴⁴ The *Lares* were neither part of the emperor's moral program, nor were they deities that were personally associated with the emperor himself.⁴⁵ This suggests to me that Augustus himself did not give his adjective-*cum*-epithet; he reorganized the *vici*, gifted the *vicomagistri* with new statues of the *Lares* (see below), and in response the *vicomagistri* named their *Lares* '*Augusti*,' just as they privately named other gods *Augusti* in their respective *vici*.

Anna Clark, Ittai Gradel, and Duncan Fishwick read the use of the adjective in general as "vaguer and more subtle" in recalling the emperor, which was "a conventional gesture that flattered the emperor or expressed passive sympathy with the state and its policies,"⁴⁶ but I believe that this overlooks the context in which the adjective-*cum*-epithet was adopted. Official *Augusti* gods in public cults were limited to five, so the adjective cannot

⁴² Cf. section VA below. Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 156 pointing out that *Pax Augusta* was the first public Augustan god and that the *Ara Pacis* was the first monument in Rome specifically for a cult of Pax.

⁴³ Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 9, 159 that Pax did appear on Republican coins, but there is no evidence that she had a public cult in Rome.

⁴⁴ As identified by Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 256, 334; Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 135; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 102-3.

⁴⁵ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 275, the *Lares* were neither personal saviors nor avengers of the *princeps* in the way that Apollo and Mars were.

⁴⁶ Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 264 summarizes and quotes Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 103-6 for the adjective in general; Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*, Vol. II.1, 448 gives the summary of the adjective as a gesture.

be said to have saturated official and public religious dialogue.⁴⁷ In contrast to these five, private cults in the city, like the *Lares Augusti*, applied the term with greater freedom. Private gods called *Augusti*, like *Diana Augusta* and *Apollo Augustus*,⁴⁸ were not required to have a public equivalent in Rome, allowing the two spheres of public and private cults to co-exist, demonstrating an awareness of a public Augustan god, cult, and imperial discourse rather than equivalency. As Lott has argued, Augustan gods were an attempt to define interactions between the public and official, and private and unofficial spheres.⁴⁹ For example, a Mars *Augustus* (as there was in Lepcis Magna, ca. 6 CE) verified the local population's cognizance of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum. Mars was not officially an Augustan god, but giving him the epithet allowed participants at the new cult place in Lepcis Magna to call to mind the Forum of Augustus in Rome and Augustus' presence there, thus permitting the worshipers in Lepcis Magna to claim some membership in a Roman, Augustan cult in their own terms.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Cf. n. 44 *supra* for *Pax Augusta*, *Concordia Augusta*, *Providentia Augusta*, *Ops Augusta*, and *Iustitia Augusta*. Gradel, *Emperor Worship*, 104, citing a 59 BCE inscription from Cisalpine Gaul “[a]ug(ustis) Laribus” (*CIL* I² 753 = *CIL* v.4087) argues that “the adjective ‘*augustus*’ would certainly connote the emperor, but on the formal level it was simply an epithet to a divine name, one which indeed had been employed as such before Augustus’ day.” McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 101; Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 159 n. 16; and Karl Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Interpreted Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 301 cite this inscription for evidence of august *Lares* before 27 BCE, in an effort to remove the man from the epithet. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 287-8, however, finds great fault with this reading; the inscription itself has been lost and “this frequently cited inscription is incomplete and has been muddled in its transmission in a manuscript tradition, all of which obviously makes it unpromising evidence for an otherwise unattested cult of *lares augusti* at a time when Octavian was still as small child.”

⁴⁸ Cf. n. 34 *supra* for *Augusti* gods dedicated during the emperor's lifetime: *Diana Augusta*, *Mercurius Augustus*, *Stata Mater Augusta*, *Apollo Augustus*, and *Stata Fortuna Augusta*.

⁴⁹ Lott, “The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome,” 134 lays out his argument. Lott reads a connection between the epithet in private settings and the lower classes.

⁵⁰ Lott, “The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome,” 144-6 for the cult, 146-7 for the cult's significance, cf. n. 3 and 4 *supra* on the interweaving and infusion of cults and provincial awareness of Rome and Augustan policy. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 331 on *Diana Augusta*, *Mercury Augustus*, *Apollo Augustus*, and *Aesclepius Augustus* and *Concordia Augusta* from after 14 CE; all of these gods were at the same time being reinterpreted in a public Augustan discourse.

We can find an Italian example of this practice in Pompeii at the Temple of Fortuna *Augusta*; Fortuna *Augusti* and Fortuna *Redux* are attested cults at Rome during Augustus' lifetime, but Fortuna *Augusta* was a newly founded, local cult.⁵¹ At this cult place, William Van Andringa argues that the divisions between public and private are intentionally blurred since Marcus Tullius built the temple on his private land and the altar on a public street, recalling (intentionally or unintentionally) Augustus' own blurring of private and public with the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine bordering his own house.⁵² Within the streets of Rome, where the distance between public and private was not measured in miles, the same concept applies: the adjective-*cum*-epithet advertises the local population's awareness of public and official narratives, while allowing the worshippers to adapt the god to their own needs. A private motivation for the adjective-*cum*-epithet in the *Lares Augusti* displays each *vici*'s relationship and familiarity with public and official cult, but still maintains the private status of their *Lares* as gods of place.

An eponymous and officially designated adjective-*cum*-epithet would, in fact, require the *vicomagistri* and the members of each *vicus* to surrender their independence in the identity of their gods of place. None of the *vicomagistri* were imperial freedmen,⁵³ so the taking of the emperor's name, rather than adopting it privately or being given it by the senate, contrasts with other Augustan practices. Just as Augustus did not institute the cult of his *genius* (see section IV below), and Pax was not personally named '*Augusta*' by

⁵¹ Van Andringa, "'M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae)," 100, 103, 107-8. This cult achieved multiple aims for the benefactor and emperor: expressing the proximity between the emperor and goddess through the adjective-*cum*-epithet, the ideology of Augustan Fortuna in Rome, the strong influence of local elites, and the benefactor's devotion to the emperor and state.

⁵² Van Andringa, "'M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae)," 99, 107-8. Van Andringa does not comment on whether or not the link between Fortuna *Augusta* and Apollo in Rome is intentional or part of a larger trend.

⁵³ Cf. section IIA, n. 25 for the lack of connection between imperial *familiae* and the *vicomagistri*.

him, it is odd that he would have gifted his own name to the *Lares*. When Augustus gifted other statues as part of his New Year's gift, he did not name the gods with his own adjective-*cum*-epithet and did not correct local individuals who did this of their own accord. For example, Augustus gave a statue "to Mercury in the Subura as a New Year's gift around 10 BC[E], but did not designate him Mercurius Augustus," as the *vicomagistri* had done privately with their earlier and nearby dedications.⁵⁴ Moreover, if the emperor had mandated the term, the language should reflect that mandate. I present a simpler solution that, rather than the official attribution of the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augusti* to local Roman gods, the *vicomagistri* and their residents unofficially added the adjective-*cum*-epithet themselves. This change in perspective does not alter the facts of Augustus' reforms, but makes the term part of private rather than public cult.

When the epithet is privately given to a god, as it was in Lepcis Magna, Pompeii, and in Rome, that god's cult place evokes the emperor in addition to the god. As the *numen Augusti* (with the genitive) calls to mind the divine component of the emperor housed in a living man, the adjective-*cum*-epithet conjures the relationship between the god(s) given the adjective and the man—their attribute is the emperor. The relationship between *Augusti* gods, the emperor, and the people, like much in Augustan Rome, is not a straight line of correlation. Neither did individuals or collectives always worship a public *Augustus* god in private settings, nor did they unilaterally call a private god *Augustus* (hence the inconsistencies in later sources, as I mentioned *supra*). To call the *Lares* 'Augusti' with the adjective-*cum*-epithet does not invoke the emperor any less than a genitive form of *Augusti* would, but the term allows each *vicus*'s ownership of its own

⁵⁴ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 331-2, cf. n. 34 *supra* especially Mercurius Augustus (no. 6, *CIL* 6.283; no. 17, *CIL* 6.34 from 3-2 BCE). Similarly, she notes that Augustus did not make dedications to Apollo Augustus nor did he name Mars an Augustus god.

Augusti Lares as well as its independence and individuality. Again, these *Lares* make Augustus a member of every *vici*,⁵⁵ and as gods, Augustus and the *Lares* protect and are protected by the residents (now including Augustus) of the *vicus*. The prevalence of the name (as noun or as adjective) creates multiple places where the emperor and his cult are present. I read any private ritual directed to these *Augusti* gods as simultaneously worshipping the emperor, who shares the altar (but does not detract from the gods). The following paragraphs outline my private reading and the relationship between the man and the adjective-*cum*-epithet.

An example for my reading of private attribution in the term is the *Fasti Magistrorum Vici*, a fragmentary text with inscriptions on both sides, including the names of *vicomagistri* from 7 BCE to 2 BCE, with additions up to 21 BCE.⁵⁶ The list of *vicomagistri* opens with:

imp(erator) Caesar August[us] pontif(ex) maxim(us)] co(n)s(ul) XI tribun(icia) potes[t(ate) X]VII Lares Aug(ustos) mag(istris) vici dedit. ⁵⁷	Imperator Caesar Augustus , Pontifex Maximus, Consul for the 11 th time, with tribunician powers for the 17 th , gave the <i>Lares Augusti</i> to the <i>Magistri</i> of the <i>vicus</i> .
---	--

The name of the *vicus* does not survive, but the opening lines establish the emperor's role and that of the *vicomagistri*. The repetition of Augustus and *Augusti* (the name and the adjective) in the first and last lines places visual brackets around the introduction;

⁵⁵ Cf. section I, n. 11 and the chaos associated with taking the household *Lares* out of the home.

⁵⁶ Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 196 adds that "... all of the *magistri* up to those entering office in 2 BCE were carved at the same time and in the same hand and thus 2 BCE must be the year the calendar was initially inscribed."

⁵⁷ The inscription was found on the southwest slope of the Aventine. A detailed description of the text is in Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 91 and cat. no. 22 (Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano (delle Terme) inv. 121558; *Insc. Ital.* 13.1 279-289 no. 20; *Insc. Ital.* 13.2 90-98 no. 12). Some additions were made up to 21 CE. Since it is unlikely that Augustus himself selected the *vicomagistri* of each *vicus*, this *Fasti* documents private election results. Cf. section IIA *supra*, especially n. 22-3 on Lott's view with my view at n. 24, citing Favro, "'Pater urbis'," 68. When I say election, I am referring to the selection process for the New Year's *vicomagistri*.

Augustus the man and *Augusti* the divine adjective-*cum*-epithet are both in attendance.

The man and epithet form a dialogue in which the listed *vicomagistri* participate as they worship the *Lares*.

The *Fasti Magistrorum Vici* records that Augustus gave the *Lares Augusti*, as in the statues, to the *vicomagistri*.⁵⁸ There was a practice unique to Augustus in which the people gifted Augustus with money at the new year, called *stips* or *strena*, and “Augustus, in turn, used the money he had been given... to pay for very expensive (*pretiosissima*) new statues of gods that he set up as his own gifts in the local neighborhoods, labeled with his name but also with the year of each *stips*.”⁵⁹ Lott adds that we know Augustus gave other statues to the *vici* that were not images of the *Lares* of the *compita*.⁶⁰ While none of the extant private gods named *Augusti* in Lott’s catalogue have specific indications that the statues were gifted by Augustus (all were paid for by members of the *vicomagistri*), the practice of private gods, gifted statues, and local use point towards private practice in adopting the adjective-*cum*-epithet in response to Augustus’ reforms and gift of statues. Just as Augustus’ statue of Mercury was not named *Augustus* by him, local *vicomagistri* dedicated their own images of Mercurius *Augustus*

⁵⁸ Cf. n. 32 and 38 *supra*, Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 81-125, where he argues that Augustus “personally provided new cult statuettes of the *Lares Augusti* for each neighborhood shrine,” (103).

⁵⁹ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 263-4, citing Suetonius, *DA*, 57 which mentions the practice. She translates: *Omnes ordines in lacum Curti quotannis ex voto pro salute eius stipem iaciebant, item Kal Ian. strenam in Capitolio etiam absenti, ex qua summa pretiosissima deorum simulacra mercatus vicatim dedicabat, ut Apollinem Sandalarium et Iovem Tragoedum aliaque*; Every year, all classes (of citizens) tossed an offering (*stips*) into the *lacus Curtius* (in the Roman Forum) to mark a vow for his (Augustus’) good health and safety. In the same way, on the 1st January (they donated) a gift (*strena*) on the Capitol, even when he was away. From these collected funds he acquired very valuable statues of the gods and dedicated them in the local neighborhoods, for example Apollo Sandaliarius and Jupiter Tragoedus and others.”

⁶⁰ Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 130, 134 suspects the statues were only displaced a few times a year and were otherwise kept in their shrines, away from view. Augustus himself was often physically absent when the statues were received (“*apsenti contulit*” appears on the inscriptions). Cf. n. 34 and 54 *supra* for other statues.

in response.⁶¹ The Belvedere altar⁶² shows Augustus distributing the statues to magistrates, but Lott does not consider it to be a compital altar since it lacks the inscription naming the *vicomagistri* (which all other complete altars have).⁶³ The Belvedere altar does depict what the gift of statues from the emperor to the *vicomagistri* would look like; the emperor gifts statues to the magistrates for private altars, but does not necessarily gift his adjective-*cum*-epithet.

Unlike other private organizations which supported and participated in the imperial cult, the relationship between emperor and *vicomagistri* has public and official as well as private elements: the public reforms of the *vici* and private commissioning of the altars. This places the *Lares Augusti* at odds with the *Augustales*, which were privately and unofficially founded and operated.⁶⁴ The official backing of the cult (i.e. the emperor's reforms of the *regiones* and *vici*, as well as the gift of statues) in combination with the private sponsorship of the *vicomagistri*, allowed the cult to participate in the best of both public and private spheres of worship. Without the emperor's direct intervention, the *Lares Augusti*, in location, language, and cult were able to saturate the streets of Rome and call to mind the emperor with the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augusti*, all at a private cult place that is aware of and participating in developing cult of the emperor.

⁶¹ Cf. n. 54, Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 331-2 on Augustus not naming his statue of Mercury 'Augustus'.

⁶² Rome, Museo Vaticano, inv. 1115.

⁶³ Lott, *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 218.

⁶⁴ As stated by Galinsky, *Augustan Culture*, 312: "In contrast to the reorganization of the *vici* and the *Lares* cult in Rome, Augustus did not found the Augustus cult of the *Augustales*." Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 46-8 on Laird, *Civic Monuments and the Augustales* on the *Augustales* as not a cult-group, and Chapter 3, section IIA, n. 25 on Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 303; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 97 and the freedmen of the *vicomagistri* often being conflated with those of the *Augustales*.

IIIA. *Lares* in Rome: A Study in Marble

In addition to language, the materials and images present on extant compital altars localize the emperor and his cult. In this section, I compare materials and images depicted on private compital altars to public monuments constructed during the emperor's lifetime. Beginning with the materials, and then moving to images and their contexts, I show that privately commissioned monuments take part in the narrative of their public counterparts, adding local interpretations to Augustus' projects and reforms. These local interpretations create a visual narrative of Augustus' and his cult's progression towards public divinity. I assert that a viewer would locate the cult of Augustus in these monuments as the visual narrative connects Augustus to official gods.

James Anderson identifies that for late-Republican and early Imperial private buildings, it was common for a division of responsibilities among the dedicator, architect, and *redemptores* (contractors); the dedicator paid for all of the materials and the work was divided ad hoc between the architect and *redemptores*.⁶⁵ The majority of *redemptores* during the empire were freedmen or the descendants of freedmen, and were often specialized in their work; this suggests to Anderson that private contractors, specialized ones at that, were an important part of both private and public building projects, and that the increase in imperial monuments throughout the empire could not have happened without these groups.⁶⁶ In terms of the compital altars and the *vicomagistri*, the magistrates as the dedicators would have paid for the raw materials and

⁶⁵ James C. Anderson, Jr., *Roman Architecture and Society* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 13-14 citing S. D. Martin, *The Roman Jurists and the Organization of Private Building in the Late Republic and Early Empire* (Brussels: Collection Latomus, vol. 204, 1989), 49-57.

⁶⁶ Anderson, *Roman Architecture and Society*, 112-13.

specialized work of *redemptores*, and these same *redemptores* are likely to have participated in other public and private construction projects throughout the city.

The five compital altars Lott securely dates to Augustus' reign (plus eight possibilities) are all made of Carrara marble.⁶⁷ Carrara as a material is noteworthy because the same marble was used for the temple at the emperor's complex to Apollo Palatinus, his Mausoleum, the Temple of Mars Ultor, as well as the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, to name a few.⁶⁸ The application of Carrara marble on all of the surviving compital altars with an Augustan date is significant for two reasons: first, the marble advertises the wealth of the *vicomagistri* who imported it; second, the consistent use of a material when there was no standardization of composition promotes the connection between the gods of the *vici*, the gods of the emperor, and the emperor himself as a god.

⁶⁷ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 136. The five certain altars: no. 7 with an unknown provenance (Vatican inventory no. 311, cf. n. 27); no. 20 altar of *Vicus Sandaliarius* (Florence, Uffizi, inv. 972; *CIL* 6.448); no. 23 altar of *Vicus Statae Matris* (Rome, Musei Capitolini, Museo Nuovo, *salle* 7, inv. 2144; *CIL* 6.36809a-b; *ILS* 9250); no. 26 altar of *Vicus Aesculeti* (Rome, Musei Capitolini, Museo Nuovo, *salle* 6, inv. 855; *CIL* 6.30957; *ILS* 3615); no. 27 altar of *Vicus Compiti Acili* (Rome, Museo Capitolino; *AE* 1964 74b). The eight possibilities (no. 55, *CIL* 6.36851; no. 56, M. Hano, "À l'origine du culte imperial: les autels des *Lares Augusti*: Recherches sur les themes iconographiques et leur signification," *ANRW* 2.16.3 (1986): 2342 no. 8; no. 57, Hano, "À l'origine du culte imperial," 2346; no. 58, Hano, "À l'origine du culte imperial," 2347 no. 13; no. 59, Hano, "À l'origine du culte imperial," 2348 no. 15; no. 60 *AE* 1980 55; no. 61, *CIL* 6.14180; no. 62, Silvio Panciera, "Ancora tra epigrafia e topografia," in *L'Urbs: espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Collection de L'École française de Rome, 98 (Rome: École française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 1987): 73-8) are fragmentary.

⁶⁸ Pierre Gros, "Apollo Palatinus," in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, ed. Eva Margareta Steinby, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Rome: Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, 1993), 54-57: "... il était construit en marbre de Carrare, et ses murs montés en grand appareil (Propertius, 2.31.9; Ovid, *Tristia*, 3.1.60; Servius, *ad Aeneid*, 8.720)... Les quelques fragments de décor architectural recueillis sur le site confirment que l'ensemble était construit en grand appareil de marbre de Carrare." Tara Welch, *Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2005), 85, "The various materials of the temple complex on the Palatine boasted Rome's access to foreign resources: while the temple itself was Italian Carrara marble, columns of Numidian marble and statues of Egyptian basalt adorned the portico, the temple doors were African ivory, and its cult statues were Greek marble." P. Pensabene, "The Quarries at Luni in the 1st Century AD: Final Considerations on Some Aspects of Production, Diffusion, and Costs," in *Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone: Proceedings of the IX Association for the Study of Marbles and Other Stones in Antiquity (ASMOSIA) Conference (Tarragona 2009)*, ed. Anna Gutiérrez García-M, Pilar Lapuente Mercadal, and Isabel Rodà de Llanza (Tarragona: Institut Català d'Arqueologia Clàssica, 2012), 734 and Stephan Zink and Heinrich Piening, "*Haec aurea templa*: the Palatine Temple of Apollo and its Polychromy," *JRA* 22, no. 1 (2009): 114; their analysis of the polychromy (cf. section IIIA, n. 74 below) find that the majority of the building was unpainted and un-gilded Carrara marble.

Carrara marble displays the wealth of the *vicomagistri* to members of the *vici* in that they imported the marble from Luna. Carrara marble supplanted Pentelic marble in public Roman monuments during Augustus' reign; J. C. Fant argues that Carrara marble had greater significance as an Italian material in promoting Roman themes, even if Athenian, Pergamene, and other foreign styles influenced those themes.⁶⁹ Patrizio Pensabene argues that there was a mixed system of imperial and local control of the Carrara quarries during Augustus' reign which allowed for the marble's use in public projects like Augustus' Forum, but also private monuments like the altars of the *vici*.⁷⁰ This collaboration and mixed system that Pensabene identifies allowed for private monuments to emulate public ones, marked by the use of Carrara marble but without direct imperial patronage or mandate for the private monument.⁷¹ When Augustus reformed the *vici* in 7 BCE, the *vicomagistri* were able to order Carrara marble monuments without direct imperial influence, but possessed an awareness of the imperial control and use of the material in

⁶⁹ J. C. Fant, "Augustus and the City of Marble," (paper presented at the fourth international symposium of the Association for the Study of Marble and Other Stones used in Antiquity, University of Bordeaux 3, October 9-13, 1995). Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 18 on examples of Roman practices.

⁷⁰ Pensabene, "The Quarries at Luni in the 1st Century AD," 733-4: "[Quarries] were partially under direct control of the emperor Augustus but also in part under control of the colony of Luni which had to collaborate with the imperial administration." Previously, private control was argued for Luni: Seth G. Bernard, "Pentelic Marble in Architecture at Rome and the Republican Marble Trade," *JRA* 23, no. 2 (2010): 46, 52 argues for a relationship in the Republic between *triumphatores*, temple builders, and skilled workers (possibly slaves) with quarrymen at Mt. Pentelikon. This relationship was private, and was not mandated by the senate as part of a symbolic representation of Roman "conquest of the Greek world." The same private relationship existed during Augustus' reign for Carrara marble. Alfred Michael Hirt, *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 89 argues that the "majority of archaeologically documented quarries undoubtedly remained in private or municipal hands during the Principate." Hirt finds fault with sweeping assumptions about imperial control of mines and quarries made from Tacitus, *Ann.*, 6.19 and Suetonius, *Tib.*, 49.2; he characterizes these as misinterpretations or exaggerations (85, with the general argument supported by Fant, "Augustus and the City of Marble," 277). Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 136 connects the use of Carrara to "increasing exploitation of the Luna marble quarries..." but gives no evidence for the claim. Pensabene's argument fits more of the extant evidence for the time period.

⁷¹ Pensabene, "The Quarries at Luni in the 1st Century AD," 734, 735, 738-9, 741. The specific features of the collaboration and mixed system are difficult to identify for every Carrara monument in the empire, but he marks the trend that the imperial administration paid for quarrying, transport, and installation in Rome for public monuments, and in the provinces local elites or the city administration paid for these stages, but Italian senatorial families were making local profits from the quarries.

the city. The choice of Carrara marble at the thirteen extant altars additionally becomes significant when considered in the context of other Carrara monuments in the city.

I interpret the reorganization of the *vici* and the gift of the statues of the *Lares Augusti* (as described in the *Fasti Magistrorum Vici*)⁷² in 7 BCE, twenty years after the cognomen's adoption, as creating a connecting narrative thread, weaving between the emperor, his name (even in its private, adjectival form), *Lares*, Apollo, and *Pax Augusta* (in spite of Apollo's lack of an Augustan epithet and the absence of Pax on the compital altars). Unlike Pax, the *Lares* were unique in receiving the Augustan epithet while they were never publically acknowledged as having a personal relationship with the *princeps*.⁷³ I believe the adjective-*cum*-epithet and material explicitly express a connection to the emperor and his cult in private terms that was absent in literary sources. In this way, Carrara marble visually represented the *vicomagistri*'s familiarity with this narrative and the emperor's gods around the city. The repeated application of materials on the temple structure of Apollo Palatinus, the *Ara Pacis*, the *vici* altars, and the Temple of Mars Ultor creates a dialogue between these private Augustan gods of the *vici* and other public Augustan gods.⁷⁴ The chronology of the monument's completion and the emperor's honors establish both sides of the dialogue in which the private monuments

⁷² Cf. section III, n. 57 *supra* for the text.

⁷³ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 292-3, compital altars depict no other gods of the pantheon or deified abstractions, so the images or accoutrements of Apollo or any other god could not have been applied there to demonstrate a connection with Augustus and Augustan deities. A Victory appears on the altar from the *Vicus Sandaliarius* but she is not mentioned in any of the inscriptions. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 275, the *Lares* were neither personal saviors nor avengers of the *princeps* in the way that Apollo and Mars were, cf. section III, n. 45 *supra*.

⁷⁴ Zink and Piening, "*Haec aurea templa*: the Palatine temple of Apollo and its Polychromy," 109, 115 notes the polychromy of Apollo Palatinus in the capitals and entablature that were painted and gilded. The polychromy demonstrates the monument's engagement with the viewer from multiple viewpoints, and it is suggested that from as far away as the Circus Maximus, the temple would shine golden. The majority of the monuments' surfaces "were kept untouched," in the original Carrara so the painted and gilded sections "support specific parts of the architectural design." Pensabene, "The Quarries at Luni in the 1st Century AD," 735 notes a preference for Carrara marble on monuments linked to the imperial cult.

respond to public and vice versa. The public and official Palatine temple's dedication in October of 28 BCE made the temple slightly older but still closely related to the assignation of the emperor's cognomen (given in January of 27 BCE). No later than 23 BCE, the private Mausoleum was completed.⁷⁵ The dedication of the official and public *Ara Pacis Augustae* in 9 BCE is followed by the private *Lares Augusti*.

In the same way that expensive stone on public monuments “advertised the *princeps*’ generosity and recalled his use of colored marbles in his major building projects around the city,”⁷⁶ private monuments, like the compital altars and the Mausoleum (analyzed below in section VC), recalled their public counterparts and advertised the wealth of their private benefactors. The visual medium narrates both private and public settings and gods, with the overarching theme of Augustus. Through private altars, the *vicomagistri* at their *vici* cults are able to react to public and official Augustan ideology (i.e., that he himself is not divine), yet articulate in localized terms the emperor's living divinity. The *Lares Augusti* are not the emperor's household gods dispersed throughout Rome, but the adjective-*cum*-epithet and Carrara marble recall the emperor's Mausoleum, patron gods, and home.⁷⁷ Through the narrative of Carrara, Apollo, as an official public god, saves the

⁷⁵ Magness, “The Mausolea of Augustus,” 318 cites Suetonius, *DA*, 100 for the completion range of 31-10 BCE, but Henner von Hesberg and Silvio Panciera, *Das Mausoleum des Augustus: der Bau und seine Inschriften* (Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vol. 108, 1994), 54 prefers the 28 BCE completion date, albeit without archaeological support. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 73 does not believe a specific date is relevant, since the monument is best understood in the narrative of Rome before and just after Actium. I present 23 as the latest possible completion date.

⁷⁶ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 267 on the materials for a statue base of the *Lares Publici* dedicated by Augustus, which is addressed in greater detail below.

⁷⁷ Patrizio Pensabene and Enrico Gallochio, “Neue Forschungen zum augusteischen Komplex auf dem Palatin,” in *Augustus ist tot – Lang lebe der Kaiser! Internationales Kolloquium anlässlich des 2000. Todesjahres des römischen Kaisers vom 20. – 22. November 2014 in Tübingen*, eds. Manuel Flecker, Stefan Krmnicek, Johannes Lipps, Richard Posamentir, Thomas Schäfer (Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, 2017), 160 on the use of Carrara on the lower channel along the stylobate of the north side in the square peristyle (‘western courtyard’) of the *Domus Augusti*. Other marbles and materials were used throughout the monument. Cf. section I, n. 11 for the *Lares* as not the household gods of Augustus’ *domus* and the chaos associated with taking the domestic *Lares* out of the home. This recollection is similar to the

empire and is served by the emperor in bringing about an Augustan Peace in an Augustan age, all of which benefit the Augustan *Lares*.

I find the private and unofficial narrative (that Augustus *vivus* is a god), in the Augustan images of sacrifice, oak wreaths, and laurels as well as the epithet of the altars. Carrara marble connects the *Lares* to Augustan saviors (e.g. Apollo) while also marking Augustus as the savior and protector of the city and *vici*. No gods of the pantheon were present on the altars, and only one of the five securely dated altars depicts the emperor. The altar of the *Vicus Sandaliarius*, dated to 2 BCE, shows Augustus *capite velato* holding a *lituus*, a chicken at his feet, with Livilla or a female priest on his left and Gaius Caesar on his right.⁷⁸ Flower reads the basic message of the relief as “unambiguous; Augustus plays the role of a priest and receives favorable auspices for his heir in the next generation. The *vicomagistri* celebrate and share in this dynastic moment.”⁷⁹ I see the image and adjective-*cum*-epithet of the emperor to allow his private cult share in sacrifices to the *Lares* there; these gods of place ensure Augustus’ place in securing a dynasty for Rome.

As a private monument responding to public and current themes, this altar connects the residents of the *vici* and the *vicomagistri* themselves in recognizing the more-than-human status of the emperor. No location is specified in the image of the emperor’s auspices, allowing for different readings of civic ritual(s) related to Augustus.⁸⁰ It is

process in Pompeii, cf. section III, n. 52 *supra* Van Andringa, “M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae),” 99, 107-8. Van Andringa does not comment on whether or not the link between Fortuna *Augusta* and Apollo in Rome is intentional or part of a larger trend.

⁷⁸ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 291-3; Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 74 Gaius Caesar was about to embark on military service in 2 BCE.

⁷⁹ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 293.

⁸⁰ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 295. This is the only altar to show the accoutrements of a libation (the woman’s *patera*) and an augural ritual. Koortbojian, *The Divinization of*

important to note that the image of the emperor is not visually depicted as divine (he is the same size as other figures and stands on the same visual plane); to make the emperor visually divine here would minimize the *Lares* at their own shrine. The *Lares* are the recipients of the altar's cultic function, but the emperor's presence as their manufacturer (giving the statues) and the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augusti* allows him as a more-than-human figure to share in their worship without eclipsing their importance.

Moreover, altars without the image of the emperor still recall his presence. Oak wreaths and laurels appear on every extant Augustan compital altar, "declaring the neighborhoods' acceptance and participation in the new Augustan ideology."⁸¹ The senate gave these two symbols to Augustus at the same time as his cognomen, making them as Augustan as his name.⁸² Like the adjective-*cum*-epithet and Carrara marble, I argue that these images made the emperor present in sacrifices and rituals performed there, while further evoking Augustan monuments elsewhere in the city; the laurels and oak wreaths decorated the emperor's home and the emperor appears on contemporary coins surrounded by or wearing the oak wreath.⁸³ Paul Zanker emphasizes that these symbols were an honor given to (not claimed by) the emperor, and that their prevalence

Caesar and Augustus, 76 similarly does not connect the image to a single ritual, but reads it in the context of "religio as it related to military endeavor: augury... and sacrifice."

⁸¹ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 121.

⁸² Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 120-1 citing *Res Gestae* 34, "et laureis postes aedium mearum vestiti publice coronaque civica super ianuam meam fixa est."

⁸³ Cf. n. 71 *supra* for the collaboration between imperial and local control at Luni quarries. E.g. RIC I² Aug 341, *sestertius* from the Roman mint in 17 BCE, with *OB CIVIS SERVATOS* and an oak-wreath between two laurel branches on obverse (for image, see http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1651.html#RIC_0341); RIC I² Aug 405, *denarius* from the Roman mint in 13 BCE, with the bare head of Augustus inside an oak wreath (for image, see http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1734.html#RIC_0405); RIC I² Aug 409 and 411, *aureus* from the Roman mint in 13 BCE, with Augustus wearing an oak crown on the obverse (for image of type, see [http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1\(2\).aug.409](http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1(2).aug.409)).

during the emperor's lifetime made them synonyms for the man.⁸⁴ Beyond the private, divine epithet for the *Lares*, Augustus the man and *vivus* therefore is present at and on every extant compital altar. These symbols as synonyms alone do not denote worship; it is too far of a leap to posit that every laurel and oak wreath in Rome represents and identifies a cult place for the *vivus* Augustus. When these symbols, however, share space with an established cult to Augustan gods, the cult of the *vivus* Augustus is added and incorporated into that of the *Lares Augusti* by association and proximity. Like the use of material, the consistency of Augustan images in an inconsistent medium demonstrates a private desire to make Augustus himself one of the Augustan gods.⁸⁵

The shared worship of Augustus and the *Lares Augusti* at compital altars bridges the gap between public and private cult –the *Lares* were private cults (i.e. not funded by the emperor and senate) that repeatedly recalled public cults throughout the city. Lott reads citizens sacrificing on behalf of the emperor when they sacrifice to the *Lares Augusti* during the *Compitalia* and *ludi Compitalicii*, much in the same way as *pro* is used in official, public descriptions of sacrifice,⁸⁶ but I do not read the emperor's presence as indirect. I read Augustus the man and the divine adjective-*cum*-epithet as attending and sharing in private sacrifices as emperor and resident of each *vicus*. The images on the altars and the Carrara marble connect the *Lares Augusti* to other public monuments and

⁸⁴ Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 93-4, reads these as symbols of monarchical rule that were often used in the decoration of temples for the ruler cult. The *corona civica*, an oak wreath, had been awarded in the Republic for rescuing a comrade in battle, and Augustus had rescued his fellow citizens from civil war. These sentiments appeared earlier in coins from the provinces (e.g. BMCRE 317, *denarius* from Emerita mint, 19-18 BCE (for image, see http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/BMCRE_317_denarius.jpg); RIC 40b, *denarius* from Spanish mint, 19-18 BCE (for image, see [http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1\(2\).aug.40B](http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1(2).aug.40B)); RIC 77a *denarius* from Colonia Patricia mint, 19 BCE (for image, see http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1625.html#RIC_0077a)).

⁸⁵ Cf. section IIA, n. 26 for the inconsistencies in the compital altars as a medium.

⁸⁶ *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 121. Cf. Chapter 2, section IB on the official wording in the *Res Gestae*.

temples to Augustan gods as well as Augustus as a living god so that ritual participants there cannot help but revere the emperor while worshipping the *Lares Augusti*. Through a private interpretation of his public works, Augustus becomes a god of place in the same way as the *Lares*; his presence is individualized so as to become accessible for the local population of each *vicus*.

IV. Where is the *genius Augusti*?

In the previous chapter, I addressed the emperor's *genius* (specifically its absence) in libations to the emperor; contrary to what modern scholars often assert, the *genius Augusti* is not present in libations to Augustus.⁸⁷ The weight of the argument for the prevalence of the *genius Augusti* as an aspect of Augustus' cult lies in topography of Rome and its compital altars. Modern scholars attest the presence of the *genius Augusti*, but contemporary evidence for the cult worship of the emperor's divine nature is non extant.⁸⁸ Based on one line of Ovid's *Fasti*, the *genius* is often paired with the *Lares Augusti* in the *vici* altars at Rome:

Mille Lares Geniumque ducis, qui tradidit illos, urbs habet, et vici numina trina colunt,	The city has a thousand <i>Lares</i> and <i>Genius</i> of the leader, who gave them (to you), and the
--	--

⁸⁷ Cf. Chapter 2, section IIC. Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime," 124, and *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 150-2 cites Horace, *Carmen* 4.5.31-5 as evidence for libations being poured out to the emperor's *genius* at public and private banquets, as per senatorial decree. Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," 357 argues that Horace in 4.5 must mean the *genius* when he writes *numen*, because the *genius* received libations. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 209 traces the *genius* in libations to Mommsen, not ancient sources. Scheid, "To Honor the Princeps and Venerate the Gods," 281 does not find sacrifices to the *genius Augusti* until the reign of Caligula.

⁸⁸ Sources that assert the cult of the *genius Augusti*: Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime," 124-33; Ryberg, "Rites of State Religion," 97; Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 129-32; Rudd, *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, 2, 9; Favro, "'Pater urbis': Augustus as City Father of Rome," 80, 82; Augusto Fraschetti, *Rome et le Prince*, trans. Vincent Jolivet (Paris: Belin, 1994), 274-6, 374; Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*," 417-8; Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. I*, 186; Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, 267, 278-9; Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 159, 161.

quo feror? Augustus mensis mihi carminis huius ius habet. ⁸⁹	vici worship the three <i>numina</i> ; what brings me here? The month of August rightly holds that part of my <i>carmen</i> .
--	---

Despite suggestions that Ovid here employs the plural *numina* to encompass the twin *Lares Augusti* and the *genius Augusti*, none of his other uses of the word (nor any other contemporary uses of the word) implies *genius* with *numen/numina*.⁹⁰ Flower correctly points out that this passage from Ovid is the only direct, contemporary evidence for any cult (public or private) of Augustus' *genius*, and not every manuscript preserves *genius*.⁹¹ Flower insists that the *genius Augusti* is "a phantom of early twentieth-century classical scholarship,"⁹² thus proving why the *genius* is challenging to find in Augustan Rome. Scholars often use one altar currently in the Vatican Museum to stabilize Ovid's comment.⁹³ With the *Fasti* in mind, the altar arguably depicts both the *genius* and *Lares*

⁸⁹ 5.145-8.

⁹⁰ Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 332 states that the three *numina* are the two *Lares Augusti* and the one *genius Augusti* of each *vicus*; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 110; Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome, Vol. I*, 185-6; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 117; Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 129, 131 (referring to compital altars not Ovid) state that there are two *Lares* for the two statues/twin gods depicted in surviving compital altars and the singular *genius*. Ovid elsewhere in his poetry uses the plural *numina* to denote multiple divinities but not a *genius* (e.g. *Met* 1.192-3, Jupiter describes the types of rustic *numina* he controls; *Met* 1.376-80, Deucalion and Pyrrha ask Themis for help if the *numina victa* can be appeased; *Met* 2.15-16, what is visible from the Palace of the Sun, *Met* 5.369-70 the *numina ponti* and their king are subject to Cupid). Horace 4.5.35 (examined in the previous chapter) has long been read to infer *genius* when the poet says *numen* by Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," 357; Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime," and Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, 150-2.

⁹¹ *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 308 cautions that book five of the *Fasti* is not as secure as earlier books, citing in n. 34 "some manuscripts have *geminumque ducem* or *geminique* (only M) or *duces* (G). *Geniumque* is in U (an eleventh-century MS in the Vatican) and G (an eleventh-century MS in Belgium). The best manuscript of the *Fasti* (A, which is tenth-century MS in the Vatican) stops at line 24 of book 5," using the *apparatus criticus* of Franz Bömer, *Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1957-8); Robert Schilling, *Ovid Les Fastes, Tome II, livres IV-VI* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003); E. H. Alton, D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney, P. *Ovidius Naso Fastorum libri sex* (Munich: K. G. Saur Verlag, 2005).

⁹² *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 310. See also Chapter 1, section I, n. 9 for this assertion as part of a trend in scholarship on the imperial cult.

⁹³ Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 140 dates the altar (Rome, Museo Vaticano, inv. 311) to approximately 7 BCE (the year of Augustus' reform), possibly from the Caelian in *Regio II*, following Galinsky, *Augustan Culture*, 302-4; Hano, "À l'origine du culte imperial," 2338 no. 1. Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 304 n. 25 also dates it to 7 BCE.

on the altar's front frieze; the *genius* appears as a bearded, togate figure who is pouring a libation.⁹⁴ Lott, Karl Galinsky, and others restore the inscription above the frieze to “sacred to the *Lares Augusti* and the *Genius* of the Caesars.”⁹⁵ Like Ovid's *genius*, the Latin here is not certain; the entire inscription is badly damaged with the first line reading, “*LARIBUS AUGUSTIS C[XXX; for the august *Lares* C/G xxx.*”⁹⁶ The altar and the one line of Ovid create a circular argument and cannot securely prove the existence or prevalence of the *genius Augusti* cult.⁹⁷

Moreover, the argument for the genitive *Augusti* with the *genius* is at odds with the adjective-cum-epithet *Augusti* with the *Lares*. The adjectival use of *Augusti* for the *Lares* does not make the gods the emperor's own household *Lares*; the adjectival and noun forms of the emperor's name do not imply the same meaning, where the latter implies Augustus' sole ownership, not the shared ownership of Augustus and the residents.⁹⁸

Both, however, invoke Augustus' presence. That is not to say that Augustus did not have

⁹⁴ Várhelyi, *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire*, 188; Augustus maintains “the same traditional iconography” of the *genius* that appeared on the coins under Sulla, but she does not specify which coins. Michael Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 409 describes RRC 397/1, dated to 74 BCE from the Roman mint, as having “the *genius populi Romani* with the trappings of domination,” but he cautions against certain readings of the *genius* as a political symbol. In contrast to the togate figure on this altar, the Republican *genius* is semi-nude, often with a cornucopia and pouring a libation over an altar.

⁹⁵ E.g. Andreas Alföldi, *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus* (Bonn: R. Habelt, 1973), 31; Hano, “À l'origine du culte imperial,” 2338 no. 1; Galinsky, *Augustan Culture*, 306; Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, 278; Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 140.

⁹⁶ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 304-6 citing *CIL* 6.445 = *ILS* 3613. She also notes the size difference between *Lares* and C/G.

⁹⁷ Even Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 140 admits that the altar's imagery and message are unclear (the plural use of *Genii* could refer to the *genius* of the Caesars or Caesar and his children), but rather than discredit the reading he argues “[the image of *Genius*] must reflect an individual choice on the part of this neighborhood rather than an official mandate to worship the emperor's *Genius*.” Wallace-Hadrill, *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, 279 cites post-Augustan examples from Pompeii to defend the reading, which relies on the assumption that *Lares* of Rome are the same as *Lares* of Pompeii, cf. section IIA, n. 21 *supra* for Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, x, 9, 22, 54 on the *Lares* as being gods of place, and the differences between places and their *Lares*.

⁹⁸ Cf. my discussion in section III *supra* that calling the *Lares* ‘*Augusti*’ with the adjective-cum-epithet does not invoke the emperor any less than a genitive form of *Augusti* would, but the term allows each *vicus*'s ownership of its own *Augusti Lares* as well as its individuality.

a *genius*, only that his *genius* cult, like his personal household *Lares*, was not worshipped by the Roman populace.⁹⁹ I assert that the absence of a widespread *genius Augusti* makes a greater case for his lifetime worship; every Roman man had a *genius*, so the honor would not be divine. Augustus, however, was unique in possessing a *numen* and having a divine adjective-*cum*-epithet form of his cognomen.¹⁰⁰ With or without a *genius* cult in the *vici*, Augustus as the giver of the *Lares* statues is still present and shares in worship at the compital altars as cult places.

V. Campus Martius

Much like the compital altars of the *vici*, the monuments of the northern Campus Martius span the gap between private and public cult to create and communicate a narrative of Augustan cult places throughout the city. In the following sections on the Campus Martius, I analyze the Augustan changes to the Campus Martius; Augustan monuments there build upon a Republican narrative of worship and Roman identity, and also anticipate the public and official cult of *Divus* Augustus. My analysis separates the monuments into public (*Ara Pacis*, *horologium*) and private (Mausoleum), but given their shared space, I combine conclusions about the three as the monuments reference and recall each other, all while supporting a narrative of divinity for the viewer. I argue in the following paragraphs that the narrative created by the materials and imagery of the compital altars connects to and engages with the monuments of the northern Campus

⁹⁹ Ryberg, "Rites of State Religion," 97 incorrectly uses the *genius* to differentiate between living and posthumous cult; Scheid, "To Honor the Princeps and Venerate the Gods," 281 does not find sacrifices to the *genius Augusti* until the reign of Caligula.

¹⁰⁰ Flower, *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden*, 308 makes this observation, that "no other mortal in Rome laid claim to" a *numen*. The statement lacks bibliography, so it would be safer to say that Augustus possessing a *numen* was unique but it is unknown if it was the first ever instance.

Martius. In the Campus Martius, the narrative similarly interweaves the cult of *vivus* Augustus into cult places of official gods to enhance the private worship of the emperor without impeding or limiting due worship. The civic and official nature of the Campus Martius allowed viewers to participate in a private negotiation about the emperor's divinity. After his death, however, these monuments become mnemonic devices for the glory of the *Divus*, while recounting the status of the *vivus*, playing with the chronology of his life and achievements. In this way the monumental narrative of the site encouraged viewers during the emperor's lifetime to negotiate the relationship between the emperor and the divine, and, after his death, they served as mnemonics for his divine qualities and more-than-human status: all of the necessary components for worship of the emperor in the imperial cult.

In accordance with the poet as the performer or presenter of sacrifices, the 'author' of these monuments may display the message of the emperor's exceptionalism and divine status, but the viewer, both individually and as a collective, ultimately has the final word in her interpretation of the monuments.¹⁰¹ The public nature of the Campus Martius (where the senate commissioned two of the three monuments) and the official status of the monuments (the emperor or senate sanctioned them) represent a more cautioned approach to the emperor's divinity than the poetic sacrifices of the previous chapter, but both sacrifice and cult place were components of the same private negotiation of Augustus' living cult.

¹⁰¹ Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 80, the audience for any divine quality is not a single homogenous group, but rather a heterogeneous group spanning social, economic, and temporal boundaries. Content, setting, and landscapes (real and fictional) allowed for different and unique readings of a quality in monumental associations. Cf. Chapter 1, section V, n. 74-6, *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph*, citing Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, and Chapter 2, section IA on relationship between author and reader/viewer.

The reforms of the *regiones* and *vici* added the Campus Martius to *Regio IX*, but the area was still outside the *pomerium*. The Republican identity of the space remained despite Augustus' public and private additions to the landscape; voting still occurred there, even if the outcome was predictable.¹⁰² The connections between the space and Republican identity transferred under Augustus to support his public and private ideologies.¹⁰³ As a location, the space called to mind mythic apotheosis, grand Republican funerals, as well as the election of officials.

When a viewer approached the Campus Martius travelling north on the *Via Flaminia*, the *Ara Pacis*, *horologium*, and Mausoleum formed a right triangle, recording Augustus' progress from *triumvir*, to *princeps*, to *Divus*.¹⁰⁴ The chronology of the monuments (the Mausoleum completed before 23 BCE, the *Ara Pacis* commissioned in 13 CE, and the *horologium* dedicated in 10 BCE) illustrate to the viewer Augustus' transition "from a man of war to a man of peace."¹⁰⁵ I read them as also privately anticipating public cult while fostering private worship. None of these monuments explicitly asserts that the

¹⁰² Lott, *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, 27 suggesting that the outcome in elections under Augustus were predictable in that the officially sponsored candidate would win. Paul W. Jacobs II and Diane Atnally Conlin, *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 147-8 add that Augustus' reforms of the *regiones* had no Republican precedent, and that Augustus did reform some of the Republican regulations on what could happen within and outside of the *pomerium* (e.g. commanding troops and appear in military uniform).

¹⁰³ Cf. Chapter 2, section IIB, n. 59 on Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan,'" 31-5, where Republican themes encapsulated in words have changed but the words themselves stay the same, e.g. *libertas* no longer meaning "...freedom' (from a *rex*), but 'freedom' (through a *princeps*)."

¹⁰⁴ Peter Heslin, "Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti," *JRS* 97 (2007): 14-16 argues for a reading of the monuments together. His discussion focuses on the *Ara Pacis* and *horologium* more so than the Mausoleum, which B. Frischer and J. Fillwalk, "A Computer Simulation to Test the Buchner Thesis. The Relationship of the Ara Pacis and the Meridian in the Campus Martius, Rome," paper presented at the Digital Heritage International Conference, October 28- November 1, 2013, adopt in their digital recreation of the space. The Mausoleum was farther away but still easily visible from the *Ara Pacis* or *horologium*.

¹⁰⁵ Heslin, "Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti," 16 that the three corners of the triangle can be read together as a thoroughly Augustan narrative; Jacobs and Conlin, *Campus Martius*, 146-8 on the *Ara Pacis* and *horologium* together representing Augustan themes and the blurring of lines between "the city proper and Campus Martius," but I see them as additionally blurring the lines between man and god.

living emperor is divine, but, both individually as well as collectively, I maintain that the images, language, and layout of the monuments acknowledge the emperor's divine qualities and more-than-human status while anticipating his deification.

As official and public monuments, the state paid for and sanctioned the *Ara Pacis Augustae* and *horologium*.¹⁰⁶ There is no explicit presentation of Augustus as divine (as was the official, public understanding of his divinity), but the monuments still emphasize the emperor's divine qualities, more-than-human status, and incorporate his private cult into that of official Roman gods. Much like the *Lares Augusti*, the man as the honoree of the monuments and guarantor of their qualities receives unofficial worship there. They become cult places in that they add to the ritual landscape of the emperor's *vivus* cult. Modern scholars often read the narrative of the northern Campus Martius in terms of the Augustus' exceptionalism and cosmological imagery,¹⁰⁷ but I believe they overlook the elements of private cult. I examine in the following sections the *Ara Pacis* and *horologium* as public monuments and then the Mausoleum as a private monument in civic space; together on the Campus Martius, these three form a combined narrative of the progression from the *vivus* to the *Divus*.

VA. Campus Martius: *Ara Pacis Augustae*

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Chapter 1, section III for definitions of official and public as terms and categories.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. the central thesis of Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos* is the cosmological metaphor made manifest in the northern Campus Martius; Jacobs and Conlin, *Campus Martius*, 1-7 on the divine implications of the space; Zanker, *Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 120-5 on the *Ara Pacis* and images of imperial power and control.

The *Ara Pacis Augustae* as a cult place was not dedicated to Augustus but was directly linked to him in both life and death.¹⁰⁸ Sacrifices performed there were offered to an Augustan peace; Augustan peace credited Augustus with a more-than-human status. In contrast to the private adjective-*cum*-epithet used for the *Lares Augusti*, *Pax Augusta* is an official goddess with a public cult. The connotation of and connection to the *vivus* emperor at the *Ara Pacis* places him within the Republican tradition of living men associating themselves with divine qualities, but takes the tradition a step further than his Republican predecessors.¹⁰⁹ As I stated above in Chapter 2, Augustus' *numen* in poetry was a divine metonymy, where the man as the possessor of the quality is always inferred; in a similar way, the adjectival form of his name in the *Ara Pacis Augustae* implies the emperor as the sponsor of the quality.¹¹⁰

Pax was a newly made public Augustan goddess. Alison Cooley emphasizes the novelty and innovation of the cult of *Pax Augusta*, who was the first public deity to officially be an Augustan god.¹¹¹ The novelty of her cult enabled the senate and emperor to create her literally in Augustus' own name, making her cult place both hers (officially)

¹⁰⁸ Scheid, "To Honor the Princeps and Venerate the Gods," 291. My analysis of the *Ara Pacis* considers it in terms of its location alone.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Chapter 1, section VA, n. 78-9 on Wardman, *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans*, 24 for the Republican temple as a monument to the politician as well as an offering to the god, and also in the same section n. 81 on Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 3, 21 on the necessity of sacrifice. See also Chapter 2, section IIA on the relationship the Republican tradition of men becoming gods in Cicero.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Chapter 2, n. 4 and section IIC, elaborating on Fishwick, "Genius and Numen," 361 for the divine metonymy. Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 28, 254; Clark traces the connection between dedicator and quality in Republican Rome, finding a reciprocal relationship between quality and dedicator, which the viewer monitored over the course of time. When a temple was dedicated to a deified abstraction or a god with that particular quality, the dedicator must live up to the claimed association, as was the case with Pompey the Great (cf. Chapter 1, section VA). By associating his own name with the quality, the dedicator makes a commitment to himself and to everyone who encounters the monument. The association of a quality exerts different kinds of pressure on the dedicator, encouraging him to live up to common readings of that quality.

¹¹¹ Cf. section III, n. 42 Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 156 pointing out that *Pax Augusta* was the first public Augustan god and that the *Ara Pacis* was the first monument in Rome specifically for a cult of *Pax*. Cf. section III, n. 43 Clark, *Divine Qualities*, 9, 159 that *Pax* did appear on Republican coins, but there is no evidence that she had a public cult in Rome.

and his own (unofficially). The cult place for Pax *Augusta*, in conjunction with Augustus' three closures of the gates of Janus (29 BCE, 25 BCE, and 1 BCE) made Augustus a synonym for Peace in the same way that laurels and oak wreaths became synonymous with him.¹¹² The two did not need to be shown together (e.g. on the obverse and reverse of coins), since their correlation was already apparent in the goddess' epithet.¹¹³

The visual imagery of the altar itself connects the emperor and his family to the divine without eclipsing the goddess. Augustus and his family as living persons are coupled with the goddess through the proximity of portraiture; the *Ara Pacis* is the first public monument to represent the imperial family.¹¹⁴ This is similar to the pairing of Caesar and his patron goddess Venus on coins in 44 BCE, the first to show a living man.¹¹⁵ The visual connection between the man and the goddess permits the former to share in the latter's glory, while presenting his more-than-human status. A coin is not an altar, however, so the image of Augustus and his family on the *Ara Pacis* both visually and contextually bonds the cults of the living and the divine. As the viewer travelled north on the *Via Flaminia*, she would see the southern frieze first, with the image of Augustus

¹¹² *Res Gestae* 13 describes the closures; Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 93-4, cf. section IIIA, n. 84 *supra* on laurels and oak wreaths as synonyms for Augustus.

¹¹³ No coin minted in Rome during the reign of Augustus depicts Pax. Hannah Cornwell, *Pax and the Politics of Peace: Republic to Principate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 188, notes only one coin from an unknown provincial mint dated to Tiberius, RPC 5451, has Pax *Augusta* in the legend (*PACE AUG PERP*) (no image available). Galinsky, "Venus, Polysemy, and the Ara Pacis Augustae," 470 and Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 265 n. 118 on the coins BMCRE I. 112 no. 691-3 with Pax holding the caduceus, issued from the Ephesus mint (for image of type, see <https://www.coinarchives.com/2e4ee46c0905c14c226eca4ee017a2d5/img/cng/110/image00976.jpg>).

¹¹⁴ Charles Brian Rose, "'Princes' and Barbarians on the Ara Pacis," *AJA* 94, no. 3 (Jul., 1990): 456, 467; Galinsky, *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*, 138, labels it as the first monument to depict women and children.

¹¹⁵ The same reverse type depicting Venus appears on RRC 480/3, 4, 5a-b, 8-16, and 18 (for image, see <http://numismatics.org/crro/id/rrc-480.3?lang=en>). All were minted in Rome. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 377-9 for pre-assassination dating of the type, specifically 480/13. Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 120 on the connection between Caesar and Venus on coins minted during the forties.

inviting her to linger.¹¹⁶ The ritual context of the altar and the *supplicatio* procession shown on the north and south friezes,¹¹⁷ like the presence of the emperor in the adjective-*cum*-epithet with the *Lares Augusti*, allow the emperor, his family, and Pax to share in worship. Just as Ovid in *Ex Ponto* 4.9 burned incense for the imperial *numina*, which included Livia, Tiberius, and his grandsons,¹¹⁸ Augustus and his family share in the benefits of the Pax *Augusta*.¹¹⁹ The emperor and his family are not shown on the same frieze as Pax, but the proximity of their images on the altar, like the proximity of Caesar and Venus, allows them a higher status than individuals in the *supplicatio* procession, without trespassing into her sacred space. Similarly to the altar of the *Vicus Sandaliarius*, the figure of the emperor remains visually on a human-scale, participating in a human and civic procession, so as to not overshadow Pax at her own altar.

While Augustus was alive, his relationship with Pax connects his cult to hers, but does not officially place him in her cult beyond his portrait on the exterior relief. Unofficially

¹¹⁶ Diane Atnally Conlin, *The Artists of the Ara Pacis: The Process of Hellenization in Roman Relief Sculpture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), 84 for a viewer's first reaction to the monument. She find that the south frieze's "more daring, complex interweave of figures merging into and out from layers of receding planes, especially apparent around the figure of Augustus himself, would have demanded more contemplation, participation, and time on the part of the viewer." This intrigued viewer would then be drawn to the landscape of the northern Campus Martius. Cf. section V, n. 104 for the viewer's approach travelling north on the *Via Flaminia*.

¹¹⁷ R. Billows, "The Religious Procession of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Augustus's *supplicatio* in 13 B.C.," *JRA* 6 (1993): 80-92 as cited in Paul Rehak, "Women and Children on the *Ara Pacis Augustae*" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, St Louis, Missouri, April 16, 2004).

¹¹⁸ Cf. Chapter 2, section IIIA-D on *Ex Ponto* 4.9.105-12. Galinsky, "Venus, Polysemy, and the Ara Pacis Augustae," argues for polysemy in reading the figure on the southeast frieze as Venus/Tellus/Pax. His article seeks to place the layered viewing in a documented layer of tradition "rather than be content with endlessly hectoring about 'ambiguities' while not presenting convincing documentation" (475). Galinsky seeks to clarify the "ambiguities" in John Elsner, "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae," *JRS* 81 (1991): 50-61.

¹¹⁹ Rehak, "Women and Children on the Ara Pacis Augustae," argued that women are more symbolic than not: "The main focus is on Augustus himself, Agrippa, and other adult men, rather than emphasizing the presentation of the family of the *princeps* to the public. The Ara Pacis may embody an Augustan peace, but it is one in which men retain all the power." Rehak seeks to clarify the arguments of Conlin, *The Artists of the Ara Pacis*, which continues from Diana Kleiner, "The Great Friezes of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Greek Sources, Roman Derivatives, and Augustan Social Policy," *MEFRA* 90 (1978): 753-85, specifically that the imagery of the Ara Pacis manifests other Augustan social policy on families.

and privately, his cognomen as divine adjective-*cum*-epithet carries the emperor beyond the Republican role of dedicator towards a divine attribute of and synonymous with the goddess Pax. We cannot know the degree of imperial or even senatorial agency in this change; within a larger setting of the Campus Martius and Augustan Rome, both the *vivus* and *Divus* emperor are explicitly present in her cult place. As a public monument, the *Ara Pacis* follows the traditional, Republican relationship between a man and a divine quality: the man must continuously maintain the association.¹²⁰ The synonymous relationship depends on Augustus continuing to bring peace to Rome. Taken in context with the rest of the Campus Martius, however, the *Ara Pacis* and its surrounding monuments share the onus of divinity with the viewers so that the man progresses towards his fully divine status. The relationship between the public *Ara Pacis* and *horologium*, and the private Mausoleum create a progression that will culminate in public cult, thereby supporting his more-than-human status beyond the singular association with Pax as a divine quality.

VB. Campus Martius: *Horologium* and Obelisk

The *Ara Pacis Augustae* is not the only monument in the northern Campus Martius with connotations of and connections to the *vivus* emperor –his more-than-human status and divine qualities. The *horologium*, dedicated in 10 BCE, located to the west of the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, pairs with the altar to supplement the *vivus* emperor’s presence at the Campus Martius as a cult place.¹²¹ The designation of this monument as a cult place

¹²⁰ Cf. Chapter 1, section VA on Pompey bearing the onus for maintaining his divine status.

¹²¹ The *horologium* lies to the west of the *Ara Pacis* when a viewer travelling north on the *Via Flaminia* approaches the altar. The *horologium* consists of an obelisk and pavement with a bronze, east-west line for measuring noon. Heslin, “Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti,” argues against the

depends on its proximity and place in the visual narrative to the *Ara Pacis* and the Mausoleum. The members of the cult community of the *vivus* Augustus would gather in the northern Campus Martius to perform their personal and collective rituals with the monuments as ritual foci. The Latin inscription on the base of the rose granite obelisk asserts Augustus' more-than-human status and connects this monument to its neighbors. Although it lacked the same adjective-*cum*-epithet as the *Ara Pacis*, the proximity of the *horologium* as well as its material, language, and origins invite the viewer to blur the division between the public and private stance on Augustus' *vivus* cult, where a public monument may suggest that he possesses divine qualities and have a more-than-human status.

Here I should clarify, since the purpose of the *horologium* is disputed in secondary sources; recent arguments and excavations suggest a meridian rather than the long-accepted sundial. Regardless of utility, whether it is Edmund Buchner's sundial on a grand scale,¹²² or Peter Heslin's meridian,¹²³ the implications of the monuments taken as a pair demonstrate *vivus* Augustus' more-than-human status and divine qualities, which ultimately led to his senate-decreed divinity.

conclusions of Edmund Buchner, "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis," *Römische Mitteilungen* 83 (1976): 319-65, mainly that the *horologium* was a meridian, not a sundial, and that the size of pavement was much smaller than Buchner suggests. The *horologium*'s dedication in 10 BCE preceded by one year the Augustan calendar reforms, but the former should not be read to have brought about the latter. As Heslin, "Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti," 5-6 has shown, there is circumstantial evidence for the two events occurring in the same context, but the large size of the *horologium* indicates its symbolic rather than utilitarian purpose. He also notes that errors in the calendar would have taken longer than a single year to become manifest. The symbolic purpose of the meridian is apparent in its massive size, which makes precise observations difficult.

¹²² Buchner, "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis," in which he argues for a larger pavement and the shadow of the obelisk falling on the altar on the afternoon of the autumn equinox, among other things.

¹²³ Heslin, "Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti," 3: "solar meridian is like a sundial with only a single hour-line that indicates noon on each day: since the shadow of an object falls exactly to the north at local noon, when the sun is at its highest point, one can plot the position of the shadow as it changes every day. This indicates the waxing of daylight in the summer, as the noontime shadow grows shorter every day, and its waning, as the noon time shadow grows longer."

The obelisk of the *horologium* was one of a pair relocated from Egypt; now known as the Montecitorio Obelisk, its setting in the *horologium* conflated its Egyptian origin with its new, Roman setting.¹²⁴ Set upon a base made from the same rose granite as the obelisk, a Latin inscription there anchored the original hieroglyphs above in a new, Roman meaning.¹²⁵ Rose granite was a new material for Roman architecture, and the emperor controlled access to it in the same way as access to Egypt itself.¹²⁶ The base's inscription attests to its function as a symbolic monument, stating Augustus' newly acquired position as the chief priest of Rome and indicating his more-than-human status in his relationship with a solar god:

Imp. Caesar divi fil. / Augustus / pontifex maximus / imp. XII cos XI trib. pot. XIV / Aegyptio in potestatem / populi Romani redacta / soli donum dedit.
--

The emperor Augustus, son of the deified Julius Caesar, pontifex maximus, emperor for the twelfth time, consul for the eleventh time, holding tribunician power for the fourteenth time, having subdued Egypt under the power of the Roman people, gave this gift to the sun.

¹²⁴ Molly Swetnam-Burland, "'Aegyptus Redacta': The Egyptian Obelisk in the Augustan Campus Martius," *ABull* 92, no.3 (2010): 135, 139, Augustus relocated a pair of obelisks from Egypt in the city in 10 BCE, one within the *horologium* in the Campus Martius (the Montecitorio Obelisk), the other originally served as the *spina* of the Circus Maximus, now called the Piazza del Popolo obelisk. Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis Historia* 36.71-2) describes the obelisks, their transportation, interpreting the engineering achievements as imperial triumphs. He confuses and conflates the two monuments' history and features. Swetnam-Burland, "'Aegyptus Redacta'," 142: "Pliny asks his readers to see obelisks as symbols of imperial undertaking, the end products of a technical process that required mastery of forces and circumstances at the limits of human control. Pliny casts both the initial erection of an obelisk and its later transplantation as opera, great works: one of ancient Egypt, the other of Rome." Sorcha Carey, *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 87 and 93 clarifies this point by placing it in terms of Pliny's language. Pliny uses the word *miraculum* to describe the transport of the obelisks to Rome, making the process of empire rather than the objects themselves a *mirabile*.

¹²⁵ Swetnam-Burland, "'Aegyptus Redacta'," 143-5; and later in *Egypt in Italy: Visions of Egypt in Roman Imperial Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 96 argues that a translation of the hieroglyphs on the Piazza del Popolo obelisk in the Campus Martius was available to Roman viewers, but she bases her argument on an anecdote of Ammianus Marcellinus "quoting verbatim for his readers a translation of the text of Augustus's obelisk in the Circus Maximus, from the book of an author identified by Ammianus simply as Hermapion" ("Aegyptus Redacta'," 143). Since Ammianus is a much later source, Swetnam-Burland admittedly cannot know if and when the translation was relevant to a Roman viewer.

¹²⁶ Swetnam-Burland, "'Aegyptus Redacta'," 146 on rose granite and Augustus' control of the stone through his control of Egypt. "Thus, the obelisk bases, along with the two smaller obelisks before the doorways to the Mausoleum, represent the earliest datable uses of Egyptian rose granite in the city of Rome."

Inscription, base, and location all convey to the viewer a message that is more complex than the *spolia* of conquest.¹²⁷ The Latin inscription makes no declaration of *victoria* or a statement about an Augustan god, only that Augustus subdued Egypt and dedicated this obelisk to Sol. Unlike the Egyptian obelisk, the cult of Sol was Roman, with temples existing on the Quirinal and in the Circus Maximus since the early Republic.¹²⁸

The solar function and dedication of the monument call to mind Augustus in a less direct way than *Pax Augusta*, but the emperor is nonetheless present in the reception of unofficial worship directed at this cult place. Since Sol and Apollo already possessed Republican cults, they could not be entirely reinterpreted in Augustan terms (as *Pax* had been); they were not qualities that Augustus could assume or maintain. The solar use of the monument (either meridian or sundial), however, calls to mind the *ludi Saeculares* celebrated seven years prior, and Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* hymn performed for the *ludi* in front of Apollo's Palatine Temple. In the hymn, Apollo as a solar god presided over the dawning of Augustus' new golden age, making Sol an appropriate recipient for this Augustan monument beyond the solar use of the site. I suggest that this reference to solar imagery and Augustus' golden age, in conjunction with the nearby Augustan Peace,

¹²⁷ Gurval, *Actium and Augustus*, 19 argues that both obelisks (Montecitorio and Piazza del Popolo) are spoils of war. The context, setting, and reception of a monument determine whether or not the obelisks were *spolia*—not every Egyptian feature or monument in Rome can accurately be categorized as such.

¹²⁸ Steven Ernst Hijmans, *Sol: The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome* (PhD diss., University of Groningen, 2009), 4-13, citing for the Quirinal temple Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 1.7.12 "*ut Latinis veteribus d plurimis in verbis adiectam ultimam, quod manifestum est etiam ex columna rostrata, quae est Duilio in foro posita; interim g quoque, ut in pulvinari Solis, qui colitur iuxta aedem Quirini, vesperug, quod vesperuginem accipimus.*" For the Circus Maximus, Tacitus, *Ann.*, 15.74.1 "*tum decreta dona et grates deis decernuntur, propriusque honos Soli, cui est vetus aedes apud circum in quo facinus parabatur, qui occulta coniurationis numine retexisset;* then decided gifts and thanksgivings were decreed, and special honors to Sol, who has an ancient temple in the circus where the crime was planned, who had uncovered by his divine power the secrets of the conspiracy." Hijmans counters the arguments of Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft)*, (Munich, 1912), that Sol was imported to Rome no earlier than the Second Punic War. Hijmans systematically argues that Sol was Roman, Republican, and not oriental in his origins.

presents the viewer with an image of Augustus' divine association solar gods, both Apollo and Sol, who, in response to Augustus' victories and more-than-human status brought about a new age for Rome. The monuments of the Campus Martius show on a larger scale, and to a larger audience than the sacrifices in poetry, Augustus' role in the negotiation of his divinity while creating a mnemonic for his progression to public cult as the sun progresses across the sky. The viewer at this site recalls Augustus' achievements celebrated in the *Carmen Saeculare* and his victory at Actium, which brought about an Augustan Peace. Again, neither the inscription, nor the *Ara Pacis* make any public statements of divinity, yet the same viewer could place these public monuments alongside the private *vici* altars in the city, where their physical location and imagery suggest a narrative of Augustus' *vivus* cult.

As cult places, the *Ara Pacis* and *horologium* establish the ritual landscape that Deena Ragavan described; the ritualized movement between the monuments shaped their function and meaning.¹²⁹ The viewer moving through Rome participated in the ritual landscape of the *vivus* Augustus. The obelisk, inscription, and later *Res Gestae* all record the deeds of a more-than-human man who would become fully divine after his death. The exclusive material and its Egyptian origin attest to Augustus' position as the more-than-human favorite of a solar Apollo, who aided the victory at Actium, which brought about the *Pax Augusta*. The monument assures the viewer that Augustus as Pontifex Maximus is the guarantor of religious precision in his calendar and meridian, as well as the goodwill of the gods (with whom he will eventually reside). The messages of these monuments express the official and public understandings of the emperor's divinity; the Roman viewer may interpret these messages favorably or not, but their physical

¹²⁹ Ragavan, "Heaven on Earth," 1, cf. section I, n. 6.

navigation and movement through the site creates a narrative of living divinity and unofficial worship that is not directly represented in a single monument.

VC. Campus Martius: Mausoleum and Private Motivations

The Mausoleum of Augustus manipulates the categories of public and private cult as it anticipates the emperor's deification. In contrast to the other monuments of the northern Campus Martius, the Mausoleum utilizes the same private stance as the compital altars of the *vici*, in that the emperor as a private citizen may interpret and anticipate his own imperial divinity. As a private monument, however, its close proximity to its public neighbors suggests a public reading. Placed outside the *pomerium*, the Mausoleum represents the transition point from the cult of the *vivus* to *Divus*, although it predates the other cult places I examined above (sections VA and VB). I interpret the building's function in housing the emperor's and his family's mortal remains as creating a distinct separation between the divine and mortal components of the man; on account of his victories, one will reside in the Mausoleum, the other will reside among the gods. This distinction, however, is unmarked in time; the early date of the Mausoleum along with its status as a victory monument and tomb resists a single interpretation of *vivus* or *Divus*.¹³⁰ The Mausoleum as the beginning and end of Augustus' monumental cult places, as well as the emperor's manipulation of public and private status, makes it significant in that the monument marks the emperor's own private view of his status to those partaking in his private worship. As a cult place, the ritual activity of the site (which I discuss in greater detail in Chapter 4, section VIB) required participants to be aware of the boundaries

¹³⁰ Magness, "The Mausolea of Augustus," 320-5 explaining that the monument fulfilled different functions as victory monument and tomb with a combination of features. Magness believes the Mausoleum of Alexander served as a prototype for both the Mausoleum of Augustus in Rome and Herod's Herodion.

between the living and the dead, mortal and divine, and the emperor's circumvention of both.

The Mausoleum as an Augustan monument is unique in that it was possibly the first of the yet-to-be emperor's building projects and because it acknowledges a living cult more so than any other Augustan monument. Additionally, unlike the *horologium* and *Ara Pacis*, the Mausoleum is a private monument in civic space; Augustus built his Mausoleum in the northern Campus Martius as a private citizen, participating in the narrative of propagandistic Republican victory and funerary monuments, yet distancing himself from it; the distance is literal with the funerary monuments of late-Republican figures lying nearly a kilometer away in the southern Campus Martius.¹³¹ We do not know the exact design of the Mausoleum and its completion date, but we can assume that it was complete when Marcellus was interred there in 23 BCE.¹³² The only contemporary source, Strabo, describes walkways surrounding the monument and a bronze colossal statue of the emperor rising above it.¹³³ In the following paragraphs I address the private status of the monument and its known features (some of the materials used, the *Res*

¹³¹ Following Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 36. Davies, *Death and the Emperor*, 7-8; Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 25-6 additionally add the regal connotations of the site as the burial location for kings, citing Appian, *Bellum Civile*, 1.10-6. Sulla's body, after a grand funeral in 78 BCE, was placed in a tumulus in the Campus Martius (Livy, *Periochae*, 90; Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 43.3). Additionally, Julia, the daughter of Caesar and wife of Pompey was buried in the Campus in 54 BCE (Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 26 citing Weinstock, *Divus Julius*, 350 n. 1, which states that the senate had not granted Julia's burial as they had with Sulla's). It is tempting to read the young *triumvir*'s tomb as a response to Antony's desire to be interred in Egypt, but the monument's Egyptian construction techniques and obelisks undermines a fully anti-Egyptian reading; Davies, *Death and the Emperor*, 4 speculates that a first-hand knowledge of was required (Augustus' or Agrippa's); 53-63 argues for Egyptian construction techniques in the concrete core and ground plan, but admits that the design was multicultural. Cf. section IIIA, n. 130 *supra* on Magness, "The Mausolea of Augustus," 320-5 explaining that the monument fulfilled different functions as victory monument and tomb with a combination of features.

¹³² Cf. section IIIA, n. 75 *supra* on the range of proposed dates.

¹³³ *Geographica* 5.3.8. Cf. Chapter 4, section IVA, n. 79 and the following discussion for the walkways, and n. 80 on the rationale for calling the statue 'colossal.'

Gestae).¹³⁴ I do not offer new interpretations on the Mausoleum's design, arguing instead that it is a cult place for the living and deified cult of Augustus.

The Mausoleum's proximity to other public monuments as well as the public (yet post-deification) inscription of the *Res Gestae* challenges its private status. As I stated above, the Mausoleum, *Ara Pacis*, and *horologium* form a right triangle that conveys the viewer through Augustus' lifetime achievements towards his eventual deification (which the Mausoleum represents). I argue that the contrast between the private and public statuses of the area encourages the viewer to interpret the private Mausoleum as part of the public narrative, even though the senate did not commission it. This proximity allows the emperor to foster private participation in his own cult; whether that is the *vivus* cult or the *Divus* cult remains up to the viewer. During his lifetime, the Mausoleum's location signifies to the viewer its status as a *vivus* cult place before considering ritual activity and a ritual focus. The northern Campus had been the location of Romulus' apotheosis, making the placement of the Mausoleum nearby, to Paul Rehak, a flagrant reminder of what happens to Roman founders.¹³⁵ The memory of Romulus' mythic apotheosis colors any statements of Augustus' more-than-human status and divine qualities, presenting a clear culmination of events long before his death in 14 CE.

I follow Henner von Hesberg's reconstruction of the Mausoleum, in which he presents inscriptions in Carrara marble on either side and above the entrance; in my view these Carrara plaques further place the monument in an Augustan narrative of *vivus* cult.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ The bronze statue of the emperor at the height of the structure will be addressed in the next chapter's analysis, specifically sections IVA and VIB.

¹³⁵ Livy, *AUC*, 1.16; Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 61, 144. The connection to Romulus is again repeated in the proximity of the *Domus Augusti* and Temple of Apollo to Romulus' hut on the Palatine. Rehak does not read Romulus in the west panel of the *Ara Pacis*, instead suggesting Numa.

¹³⁶ Von Hesberg, and Panciera, *Das Mausoleum des Augustus*, 28, fig 47, as Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 266 n. 123 cites; Davies, *Death and the Emperor*; Hesberg "posits a masonry drum reveted with

Before Augustus' death in 14 CE, a Carrara plaque around the Mausoleum's entrance listed the names of those interred inside. The senate later deified many of the names inscribed there,¹³⁷ but Augustus in building the Mausoleum during his lifetime as a private citizen was able to cultivate a narrative of his own divinity, without contradicting his own public and official stance (as they were represented in the *Ara Pacis* and *horologium*). In these locations, the cult of Augustus was added to existing official cults, but did not hinder or divert any public worship there. At the Mausoleum, Augustus stands alone as the only divinity. As the first Augustan monument to use the material, the Mausoleum visually establishes the narrative; Carrara marble here marks not just a tomb for the dead, but a liminal space where the divine disengages from the mortal, and both receive ritual (see Chapter 4, section VIB). The colossal bronze statue topping the monument emphasized this point; just as the colossal statue of Augustus rises to heaven, so too will the man (as Romulus had before him). The fact the emperor built the statue, Carrara entrance, and the monument as a whole while he was a younger man, makes his private aims clear to the viewer, inviting her to place this monument both at the beginning and at the end of Augustus' living cult. The circular nature of the narrative and the non-linear chronology (that Augustus *vivus* is/was recognized as a god before *Divus* Augustus) encourages the viewer to remove Augustus from the binary of mortal and divine, placing him in somewhere in the middle. Augustus publically and officially had the status of a mortal man, but as a private citizen visually addressing other private citizens, his living cult unofficially laid the foundations for his posthumous deification.

travertine and with Carrara marble to either side of the entrance, where inscriptions named those interred inside." Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 39 has Carrara around the entire doorway.

¹³⁷ Especially Livia, who was interred there in 29 CE but not deified until 42.

Carrara marble here on the Mausoleum, on the temple structure of Apollo Palatinus, the nearby *Ara Pacis Augustae*, the *vici* altars throughout the city, and in the Forum Augustum, designated them all as cult places for the worship of Augustus *vivus* alone or in conjunction with other gods. After his death, the monuments became cult places to the *Divus* with no revision. I do not believe the emperor's name was added to the Carrara entrance plaque, since the visual narrative of the space and the cult places of the city had already confirmed his eventual status.

VI. Conclusion: Cult Places for the *Divus*

After the emperor's changed in status from man to god, the places and terms I have analyzed in this chapter did not lose their original meaning; instead, they transitioned with the *Divus* Augustus to meet the new, public needs of Roman participants in his cult. In the following paragraphs, I first address the usage of the adjective-*cum*-epithet Augustus after 14 CE, and the role of the *universi cives* in promoting *consensus*. Second, I examine cult places of the living emperor that served his *Divus* cult in the years before his temple's dedication in 37 CE. Finally, I analyze how the addition of the *Res Gestae* to the Mausoleum enhanced the northern Campus Martius' status as a cult place by further connecting the existing monuments to the narrative of Augustus' deification. The status of these locations as cult places to the *vivus*, in my view, relies upon their ability to serve these same individuals and municipalities as they worshiped the newly made *Divus*. The same *universi cives* partook in both the private and public cult, so the elements of the emperor's cult must transition from *vivus* to *Divus* as smoothly as his status.

After Augustus' deification and during Tiberius' reign, the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augustus* did not lose its efficacy as more people, gods, and places became *Augusti*. In the provinces, as it had with *vivus* Augustus, the adjective-*cum*-epithet advertised a close reading and local participation in imperial events and ideology at Rome.¹³⁸ Lott finds these local interpretations throughout the provinces a marker of Tiberius' "general effort to more carefully control the reaction to and commemoration of important imperial events,"¹³⁹ but a private interpretation of the adjective-*cum*-epithet applies here as it did during Augustus' lifetime. Local participants demonstrate their cognizance of imperial events and narratives in order to participate in their own private and local cult. After Augustus' deification, that cognizance includes both the cult of *Divus* Augustus and *vivus* Tiberius. Tiberius and private individuals must partake in the same negotiations of *vivus* divinity as Augustus, while at the same time participating in his late-father's *Divus* cult. Lott reads the adjective-*cum*-epithet (which he calls eponymous) as promoting the *consensus* of the new regime, but I read any *consensus* for Tiberius as recalling Augustus' *Res Gestae* and 34, specifically the *consensus universorum civium* by which Augustus gained his authority.¹⁴⁰ I build upon Lott's argument, adding that the private (not eponymous) adjective-*cum*-epithet expanded in the people, places, and gods that were participating in the narrative; the cult of first emperor (now *Divus*) continued to

¹³⁸ Cf. n. 3, 4 on the interweaving and infusion of cults, and also section III, n. 50 *supra* on Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 146-7 on provincial awareness of Rome and Augustan policy and ideology, and also n. 51 Van Andringa, "M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae)," 100, 103, 107-8 in the same section on Pompeii.

¹³⁹ Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 150-1, which gives a dedication from Interamna in Umbria reading "*Saluti Perpetuae Augustae / Libertatique Publicae / Populi Romani*" and "*Providentiae Ti. Caesaris Augusti nati ad aeternitatem / Romani nominis, sublato hoste perniciosissimo p(opuli) R(omani)*" as evidence of an awareness of the fall of Sejanus (*CIL* XI 4170=*ILS* 157).

¹⁴⁰ In 28-27 BCE after Augustus attained all things *per consensum universorum*, he gave all his power to the Senate and People of Rome (*Res Gestae* 34, "*In consulatu sexto et septimo, postquam bella civilia exstinxeram, per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium, rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli*").

multiply throughout the *universi* population of the empire. The idea of *consensus universorum civium*, as the *Res Gestae* presents and as Lott understands it, includes what I read as both sides of the negotiation active in the imperial cult –the authority by which Augustus reigns in heaven and reigned on earth and the *universi cives* who recognized Augustus’ authority and status on a local level.¹⁴¹

In the city of Rome, beyond the use of the adjective-*cum*-epithet, the population of the city still visits the cult places for *vivus* Augustus to participate in the cult of the *Divus*. Although the Temple of *Divus* Augustus was completed during Tiberius’ reign, it was dedicated when Caligula became emperor in 37 CE. The *universi* population in Rome accordingly lacked an official and public cult place to worship *Divus* Augustus for nearly the entirety of Tiberius’ reign.¹⁴² Rehak believes that in the meantime “the principal cult of Augustus must have been celebrated in the forum of Augustus for nearly a quarter-century.”¹⁴³ He clarifies that this does not mean worship was stagnant; during this time

¹⁴¹ Cf. section II, n. 15 for the uses of *universus* in the *Res Gestae* and the role of *consensus* in the authority of the emperor.

¹⁴² Fishwick, “On the Temple of Divus ‘Augustus’,” 232; Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 141, no reason is given for the delayed dedication, but Tiberius’ absence from Rome may have been a contributing factor. Suetonius, *DA*, 100.4 gives a later interpretation of the timeline of events. Mario Torelli, “Augustus, Divus, Templum (Novum); Aedes,” in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, ed. Eva Margareta Steinby, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (Rome: Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, 1993), 145-6, states that Tiberius’ aversion to divine honors caused the delay: “l’edificio, lasciato a lungo incompiuto a causa dell’evidente avversione di Tiberio per il culto imperiale (Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, 57.10.2; Suetonius, *Tib.*, 47; Tacitus, *Ann.*, 6.45).” Torelli’s sources all post-date Tiberius and the temple by far, and other scholarship has supported the idea that Tiberius may have not unequivocally avoided the imperial cult (cf. Lily Ross Taylor, “Tiberius’ Refusals of Divine Honors,” *TAPA* 60 (1929): 87-101, although her interpretation of the *genius Augusti* is flawed; Steven J. Green, “Undeifying Tiberius: A Reconsideration of Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 1.2,” *CQ* 60, no. 1 (2010): 274-6 demonstrates ways to use later sources to understand Tiberius’ relationship with divinity; Champlin, “Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins,” 73-99 on Tiberius creating his own kind of divinity.) John Scheid, *Romulus et ses Frères: Le Collège des Frères Arvales, Modèle du Culte Public Dans la Rome des Empereurs*, (École Française de Rome, 1990), 421 asserts that a sacrifice of an ox to *Divus* Augustus on his birthday in 35 CE must have taken place on the Capitoline since the new temple was not complete.

¹⁴³ *Imperium and Cosmos*, 141, casually adding the controversial interpretation of Seneca’s *De Tranquillitate Animi* 14.9, that daily sacrifices took place at the Mausoleum. I do not address this interpretation here or in Chapter 4.

official rituals for the new god took place at the Temple of Mars Ultor.¹⁴⁴ As construction progressed and later while dedication was delayed, I agree with Rehak that the Forum Augustum would have provided a cult place where Romans could worship the *Divus*, surrounded by images and buildings in Carrara marble. I add that Romans were not limited to the Forum alone; the compital altars and the northern Campus Martius, I addressed in this chapter could all serve as official, public cult places for the *Divus*. The shift from private to public after formal deification did not require an explanation or addendum for worshippers at a cult place.

I see further evidence of a smooth transition from *vivus* to *Divus* in the northern Campus Martius with the addition of the *Res Gestae* to the Mausoleum after 14 CE. Augustus himself composed the *Res Gestae* and gave instructions for its public use after his death; as a text in a cult place it embodies the movement from private to public in Augustus' cult.¹⁴⁵ Since sanctuaries for Augustus' *Divus* cult throughout the empire received and displayed copies in both Greek and Latin, the text itself allows individuals outside of Rome to call to mind Augustus' monumental changes to the city as a *vivus*,

¹⁴⁴ *Imperium and Cosmos*, 141, which Fishwick, "On the Temple of Divus 'Augustus'," 232, 245 clarifies, citing Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, 56.46.4, that a gold εἰκόνη of *Divus* Augustus lay on a *lectisternium* in the Temple of Mars Ultor. Claudia Cecamore, *Palatium*, 205, 207 argues that the *Ara Numinis Augusti* on the Palatine served as a place of worship for *Divus* Augustus until his temple was completed in 37 CE. She assesses from literary evidence that the *Ara Numinis Augusti* became the altar of the temple, "l'ara dedicata da Tiberio potrebbe essere diventata, dopo il 37 d.C., l'altare del tempio," (207). Her conclusions would make this altar, dedicated during the emperor's lifetime (cf. Chapter 2, section IV, n. 156), another cult place within the city that shared in the emperor's relationship with the Palatine. Since the materials of the altar are unknown, specifically whether or not this altar visually shared in the Carrara of other monuments, I cannot definitely place it within this narrative of monuments and cult places.

¹⁴⁵ Suetonius and Dio record the publication of the *Res Gestae* after Augustus' death: Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, 56.33.1; Suetonius, *DA*, 101.4. Circulation and readership in Rome is unknown. Suna Güven, "Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All," *JSAH* 57, no. 1 (1998): 31 finds it odd that Strabo, *Geographica*, 5.3.8 makes no comment on the *Res Gestae*, but takes the time to describe other features (e.g. the statue). I hold that Strabo visited during Augustus' lifetime and therefore would not have read the unpublished *Res Gestae* but could have viewed the statue (cf. Chapter 4, section IVA).

while permitting worshippers to claim participation in the Roman iteration of his *Divus* cult.¹⁴⁶

A crucial example of this participation is the *Res Gestae*'s mention of the *Ara Pacis* which places the reader within the Campus Martius as a space and in a location celebrating Augustus and an Augustan god:¹⁴⁷ "...*aram Pacis Augustae senatus pro reditu meo consacranda censuit ad campum Martium...*; ... the senate decreed the altar of Pax Augusta must be consecrated at the Campus Martius in thanks for my return..."¹⁴⁸ A reader outside of Rome would use the text to place herself within the space of the northern Campus Martius, where the *Res Gestae* and *Ara Pacis* resided. The *Res Gestae* only mentions Pax Augusta of the five public Augustan deities, making the use of the adjective-*cum*-epithet here unique.¹⁴⁹ Cooley emphasizes the novelty and innovation of the cult of Pax Augusta, specifically its distribution by means of the *Res Gestae* to the rest of the empire.¹⁵⁰ Even though its publication post-dates the *vivus* cult, I read the text using the adjective-*cum*-epithet and the connected monuments to call to mind visual cult places. These cult places were initially constructed for the *vivus*, but the language and timeline of the *Res Gestae* draw for the reader as viewer a map of the city's cult places as they had functioned for Augustus *vivus* and now the *Divus*. The text continues the Mausoleum's play on chronology (events and locations described by the *vivus* yet

¹⁴⁶ Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 7 on the translation and transmission of the text, and the connection between the inscription and cult, as seen in both Greek and Latin at the Temple of Roma and Augustus in Ancyra, which Elsner, "Inventing Imperium," supports. Cf. section III, n. 50 on Augustan gods outside of Rome in Lepcis Magna, and n. 51 on Pompeii.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. section I, n. 5-7 on cult place, space, and place requiring the interaction of the individual or viewer.

¹⁴⁸ *Res Gestae* 12.2, dating the senate's dedication to 13 BCE, after Augustus' return from Spain.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. section III, n. 44 on the five official Augustan gods in Rome. The only other use of the adjective-*cum*-epithet in the *Res Gestae* is at 35.1 "*foro Aug(usto)*". The *Lares Augusti* are not named.

¹⁵⁰ Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 156 pointing out that Pax Augusta was the first public Augustan god and that the *Ara Pacis* was the first monument in Rome specifically for a cult of Pax. The distribution of the text spread Augustus' Peace throughout an empire already subdued by Augustan Peace.

published after he had become a *Divus*), creating an image of Rome where Augustus simultaneously lives and has died, making him as a more-than-human person as enduring as the monuments he built.

I additionally apply this process of using the *Res Gestae* to read the monuments as cult places for the *vivus/Divus* with the *horologium*. When placed in the narrative of the nearby Mausoleum, the Latin inscription on the base of the *horologium* gains further Augustan meaning. Jaś Elsner connects the Latin inscription with its nearby counterpart on the *Res Gestae*: “*Aegypto in potestatem / populi romani redacta*” of the inscription mirrors the “*Aegyptum imperio populi Romani adieci*” of *Res Gestae* 27.1.¹⁵¹ Given that the Mausoleum also featured obelisks made from rose granite, the two monuments present parallel images of Augustus’ divinity and his progression from *vivus* to *Divus*.¹⁵² I look beyond the texts to the obelisk pointing towards heaven, drawing a parallel with the bronze colossal statue of Augustus at the top of the Mausoleum, which I will analyze in the next chapter; both monument, inscriptions, and statue place the *vivus* (and later *Divus*) Augustus closer to heaven than earth.¹⁵³ This again permits the viewer to interpret Augustus’ status as enduring and resistant to time; the emperor’s proximity to heaven or earth depends on a pre- or post-date of 14 CE.

¹⁵¹ Elsner, “Inventing Imperium,” 39-40 on *Res Gestae* 27.1. Elsner states that the *Res Gestae* is quoted by the obelisk, but given the chronology the reverse is correct.

¹⁵² Cf. section VB, n. 126, Swetnam-Burland, “‘Aegyptus Redacta’,” 146 on rose granite and Augustus’ control of the stone through his control of Egypt. Elsner, “Inventing Imperium,” 39 claims that the *Res Gestae* cannot be reduced to text, but that the text is inseparable from the experience of standing in front of the monument. Heslin, “Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti,” 16, cf. n. 151 *supra*, the obelisk further connects to the Mausoleum in the similar language of inscriptions and the material of rose granite.

¹⁵³ The statue will be addressed in further detail in Chapter 4, section IVA. Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 38, speculating that the Mausoleum was the tallest monument around, taller than the *horologium* and taller than the pediment of the Temple of Venus in Pompey’s theatre; 43 on how the colossal statue literally lifted the viewer’s eye towards heaven, citing Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 34.12, “*columnarum ratio erat attolli super ceteros mortales*,” which Rehak translates as “the purpose of placing statu[e]s on columns was to elevate them above all other mortals.” Cf. Chapter 4, section IVA, n. 82.

I stress that the repetition of rose granite at the Mausoleum on the smaller obelisks holding the bronze plates of the *Res Gestae*, in conjunction with the Carrara plaques around the entrance, further references the link between the three monuments as cult places to both the *vivus* and *Divus*. A local pedestrian could witness for herself the monumental narrative of the space during and after the emperor's life, but a provincial visitor would rely more on the visual relationship in the monument's materials and proximity. As provincial Romans in Lepcis Magna and Pompeii demonstrated their familiarity with Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum and Fortuna *Augusti* and Fortuna *Redux* in Rome, respectively, I believe a similarly educated provincial visitor to the city (both during and after the emperor's lifetime) would draw the connections between Pax *Augusta*, the *horologium*, and the Mausoleum.¹⁵⁴ The publication of the *Res Gestae* after the emperor's deification in 14 CE circumvents the need for a visitor to travel to Rome, since it advertises the private cult and cult places of the *vivus* Augustus in the Campus Martius to a *universi* audience looking for places to honor the *Divus*. This development allows for the *vivus/Divus* cult to be prolific yet individual, multilocal yet focused on the city of Rome.

In conclusion, I follow Deena Ragavan's and Kathleen Ashley's views on ritual activity and landscape, asserting that the compital altars of the *vici* and monuments of the norther Campus Martius enabled ritual activity for both the emperor's *vivus* and *Divus* cults.¹⁵⁵ I interpret these sites as anchoring his cult within the topography of the city and becoming mnemonic devices in the cultural and cultic memory of Romans. As the

¹⁵⁴ Cf. section III, n. 50, Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 144-6 for the cult, 146-7 for the cult's significance.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. section I, n. 6 and 7, how viewer moving through Rome participated in shaping the function and meaning of cult places to the *vivus* Augustus there.

emperor progressed from *vivus* to *Divus*, these locations recalled his divine qualities and more-than-human status, encouraging the viewer (either before or after 14 CE) to interpret Augustus' cult and status as enduring and perpetual. In light of this, my possible explanation for Tiberius' delay in dedicating the Temple of *Divus* Augustus is that the private cult places already met the need for a public cult place, thus removing any urgency in dedicating a public one. The participants in the *Divus* cult were the same people who visited the cult places for the *vivus*, negating the need for an official directive or public cult place to redirect them. The private cult places and Augustan gods I have analyzed above provide the locations for the ritual functions of both *vivus* and *Divus* Augustus for Romans in the city as they had in the provinces; these places transformed from private to public cult as the participants moved from unofficial to official worship. I analyze in the following chapter cultic statues of Augustus and how the ritualized movements of participants around these foci in the city shaped the function and meaning of sacrifices and cult places to fit their ritual needs.¹⁵⁶

¹⁵⁶ Cf. section I, n. 7 on the reciprocal relationship between the viewer and the artwork.

Chapter 4 LOOKS LIKE A GOD: CULTIC STATUES OF THE LIVING EMPEROR

My analyses in this chapter expand my arguments in the previous two, examining cultic statues of the living emperor as the focus of private rituals within the cult places of Rome. To avoid confusion between posthumous cult statues of the *Divus* and cult statues of the *vivus*, I term the latter ‘cultic statues,’ since they relate to the imperial cult but are not yet official representations of its public manifestation; however, I find no difference between a cultic statue and a cult statue other than chronology, since cultic statues of the *vivus* became cult statues of the *Divus* with only a possible change in the inscription to denote the difference.¹ I assess the no-longer extant statues in the Pantheon, atop the Mausoleum as well as the eighty silver statues mentioned in the *Res Gestae* as private cultic statues in the emperor’s living cult. I will argue that cultic statues focus the worship of the imperial cult by making the absent emperor present to private worshippers in the cult places of Rome.

A statue as a focal point for private worship is often interwoven within other, public cults, encouraging the negotiation between emperor and citizens that is inherent in the imperial cult.² I contextualize non-extant cultic statues based on terminology, location,

¹ My separation of cultic and cult statues in this study serves as a marker of a statue within the particular narrative, not necessarily as it would have appeared in the author’s time. Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 182-3, 185, 189, 226; Koortbojian attempts to find visual differences between statues of the man and those of the god. When he cannot isolate any specific differences, or determine re-cutting, he argues that inscriptions on the statue bases would have provided the correct identification.

² Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 for the interweaving and infusion of Augustus into existing cultic framework both in Rome and in the provinces, and Chapter 3, n. 4 on Lott, “The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome,” 146-7 on provincial awareness of Rome and Augustan policy expressed in architecture and cult practices, but I assert that the same practice occurs in Rome.

and appearance, utilizing descriptions and analyses of them in literature.³ From these contexts, I extrapolate from the evidence how ritual participants engaged with these statues in their private ritual activity. While ancient sources are largely silent on this matter, I base my analyses on literary evidence, emphasizing the perspective of the viewer and the emperor's side of the negotiation between citizens and *princeps*, in order to shed light on the ways these statues as cultic images define the practices of the imperial cult.

My analyses begins with a review of the ancient sources I employ (especially Dio Cassius), and then I establish that cultic statues of the emperor were not unique to Rome and how they would have received worship and evoked Augustus' presence. The following sections assess four aspects related to the cultic statues of Augustus: terminology, location, appearance, and the ritual activity surrounding these images, with each area limited to the available evidence. For example, the appearance of the Mausoleum's and Pantheon's statues is unknown, but I derive their location, terminology, and the ritual activity directed towards them from their contexts. Some speculation is required, but I base any and all such theories in the surviving evidence and practices with the imperial cult.

The movement from Augustus' private to public worship with cult statues, although a cult place and ritual activity are required, stands somewhat outside of time.⁴ Just as it had

³ Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 6 suggests an etic perspective for examining cult statues in ancient contexts, where the perspective of the viewer supersedes modern interpretations. Mylonopoulos' analyses focus on position (here location), appearance, and cult involvement. Gregory, "Powerful images: responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome," 84 posits that visual language "exercised power... through their location in space and the way they look," quoting from A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf, ed., *Literacy and power in the ancient world* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 8.

⁴ Derks, *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices*, 133 where ritual focus is a required component of a cult place. He defines as cult place: "cult places are spaces intended for the worship of one or more

in the previous chapter, the viewer manipulates the narrative and chronology of Augustus' progression from *vivus* to *Divus* depending on her perspective; monuments that had been cult places to Augustus *vivus* serve as those for the *Divus*, making the emperor simultaneously alive and deified.⁵ This lack of temporality rests on the fact that images of *vivus* Augustus were visually indistinguishable from images of *Divus* Augustus.⁶ The same statues of the *vivus* (on foot, driving a *quadriga*, on a horse, *capite velato*, etc.) served as cult statues after his deification in 14 CE.⁷ These statues of Augustus were not imbued with divinity overnight, but in the same way that his divinity was not a spontaneous, public reaction after his funeral, they are part of a movement from living, private cult to public cult. Michael Koortbojian allows that in Rome statues of the emperor might, "contemporaneously appear as both man *and* god. This fact enforced (and in some sense forged) the very elasticity that marks the representation of the new *divi* at the advent of empire."⁸ This is, in part, the reason why the appearance of Augustus' cult statues alone does not prove their status as cult statues –the facial features and pose of a statue do not change after deification. Therefore, the title of this chapter is meant to be tongue-in-cheek, since these cult statues already had a 'divine appearance' when they were originally set up in the city. This lack of visual divine attributes coupled with chronological ambiguity fits with cult statues for other gods, where the ancient viewer did

cosmological powers, separate from the profane world, in which the members of the cult community regularly gather in order to perform their personal or collective rituals before a ritual focus." Cf. Chapter 1, section IV, n. 64 and Chapter 3, n. 1.

⁵ Cf. Chapter 3, sections VC and VI for this play with chronology, especially with the Mausoleum as the first and final Augustan monument.

⁶ Cf. n. 1 *supra*, Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 182-3, 185, 189, 226, where a change in the inscription would have been the only way to distinguish a cultic from a cult statue. Cf. section IIIA, n. 57 below on the inherent ambiguity in terminology for cult statues that encouraged this lack of black-and-white identification for other gods.

⁷ Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 189.

⁸ *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 182-3 (emphasis his), speaking specifically about the various charges of *maiestas* after Augustus' deification, which are briefly assessed below in section IIIB. Terminology: Authorial Frequencies.

not require the same cues as a modern scholar to tell the difference.⁹ Because cultic/cult statues of Augustus received both private and public worship as the emperor's reign progressed, I do not categorize them by specific dates, statue types, or features.

I. Sources

While the surviving ancient literature often does not tell us everything about how a cultic statue was situated within a cult place and how people interacted with it there, the language describing a non-extant statue in a text does provide us with a Roman's perspective. The literary context and the author's reactions to a statue establish a framework from which we can infer ritual, and assess that statue as a cultic statue of Augustus.¹⁰ Surviving statues of Augustus (e.g. the Prima Porta) are not included in my analysis because they exist outside of their original context, and are therefore even further separated from descriptions of ritual activity in a cult place.¹¹ Within a literary account, the author locates a cultic statue within a cult place, and his language in describing both alludes to the ritual practices he leaves out. Although any conclusions from literary descriptions of non-extant statues cannot and never will be definitive, I assert that they

⁹ Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 8 emphasizing that we cannot visually tell the difference between statues of gods and mortals, and that ancient viewers were better equipped than modern scholars. This observation would have greatly helped Koortbojian's attempt to find visual differences (cf. n. 1 *supra*); Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 183-5, 189 eventually supports this view of Augustus, without making statements about ancient viewers. This position counters the following arguments, where the *vivus* could be distinguished visually from the *Divus*: Price, *Rituals and Power*, 177, 178; Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 33-4; Jörg Rüpke, "Representation or Presentation? Picturing the Divine in Ancient Rome," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 12 (2010): 186.

¹⁰ Bodel, "Cicero's Minerva, *Penates*, and the Mother of the *Lares*," 263 arguing that a statue as a thing is a neutral until it was put in a setting; Van Andringa, "Statues in the Temples of Pompeii," 110 that cults could be interwoven in a single setting (i.e. temple) and must be viewed on a local level; Michael Lipka, *Roman Gods: A Conceptual Approach* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 13-14 argues that no cult statue could function outside of its spatial context. Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 on the infusion of cults as a feature of the imperial cult.

¹¹ Gregory, "Powerful images: responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome," 82-3 presents and supports the point that literary discussions of statues in their original context preserves the viewers response to the objects.

provide necessary and contemporary perspective on a cultic statue within its original (public or private) context.

Unlike my analyses presented in previous chapters, my argument and analysis in this chapter relies, in part, on Dio Cassius as a source for cult statues. Dio's treatments of the statues in the Pantheon and the silver statues set up throughout the city are valuable to an assessment of the progression of the imperial cult, because they present the images to a reader who is familiar with established imperial processes. As was the case with Dio's account of libations and prayers to Augustus, analyzed in Chapter 2, section IB, Dio does not necessarily invent practices, but rather includes both the official and unofficial presentations of Augustus' status;¹² libations and prayers on the emperor's behalf were the official custom, as the *Res Gestae* records, but they were unofficially offered to the emperor directly. Similarly, he reports images of both the *vivus* and the *Divus* to his audience; his audience saw these statues (the ones that still remained) as images of the deified emperor, but his descriptions additionally portray them in their original context as images of the *vivus*. In the following paragraphs I address Dio as a source for statues and his anachronistic speeches from his history of Augustus' lifetime.

A pressing critique of Dio as a source for this time period is that he wrote over two-hundred years after these events took place; he neither saw the Pantheon as it stood in Augustus' time, nor could he have seen the eighty silver statues that were destroyed and repurposed long before his birth.¹³ Moreover, the cult of *Divus* Augustus, to Dio, was not

¹² Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 27 for Flower, "The Tradition of the Spolia Opima," 52-3 in this assertion, since it is not the case for every instance that Dio's history introduced anachronistic elements "based on practices or expectations current in his own day."

Also cf. Chapter 2, section IB, n. 19 for the passage and my discussion on Dio presenting both customs to his readers.

¹³ Section IVB specifically argues against anachronisms in Dio's presentation of the Pantheon. I argue that his language clearly indicates an image of the *vivus*, not *Divus*.

the private and unofficial cult of Augustus *vivus* as it appeared in poetic scenes of sacrifices and in cult places throughout the city. Dio addresses the development of Augustus' cult, however, in his inclusion of official and unofficial practice (as with the libations) and also in the specifics of his language (as I argue in section IIIC below). The negotiation between *princeps* and his citizens would have lost much of its nuance by the third century, but I assert that Dio's history aims to present the early elements of the imperial cult. His use of events recorded in the *acta* as sources and material culture (monuments, statues, and coins) provide the evidence for his accounts of early cultic practice to his later audience.

Dio often made use of specific language to report the information contained within his annalistic sources to his contemporary, Roman audience.¹⁴ Although he wrote in Greek, his accounts employ Roman practices to convey his meaning in Greek.¹⁵ For example, Dio names the first emperor Αὔγουστος rather than the historical and preferred Σεβαστός of Strabo;¹⁶ the title Αὔγουστος was more familiar to his Roman reader, and would have conveyed the Roman practice to a Greek one, but in neither case did he introduce a title

¹⁴ Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 26 for Swan, "Cassius Dio on Augustus," 274, 277, 285, 288; Swan argues that Dio utilized source material from both the *acta senatus* and *acta diurna* and annalistic sources (the exact text is unknown) in his accounts of Augustan Rome, especially books 51-60. These sources detailed public works, spectacles, prodigies, public transactions of the senate, and unusual events of popular interest counters the arguments of Fergus Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 100 and Bernd Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus: philologische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern 45-56 des dionischen Geschichtswerkes* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979), 87-92, who both are apprehensive about chronology and annalistic sources in Dio. Swan adds that their apprehension "is of course a widespread attitude among scholars, so that Millar and Manuwald could be said to have provided a theoretical justification for it" (273). Swan notes a Suetonian *terminus ante quem* for his annalistic sources.

¹⁵ Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 18 on individuals using Roman practices in the provinces to present Augustan power to themselves, and cf. Chapter 2, sections IIA-B on Horace emphasizing Roman practices by alluding to Hellenistic traditions, and cf. Chapter 3, section IIIA on Italian Carrara marble supplanting Pentelic marble in Roman monuments during Augustus' reign.

¹⁶ Rubincam, "The Nomenclature of Julius Caesar and the Later Augustus in the Triumviral Period," 98 notes the difference in Dio's language and that Σεβαστός was far more common in Greek inscriptions and the works of other Greek authors, cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 18.

the was contemporary to his own time.¹⁷ I read Dio's descriptions of Augustus' cultic statues (i.e., the terms used, their locations, and appearances) to portray the man who transitioned from *vivus* to *Divus*, rather than a post-14 CE image of only the *Divus*. Just as his account of libations included both official and unofficial custom, I find his accounts of statues to include specific language that describe the *vivus* Augustus. These statues were erected during the emperor's lifetime and transitioned to depict the *Divus* Augustus without requiring viewers and ritual participants to revise their actions, location, or appearance. Therefore, I consider Dio's descriptions of the cultic statues of Augustus *vivus* as descriptions based on annalistic sources from Augustus' reign.

I do not, however, assign Dio's manufactured speeches the same value as accounts of material culture and events. In the case of Dio's reported debate between Augustus, Agrippa, and Maecenas, in which Maecenas speaks about the nature of the emperor's statues, there is no reason to believe this conversation took place, or that it reflects Dio's view of the first emperor's practices. Instead, this conversation provides more information about later emperors than it does for Augustus.¹⁸

<p>Τὴν τε οὖν ἄλλην λαμπρότητα σπαντῶ διὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων παρασκεύαζε, καὶ εἰκόνας σου χρυσᾶς μὲν ἢ καὶ ἀργυρᾶς μηδέποτε ἐπιτρέψῃς γενέσθαι· οὐ γὰρ μόνον δαπανηραὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐεπιβούλευτοι καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνιοί εἰσιν, ἄλλας δὲ ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαῖς καὶ ἀκηράτους καὶ ἀθανάτους ἐξ εὐεργεσιῶν δημιουργεῖ.¹⁹</p>	<p>You must provide through your good deeds any additional splendor for yourself, and you should never permit gold or silver <i>eikonas</i> of yourself to be made for they are not only expensive, but invite treachery and are short-lived, but fashion from your public services other [<i>eikonas</i>] in the souls of your people, which are untarnished and immortal.</p>
---	---

¹⁷ Cf. n. 12 *supra* on Dio not anachronistically introducing trends in every instance.

¹⁸ Duncan Fishwick, "Dio and Maecenas: The Emperor and the Ruler Cult," *Phoenix* 44, no. 3 (1990): 267, 274; G. W. Bowersock, "Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century A.D.," in *Le Culte des souverains dans l'empire romain*, ed. W. den Boer (Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 1973), 205 specifies Dio's Maecenas' advice is a reaction to Commodus and Elagabalus.

¹⁹ 52.35.3. The passage is part of the Agrippa-Maecenas debate (52.2.-40), set in 29 BCE. Eric Adler, "Cassius Dio's Agrippa-Maecenas Debate: An Operational Code Analysis," *AJPh* 133, no. 3 (2012): 477-520 examines the debate from the political science theory of "operational code analysis."

This narrative advises against public and official statuary, specifically εἰκόνες, in gold or silver, which had in fact been the imperial trend since Augustus' time.²⁰ He further adds, in the voice of Maecenas, that Augustus should not have statues since his the minds of his people are his ἀγάλματα.²¹ Contrary to Dio's speech, as I argue in sections II and V, silver statues were prevalent in private practice and were neither commissioned by the emperor, nor with the approval of the senate (i.e. private and unofficial). Private statues in cult places focus the participants' ongoing negotiation of the emperor's cult, and these statues were not destroyed because they depicted the emperor in an atypical, or foreign material. Moreover, Dio deems the prohibited statues here to be εἰκόνες and ἀγάλματα for living emperors; when he later recounts the emperor's repurposed silver statues (53.22.3) he names them ἀνδριάντες, which I prove in my analysis of Dio's terminology are not interchangeable terms.

II. Statues in Context: Silver Statues of the Emperor

The most challenging aspect of my analyses in this chapter is recreating and reconstructing the ritual activity that these cultic statues would have received in Rome. In particular, the eighty silver statues of the *Res Gestae* resist reconstruction and suggest imperial censure, since they were seized and repurposed by Augustus himself. I argue in sections IIIC, V, and VIA that these statues were cultic images that were incorporated into the framework of Apollo's cult on the Palatine and were neither destroyed because of

²⁰ Fishwick, "Dio and Maecenas," 272. The statuary addressed below are privately commissioned images; publically commissioned statues in the Forum Romanum (cf. section V, n. 122 below) are bronze or even gilded bronze.

²¹ 52.35.5: "πάντες δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἀγάλματα (ἐν γὰρ ταῖς γνώμας αὐτῶν αἰεὶ μετ' εὐδοξίας ἐνιδρυθήσῃ); all men will be your *agalmata* (since in their thoughts you will always be enshrined by your virtues)." Cf. section IIIB, n. 70.

their appearance, medium, nor status as cultic images. To stabilize those arguments, I locate in this section other silver statues of Augustus and the imperial family that received worship in cult places throughout the empire, thus demonstrating how ritual participants would have focused their ritual activity on these eighty silver statues and other statues in order to make the absent emperor present to meet their local needs.

While the statues I examine in this chapter are non-extant, we do have literary evidence for statues of Augustus receiving worship in a domestic cult place. As I analyzed in Chapter 2, Ovid possesses five statuettes of the imperial family in a *sacrum Caesaris* in his home.²² We know from the earlier *Ex Ponto* 2.8 that at least the statues depicting Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia are silver, but we cannot say for certain the medium of Drusus' and Germanicus' images. Additionally, Cotta Maximus gave the first three to Ovid (Augustus, Tiberius, and Livia) during Augustus' lifetime.²³ Ovid worshipped the images of the *vivus* Augustus in the same way as the *Divus*, using similar language of prayer and worship:

Argentum felix omni que beatius auro, quod, fuerit pretium cum rude, numen habet! Non mihi diuitias dando maiora dedisses, caelitibus missis nostra sub ora tribus. Est aliquid spectare deos et adesse putare et quasi cum uero numine posse loqui. 10 ... Felices illi, qui non simulacra , sed ipsos, quique deum coram corpora vera vident,	5 Fortunate silver more blessed than any gold, 5 what had been unpolished metal, now has value as a <i>numen</i> ! By giving me riches, you could not have given [me] more than the triple gods you have sent to our shores. It is something to look at gods and to imagine them present and to be able to speak [to them] just as with a true <i>numen</i> . 10 ... Happy are those, who [see] not simulacra , but the gods themselves, whoever sees before their eyes
---	--

²² *Ex Ponto* 4.9.105-112, cf. Chapter 2, section IIIA, n. 98 for the full passage.

²³ Cf. Chapter 2, section IIIA, n. 99 for the dating of Galasso, "Epistulae ex Ponto," 195 and Tissol, *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto*, Book I, 1 that the first three *Epistulae Ex Ponto* cannot be dated after 13 CE. For the statuettes Cotta Maximus gave in 2.8 being the same as those in 4.9: Tissol, *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto*, Book I, 111; McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 105; Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*, 202-4; Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, Volume 1, 347; Scott, "Emperor Worship in Ovid," 65.

quod quoniam nobis invidit inutile fatum, quos dedit ars, vultus effigiemque colo . ²⁴ 60	the true form of the gods; since hostile fate refused us that, I worship the face and effigies which art made. 60
---	---

Ovid rejoices in and worships his silver *effigies* and its ability to make Augustus present. The poet does not outline his specific ritual practices in 2.8 beyond the word *colo*, but he directs ritual and sacrifices to the cultic statue of the absent emperor. Later in *Ex Ponto* 4.9, Ovid continues his worship of the statuettes after Augustus became a *divus*, giving us the elements of his ritual activity: “*his ego do totiens cum ture precantia verba*; I offer incense to them and words of prayer.”²⁵ The worship (*colo*, *cum ture precantia verba*) transitions from the *vivus* to the *Divus* emperor, in both instances making the absent Augustus present. This, I argue, is the same concept of ritual applied to Augustus’ statues in the civic setting of Rome. The statues manifest the emperor’s divine aspects, like his Jupiter-esque authority over earth,²⁶ focusing the poet’s ritual activity in a cult place on the image of the absent emperor, with Ovid’s goal of making the emperor present to meet his needs. This is not to say that the act of viewing a statue alone makes it cultic, but rather that the combination of viewing a statue in a specific context where the image is imbued with the divine aspects of the god and where ritual is performed with the image as a focus. Since we cannot always recreate or assert ritual from the author’s description, we rely on what the viewer would have seen, the possible messages or meanings of that image, and the context of the image in a space. Both Ovid’s domestic statuettes and the civic cultic statues in Rome are the means by which ritual participants communicate with

²⁴ 2.8.5-10, 57-60. The omitted lines include Ovid imagining himself in Rome when he looks at face of Augustus, and offering prayers to the *Domus Augusta* for their prosperity. He also details the angry expression on the emperor’s face at line 21: “*Fallor an irati mihi sunt in imagine vultus*; I am deceived, or are the expressions on the image angry with me?”

²⁵ Line 111, cf. Chapter 2, section IIIA, n. 98 for full passage.

²⁶ Cf. Chapter 2, section III, n. 92 for Augustus’ as a Jupiter-on-Earth in Ovid (e.g. *Fasti* 1.608, *Met.* 15.858-60).

the emperor, and the emperor is able (for the participants in Rome) to reciprocate and reinterpret their statements of his divinity.

Ovid is not the only Roman to participate in Augustus' private cult in this way. An inscription from *Gallia Transpadana* dated to the early first century, CE, honors Aulus Virgius Marsus, a military tribune who served in both Augustus' and Tiberius' Praetorian Guard, and bequeaths his five silver statues of Augustus and Tiberius to the *vicus* Anninus in Marruvium (located in central Italy):

<p>A VIRGIO L F MARSO PRIM PIL LEG III GALLICAE ITERVM PRAEF CASTR AEGY PRAEF FABR TR MIL IN PRAET DIVI AVG ET TI CAESARIS AVG COHORT XI ET IIII PRAETORIAN IIIIVIR QVINQ DELATO HON ORE AB DEC ET POPVL IN COL TROAD AVG ET MARRVIO TESTAMENTO DEDIT VICALIBVS ANNINIS IMAGIN CAESARVM ARGENTIAS QVINQVE ET SESTERTIA X MILIA VICALES ANNINIS HONOR CAVSA²⁷</p>	<p>To Aulus Virgius Marsus, son of Lucius, chief centurion of Legion III Gallica for a second time, camp prefect in Egypt, prefect of engineers, military tribune in the praetorian guard of the divine Augustus and Tiberius Caesar Augustus of the eleventh and fourth praetorian cohorts, member of the Board of Four <i>quinquennalis</i> when the office was conferred by the town councilors and people in the Augustan colony in the Troad (Alexandria Troas) and in Marruvium; through his will he granted five silver <i>imagines</i> of the Emperors and 10,000 sesterces to the inhabitants of the district of Anninus (in the territory of Marruvium); the inhabitants of Anninus (set this up) in his honor.²⁸</p>
---	---

The statues are *imagines*, which, like other terms for imperial cult statues, are ambiguous until placed in the context of ritual activity, i.e. the *vicus* Anninus.²⁹ While we cannot know the ritual activity Aulus Virgius Marsus or the members of the *vicus* Anninus directed at these statues, they and Ovid's silver statues attest to the prevalence of cultic and cult statues of the emperor and imperial family.

²⁷ AE 1978.286 and C. Letta, "Le imagines Caesarum di un praefectus castrorum Aegypti e l'XI coorte pretoria," *Athenaeum* 56 (1978):3–19. Letta dates the inscription from 14–51 CE and suspects it was a statue base.

²⁸ Translation from Brian Campbell, *The Roman Army, 31 BC–AD 337: A Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 54. I amended Campbell's translation of IMAGIN to the original Latin, rather than his 'statues.'

²⁹ Cf. section I, n. 10 *supra* on a cult statue requiring a ritual context.

My analysis of non-extant statues, particularly the eighty silver statues of the *Res Gestae*, demonstrates that they fulfilled the same ritual functions as these two examples from outside of Rome: making the absent emperor present to meet the needs of ritual participants. While none of these statues survive in modern times, ancient sources document their prevalence during the emperor's lifetime, as well as their continued use after his deification. While we cannot ever affirm ritual activity with the sources we have, in examining the terminology, location, and appearance of the cultic statues in this chapter, I recreate the ritual activity that would have been directed at them in a cult place. Ancient sources do not always document this ritual activity in the same way that Ovid did,³⁰ but we can shine some light into that gap in our understanding by recognizing these statues' statuses as cultic images of Augustus. From that recognition, I aim in this chapter to demonstrate how participants in the imperial cult, private and public, would have interacted with these statues.

III. Terminology

In the following paragraphs, I define the linguistic parameters for a cult statue and the different terms applied in ancient contexts to indicate a cultic statue of Augustus. Ancient authors do not universally apply these terms in the same way; one author's tendencies and preference cannot be mapped onto another. As Joannis Mylonopoulos succinctly demonstrates, this derives from the fact that antiquity never had specific or exclusive language for a cult statue; any variance in language then captures "the fluid

³⁰ Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 31 on Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 96 and the absence of living cult in Hellenistic sources. I see a repeated absence in Roman sources.

understandings of the functions and forms of an image used in cult.”³¹ The same statue may be (and often was) described with different terms; for example, Tiberius and Livia erected a statue of *Divus* Augustus in 22 CE which was identified as a *signum*, *simulacrum*, and *effigies* in three separate sources:³²

sig(num) divo Augusto patri ad theatrum M(arcelli)/ Iulia Augusta et Ti. Augustus dedicarent ³³	Julia Augusta and Tiberius dedicated a <i>signum</i> to father <i>Divus</i> Augustus at the Theater of Marcellus
A.d. IX k. Maias/ [Taurus Statilius C]orvinus promagister collegii fratrum arvali[um nom]ine/ [ad theatrum M]arcelli ante simulacrum divi Augusti bovem [marem immolavit] ³⁴	The 23 rd of April, Taurus Statilius Corvinus, <i>promagister</i> of the collegium, in the name of the <i>fratres Arvales</i> sacrificed a male bull before the <i>simulacrum</i> of <i>Divus</i> Augustus at the Theater of Marcellus
Neque enim multo ante, cum haud procul theatro Marcelli effigiem divo Augusto Iulia dicaret, Tiberi nomen suo postscripserat... ³⁵	For instance, not long before, when Julia dedicated an <i>effigies</i> to <i>Divus</i> Augustus near the Theater of Marcellus, she had inscribed the name of Tiberius below her own...

These three instances demonstrate that there was uniform public practice and understanding where there was no uniform language to describe it; this differs from the official wording of Augustus’ libations, where the prepositions *pro* and *ὕπὲρ* captured the official stance on Augustus’ divinity (i.e. that he himself is not divine).³⁶ Cultic and cult statues were not unique to Augustus, so participants did not universally invent an entirely new set of terms to describe their practices, both for the *vivus* and the *Divus*. Many descriptions of cultic statues are not contemporary to the emperor’s lifetime, but the three

³¹ Mylonopoulos, “Divine Images *versus* Cult Images,” 4, 5 describing the multiple terms for visualization of the divine.

³² Estienne, “*Simulacra Deorum versus Ornamenta Aedium*,” 258 and 258 n. 7 for all three passages. She calls the statue “apparently a cult statue,” but does not elaborate on the differences between a statue *to* Augustus and a statue *of* Augustus. I posit that they both designate a cult statue, where sacrifices would be offered *to* the image *of* the deified emperor.

³³ *Fasti Praenestini*, for the 23rd of April, in Degraffi’s *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII, 2 l. 131.

³⁴ The comments of the *fratres Arvales* in Scheid, *Romulus et ses Frères*, 30 no. 12c, l. 24-26.

³⁵ Tacitus, *Ann.*, 3.64. Estienne, “*Simulacra Deorum versus Ornamenta Aedium*,” 259 notes that Tacitus more commonly applies *effigies* to statues of both gods and mortals, perhaps to avoid any judgement on the matter.

³⁶ Cf. Chapter 2, section IB for this wording.

examples of the cult statue from 22 CE demonstrate that even after Augustus' cult became public, the language in describing a statue was not consistent.

I follow's Jörg Rüpke's operating definition for 'cult statues,' that such a statue is "a sign or symbol for something else, is 'showing the invisible.'"³⁷ In terms of Augustus *vivus*, I argue that the sign or symbol specifically represents to the viewer the emperor's divine qualities and his physical absence from statue's location. This definition designates a cultic statue of Augustus in relation to its location, appearance, and especially ritual activity, without permitting location to supersede the other two, nor a preference for public or private commissions.³⁸ Rüpke's definition, however, does not emphasize an important requirement for a cult statue: the viewer; "the viewer's gaze transforms a cult statue into the living form of the deity."³⁹ The viewer makes the connection between the cold image and the divine, imbuing that statue with meaning and significance. We see this with Ovid's silver statuettes in *Ex Ponto* 2.8 "*Est aliquid spectare deos et adesse putare et quasi cum uero numine posse loqui... Felices illi, qui non simulacra, sed ipsos, quique deum coram corpora vera vident, quod quoniam nobis*

³⁷ "Representation or Presentation?," 191. This study will not examine statues of Augustus represented as a god. Pollini, "Man or God," 335 divine assimilations or imitations in statues are images of a god with a physiognomic resemblance to a particular individual, or an individual with divine attributes or symbols. An example of this is the statue of Apollo/Augustus in the Palatine temple complex: Lowell Bowditch, "Palatine Apollo and the Imperial Gaze: Propertius 2.31 and 2.32," *AJPh* 130, no. 3 (2009): 411 and Miller, *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*, 204 believe the statue was located in the library-complex, not the temple; Elaine Fantham, "Images of the City: Propertius' New-Old Rome," in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, ed. Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 127 and Alessandro Barchiesi, "Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers," in *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, ed. Karl Galinsky (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 284 believe the statue in the temple is the one Propertius mentions in 2.31, even though Propertius uses no vocabulary for 'statue.'

³⁸ For example, Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 17 classifies 'cult statues' as "those set up in temples or sanctuaries and to whom religious ritual was addressed as if to the gods themselves." This definition relies heavily on the location of a statue, and can be easily undermined by particulars, as will be addressed in detail below.

³⁹ Georgia Petridou, *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 50 where the viewer's "intentions, expectations, cultural references, and psychological preconditioning," make the statue a manifestation of the god.

invidit inutile fatum, quos dedit ars, vultus effigiemque colo; It is something to look at gods and to imagine them present and to be able to speak [to them] just as with a true *numen*... Happy are those, who [see] not *simulacra*, but the gods themselves, whoever sees before their eyes the true form of the gods; since hostile fate refused us that, I worship the face and *effigies* which art made.”⁴⁰ Ovid’s vision of the silver statuette of Augustus produces his reaction, even before he tells the reader this statuette’s and the others’ location in his *sacrum Caesaris* in *Ex Ponto* 4.9.⁴¹ With this aspect in mind, I address the cultic statues examined in this chapter from the perspective of the viewer, whether that is the author as viewer, the viewer within the author’s account, or the reader as viewer.

Ritual activity is the glue that connects all three areas of this chapter’s assessment, in which the participants and viewers engage with the physically absent emperor. One area on its own does not make a statue cultic, since images become symbols of the divine when they are put in a place for a viewer to see.⁴² In this way, I assert that a cultic statue of Augustus *vivus* is similar to his *numen* in poetry –the statue is a visual representation of a divine metonymy, making the divine aspect of the emperor present.⁴³ While the emperor’s *numen* had no image,⁴⁴ but was an aspect of the living man, I argue that his cultic statue, as “showing the invisible,” made his divine aspect visible to the viewer. The

⁴⁰ Lines 9-10, 57-60, cf. section II, n. 24 for full excerpt.

⁴¹ No location is specified in *Ex Ponto* 2.8 for the statuettes other than Ovid’s possession.

⁴² Cf. section I, n. 10 above for a cultic statue being neutral until it was put in a setting, and how its setting and context must be viewed on a local level.

⁴³ Cf. Chapter 2, n. 4 and section IIC for Fishwick, “Genius and Numen,” 361 *numen* in Augustan literature as a metonymy for god, and 362 on the absence of pictures of the *numen Augusti*: “... there are no pictures of the *numen Augusti*; nor could there be.”

⁴⁴ Fishwick, “Genius and Numen,” 362 on the absence of pictures of the *numen Augusti*: “... there are no pictures of the *numen Augusti*; nor could there be.”

viewer, like the audience in poetry, participates with the guidance of the location, appearance, and ritual activity.⁴⁵

III.A. Terminology: Basic Definitions

As has been the case with most terms relating to the imperial cult and divinity of the emperor, the terminology describing his images is distinct yet varies depending on context. The language applied to imperial statuary in Latin and Greek has points of correlation with each other, but is not entirely synonymous.⁴⁶ I generally explain the terms below, beginning with Latin and then turning to Greek. I say ‘generally’ because there are variations and nuances in each author’s corpus. The following sections on location, appearance, and ritual activity place the terms within their respective contexts.

The most common Latin words for cult statues are *simulacrum* and *signum*. Peter Stewart finds *simulacra* are most often statues of gods, specifically cult statues.⁴⁷ Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, in looking at the ritual activity surrounding a *simulacrum*, associates the term with “a metaphysically prior divine power,” that is a more abstract understanding of a cult statue. The term encompasses more of the invisible implied in ‘cult statue,’ almost like a photographic negative.⁴⁸ A *signum*, in contrast, is often a statue

⁴⁵ Cf. Chapter 2, section IA, n. 11, and my discussion in that section on the relationship between reader/observer and explanations offered by a narrator, or in this instance, a place and ritual activity.

⁴⁶ Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 25 and 25 n. 19 on Price, *Rituals and Power*, 178 on the uses of ἀγάλματα for living men.

⁴⁷ Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 21-23, differentiating a *simulacrum* from a votive or “‘unconsecrated’ representations of deities,” (22). There are examples of *simulacra* referring to a mortal, not a king, dynast, or *divus*; e.g. Propertius 4.11.83 uses *simulacra* for an image of Cornelia. Rüpke, “Representation or Presentation?,” 186 does not find *simulacra* to include honorific or public commemorative statues of living men.

⁴⁸ Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, “Statuary and Ritualization in Imperial Italy,” in *Ritual Matters: Material Remains and Ancient Religion*, ed. Claudia Moser and Jennifer Knust (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017), 92. Várhelyi references the works of Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, Rüpke, “Representation or Presentation?,” and A. Dubourdieu, “Voir les dieux à Rome,” in *Perception et construction du divin dans*

of a god which suggests a divine presence, i.e. a visual sign of the invisible,⁴⁹ and is more prevalent than *simulacrum* in textual sources.⁵⁰ Based on the perspective of the viewer, these terms may refer to the same statue, as was the case with the previously mentioned statue of *Divus* Augustus erected by Tiberius and Livia in 22 CE.⁵¹

Statua and *effigies* are more general terms that do not seem to identify the invisible aspects of an image, only that the statue is a sign or symbol of the individual. The former usually indicates statues of mortals, and the latter is applied to images of both men and gods.⁵² This may seem convoluted, but I cannot stress enough that the ancient context of the terms, more so than their modern definitions, provides their meaning; for example, when Augustus calls the eighty silver statues *statuae*, we should not dismiss them on the basis of his language alone, but look at his description as a whole.⁵³ In that instance, the Greek and Latin together offer greater clarity on Augustus' possible meaning in the term. As Stewart cautions, "we must be clear that these terms are not separated by rigid

l'Antiquité. Rivista di Storia delle Religioni, ed. P. Borgeaud and D. Fabiano (Geneva: Droz, 2013), 19-34 for her evidence. Rüpke, "Representation or Presentation?," 185 follows Varro, *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum*, Book 16: "the statues and their paraphernalia (*simulacra deorum et insignia ornatusque*, fr. 225 Cardans), he said elsewhere, were intended to help the initiated to see the real significance of the gods, the soul (*anima*) pervading the world."

⁴⁹ Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 5.

⁵⁰ Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 21-23, clarifies that when generally speaking about sculpture, *signa* are statues of gods, but not always an honorific or divine image. Stewart finds *statua* "almost always refers to free-standing sculptures of mortals," (22). Várhelyi, "Statuary and Ritualization in Imperial Italy," 92 cites without page number Rüpke, "Representation or Presentation?," in her argument for prevalence. Rüpke, "Representation or Presentation?," does not specifically make a textual reference, but argues more for what the terms imply or leave out (a negative or a positive image). *Statues in Roman Society*, 23 citing Raimund Daut, *Imago: Untersuchungen zum Bildbegriff der Römer* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1975): 36-8. Rüpke, "Representation or Presentation?," 186 n. 29 finds the terms to be synonymous in epigraphic evidence, citing Estienne, "*Simulacra Deorum versus Ornamenta Aedium*," 257-71. In these instances, Estienne finds that *simulacrum* is often paired with verbs of consecration, like *consecrare*, *colere*, or *venerari*, but it and *signum* were frequently treated as synonyms. Ovid's reaction to his silver statues, contradicts the notion that *simulacra* are often paired with verbs of worship, cf. section II, n. 50.

⁵¹ Cf. section III, n. 32-5 for the same statue of the *Divus* described with three different words (*signum*, *simulacrum*, and *effigies*) by three different authors.

⁵² Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 22, 24 adding that in Cicero, *In Verrem*, 2.5.187 *effigies* is used as a synonym of *simulacra*, which Daut, *Imago*, 39-40 argues for 'poetical variety' in Cicero's word choice. Cf. section III, n. 35 *supra* for Tacitus' broad use of *effigies* for gods (members of the pantheon and *divi*) and mortals.

⁵³ Cf. section IIIC, n. 72 below for *Res Gestae* 24.1-2 in Latin and Greek.

semantic barriers and in reality (as we shall see) the distinction between a ‘cult statue’ and any other representation of a god (perhaps dedicated as a religious offering), is not a sharp one.”⁵⁴ Certain authors, as I examine below, apply the terms to encapsulate their judgements or represent the nuance inherent in an image. On the other hand, as was the case with the statue of *Divus* Augustus near the Theater of Marcellus, even after 14 CE different authors employ different terms to describe the same cult statue: *signum*, *simulacrum*, and *effigies*.⁵⁵

In contrast to Latin terminology, Greek language for cult statues must (in this study) be viewed through the lens of a Roman audience and viewer.⁵⁶ Jaś Elsner notes an interesting ambiguity in the Greek, where there is no clear distinction between a goddess and an image of her. He finds, “this ambiguity afforded an edge of danger, since incorrect treatment of a statue could be constructed as an assault on the deity embodied in it.”⁵⁷ ἄγαλμα, ἀνδρίας, and εἰκών all could refer to a cult statue, but like the Latin, the ancient context provides the meaning more so than the modern definition. An ἄγαλμα conveyed the similar divine associations to *simulacra* and *signum*; it belonged to the sacred, and attempted to encompass the invisible aspects of the god. Living men in the Greek East, however, received honorific ἀγάλματα, complicating a linguistic division between images

⁵⁴ *Statues in Roman Society*, 23.

⁵⁵ Cf. section III, n. 32-5 *supra* for the terms in context.

⁵⁶ Scott, “The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship,” 105 incorrectly maps the languages on to each other, stating: “the following equivalents between Greek and Latin appear to exist: ἄγαλμα = *simulacrum*, εἰκών = *imago* or *effigies*, and ἀνδρίας = *statua*.” This oversimplifies cult statues, disregarding the differences in language exemplified by Estienne, “*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*,” in section IIIB below.

⁵⁷ Jaś Elsner, *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 11. Petridou, *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*, 50 presents a similar view, in terms of a divine epiphany, that “imagistic representation of the deity posed the same challenges and the same dangers for the viewers as his or her corporeal manifestation.”

of gods and divine men.⁵⁸ Price in his study of the imperial cult in Asia Minor defines ἀνδρίας and εἰκόν as “honorific images placed in the square or other public places,” where both could be an imperial image, but he relies on location to define cult.⁵⁹ I assert that in the city of Rome and throughout the empire, *contra* Price, all three terms describe public and private statues of the emperor that, I argue, functioned as cultic statues during his lifetime.

IIIB. Terminology: Authorial Frequencies

Even within a single author’s corpus, the language describing a statue varies. I have expanded Sylvia Estienne’s study of the frequencies and applications of *signum*, *simulacrum*, and *statua* in Suetonius and Tacitus to include *effigies*, as well as ἄγαλμα, ἀνδρίας, and εἰκόν in Dio Cassius. I have expanded her charts to reflect authorial proclivities as the imperial cult develops over time:⁶⁰

	<i>Signum</i>	<i>Simulacrum</i> ⁶¹	<i>Statua</i>	<i>Effigies</i>
Tacitus	Images of Gods (2) Uncertain (1)	Images of Gods (12) Imperial Image (1)	Images of Gods (1) Imperial Image (19) Human (6) Uncertain (3)	Images of Gods (11) Imperial Image (29)

⁵⁸ Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 25 uses the negative phrasing here: “and yet the epigraphic evidence from the Greek East reveals that living men were not infrequently recipients of honorific *agalmata*.”

⁵⁹ *Rituals and Power*, 176-7 adds that ἄγαλμα were used for imperial images, too. He does not find statues located in public places as the recipients of cult, specifying that ἄγαλμα was the common term for an imperial image in a religious context; Thomas, “The Cult Statues of the Pantheon,” 151 does not include location in his definition, but echoes Price’s sentiment.

⁶⁰ The original chart included Livy and the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, but these sources are not repeated in this study, so they have been omitted from the chart as it is presented here. Additionally, I have reordered the chart so the authors are in chronological order. Estienne, “*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*,” 260 does not link her results to the development of the imperial cult, but the absence of “Imperial Images” in Livy is better explained by the imperial cult.

⁶¹ Estienne, “*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*,” 259-60 resists the reading of *simulacrum* as ‘cult statue’ but expands it to include all anthropomorphic images of gods. She argues for a broader understanding of both ‘cult statues’ and ‘*ornamenta*’ as terms. She does not specifically analyze language for imperial images as cult statues.

Suetonius	Images of Gods (1) Uncertain (2)	Images of Gods (11) Imperial Images (5) Uncertain (2)	Images of Gods (2) Imperial Image (17) Human (21) Uncertain (1)	Images of Gods (3) ⁶² Imperial Image (4, 2 <i>divi</i>)
-----------	---	--	--	--

	ἄγαλμα	ἀνδρία	εἰκών
Dio	Images of Gods (31) Imperial Image (12, 8 <i>divi</i> , 2 transgressive images of Caligula and Nero while alive, and Maecenas advises Augustus against these) Human 0 Uncertain (6)	Images of Gods (0) Imperial Image (26, <i>vivus</i> and <i>divus</i>) Human (17, living and dead) Uncertain (5)	Images of Gods (3) Imperial Image (46) Human (37, living and dead) Uncertain (6)

Although context (location, appearance) and ritual activity are missing from the chart, we can see some tendencies within each author's corpus. These authors display a nuanced understanding of the terms for a cult statue, but some boundaries do appear. For example, Tacitus never labelled images of humans as *simulacra*, and only once used the word for an imperial image.⁶³ Moreover, my addition of *effigies* to Estienne's chart brings to light Tacitus' preferred and varied application of the word for statues.⁶⁴ He classified members of the pantheon, *divi*, and living men under the same umbrella-term.

An ancient author's preference for a more general term may be an attempt to avoid judgement on the matter, or, as I suspect, is a statement on the ambiguity and complexity inherent in an imperial cultic/cult statue. Tacitus's preference for *effigies* additionally adds shades of meaning to his recorded charges of *maiestas* involving statues of the

⁶² *Domitian* 4.4.8, where the emperor is wearing a golden crown with *effigies* of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva.

⁶³ *Ann.*, 3.63.13, where the people of Crete demand a "*simulacro divi Augusti*". Estienne does not provide entries for her word frequencies.

⁶⁴ Estienne, "*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*," 259, cf. section III, n. 35 *supra*, noted Tacitus' broad use of *effigies* for gods (members of the pantheon and *divi*) and mortals, but did not include the term in her chart.

Divus Augustus, where images of the *vivus* are now supposed to depict the *Divus*.⁶⁵

Tacitus in these scenes characterizes Tiberius, who presides over the cases, as resisting the transition from private into public and official cult. Tiberius' response to two of the charges of *maiestas* (one man sold a statue of Augustus with his gardens and the other committed perjury in the late emperor's name) is to remove the state and himself from the matters at hand:

<p>Nec contra religiones fieri quod effigies eius, ut alia numinum simulacra, venditionibus hortorum et domuum accedant. Ius iurandum perinde aestimandum quam si Iovem fefellisset: deorum iniurias dis curae.⁶⁶</p>	<p>Nor is it contrary to public religion that his effigies, just as the simulacra of other <i>numina</i>, to be added to the sale of gardens and houses. In a like manner the oath should be considered as if he had deceived Jupiter: crimes against the gods were the concern of the gods.</p>
--	--

Tacitus' Tiberius pointedly makes no distinction between different types of statues, equating Augustus' *effigies* with all other divine *simulacra*. The weakness of Tiberius' wish, to leave the business of the gods to the gods, is that the emperor cannot determine the parameters (or lack thereof) of the imperial cult; that is for the participants in the cult to decide. Therefore, the language used for cult statues reflects the later author's understanding of the events, and encapsulates his judgements of them.

Similar trends and revelations appear in the Greek with Dio Cassius' applications of terms. Dio never employs any form of ἀνδρία alone to indicate statues depicting the pantheon, but all five of the uncertain applications of the word refer to groups of statues, which likely included images of gods, imperial images, and honorific statues of men.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ E.g. in 15 CE a statue (*statua*) of Augustus in a garden was sold with a house (*Ann.* 1.73); Augustus' head was removed from a statue (*statua*) and replaced with Tiberius' *effigies* (*Ann.* 1.74); and in 22 CE a silver statue of Tiberius (*effigies*) was melted down to make silver-plate (*Ann.* 3.70).

⁶⁶ Tacitus, *Ann.*, 1.73 in response to a charge of selling the statue and perjury of an oath sworn by Augustus.

⁶⁷ Ἀνδριάντες at 37.9.1, many ἀνδριάντες and other ἀγάλματα were melted by thunderbolts; ἀνδριάντες at 54.1.1, statues in the Pantheon, including Augustus' (cf. section IVB, n. 110 for discussion); ἀνδριάντας at

Following this, I posit that Dio uses the plural broadly as a term for statues of both gods and men; the context and ritual activity directed at each group would make them cult statues. Similarly, Dio never describes a statue of a human man (living or dead) as an ἄγαλμα, but does employ the word for an image of a god or emperor. His three instances of living emperors all serve as bad examples: Caligula's living ἀγαλμάτων are in a narrative of his excessive behavior,⁶⁸ and the *Augustales* in giving Nero an ἄγαλμα cannot pay for it without aid.⁶⁹ Additionally, Maecenas advises Augustus that all men will be his ἀγάλματα, so he does not need statues and temples during his lifetime.⁷⁰ Dio therefore privileges ἀγάλματα of deified emperors and gods over those of living emperors and men. The cultic statue of Augustus during his lifetime, or from the perspective of a viewer during that time, is not labeled as an ἄγαλμα, so we must read it as Dio presenting the statue from the perspective of an Augustan viewer.

Some of the ambiguity in the ancient sources may be the result of poetical variety, but that cannot account for every and all variation within a single author's corpus. I proceed with the reading that each author deliberately applied the terminology to illustrate a nuance not present in our modern understanding of a cultic or cult statue. Different terms for a statue of Augustus, then, denote the author's perception of the progression and

60.6.8, statues Claudius restored to cities; ἀνδριάντων at 74.5.3, a number of statues adorned Pertinax's funeral pyre; ἀνδριάντας at 74.12.5, bronze statues thrown down during the siege of Byzantium in 194 CE.

⁶⁸ 59.4.4: “πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἰκόνας τε ἀπαγορεύσας κατ’ ἀρχὰς μηδένα αὐτοῦ ἰστάναι, καὶ ἐξ ἀγαλμάτων ποιήσιν προεχώρησε; although at first he forbade anyone to set up *eikonas* set up of him, he allocated to make *agalmata* himself.”

⁶⁹ 63.18.3: “τῶν δὲ Αὐγουστειῶν ἄγαλμα αὐτοῦ χιλίων λιτρῶν ποιήσιν ὑποσχομένων, πᾶν τὸ ἱππικὸν ἠναγκάσθη συντελέσαι σφίσι τὸ ἀνάλωμα; when the *Augustales* proposed to make an *agalma* of him (Nero) weighing a thousand pounds, all the Equestrians were compelled to contribute to the cost for them.”

⁷⁰ 52.35.5: “πάντες δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἀγάλματα (ἐν γὰρ ταῖς γνώμαις αὐτῶν ἀεὶ μετ’ εὐδοξίας ἐνιδρυθήσῃ); all men will be your *agalmata* (since in their thoughts you will always be enshrined by your virtues).” Cf. section I, n. 19 for the passage and my argument against Dio's manufactured speeches as source material.

transition of cult from a later point in history. More contemporary sources, like the *Res Gestae*, provide a basis for the evolution of language after the emperor's deification.

III.C. Terminology: *Res Gestae* and Silver Statues

Augustus in the *Res Gestae* describes the eighty silver statues he melted down and from the proceeds of which he dedicated gold offerings to Apollo.⁷¹ These statues are often taken to refute the living cult of Augustus at Rome and establish Augustus as a cautious figure when it came to assertions and displays of his private cult, but my study of the terminology supports a different insight:

<p>In templis omnium civitatum prov[inci]ae Asiae victor ornamenta reposui spoliatis tem[plis] cum quo bellum gesseram privatim possederat. Statuae [mea]e pedestres et equestres et in quadrigis argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter, quas ipse sustuli exque ea pecunia dona aurea in aede Apollinis meo nomine et illorum, qui mihi statuarum honorem habuerunt, posui.</p>	<p>As a victor, I restored in the temples of all the cities in the province of Asia the ornaments which the man against whom I had waged war had held in his private possession after plundering the temples. Nearly eighty silver statues, of me on foot, on horseback, and in a <i>quadriga</i>, were standing in the city, which I myself removed, and from the money I placed golden gifts in the temple of Apollo in my name and in the name of those who had honored me with the statues.</p>
<p>[Εἰς ν]αοὺς πασῶν πόλεων τῆς Ἀσίας νεικήσας τὰ ἀναθέματα ἀποκατέστησα, [ἃ] κατεσκήκει ἱεροσυλήσας ὁ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ καταγωνισθεὶς πολέμιος]. Ἀνδριάντες πεζοὶ καὶ ἑφιπποί μου καὶ ἐφ' ἄρμασιν ἀργυροὶ εἰστήκεισαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνγυὺς ὀγδοήκοντα, οὓς αὐτὸς ἦρα, ἐκ τούτου τε τοῦ χρημάτων ἀναθέματα χρυσᾶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ[ι] τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ τε ἐμῷ ὀνόματι καὶ ἐκείνων, οἵτινές με [τ]ούτοις τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ἐτείμησαν, ἀνέθηκα.⁷²</p>	<p>After my victory, I reinstated in the temples of all cities of Asia the dedications which the enemy against whom I had prevailed had plundered and was holding in his possession. The silver statues, on foot, on horseback, and in a war-chariot set up in the city, nearly eighty in number, which I myself removed, and from this money I set up golden dedications on the temple of Apollo both in my name and in the name of those who honored me with these statues.</p>

⁷¹ Pekáry, “*Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt*,” 98-103 proves that eighty is not an unusual or noteworthy number of statues (privately or publically) for a living man to receive.

⁷² *Res Gestae* 24.1-2.

Since Augustus only uses *statuae* here in the *Res Gestae*, I cannot infer his meaning from other applications in his literary corpus; similarly I cannot read the use of ἀνδριάντες to imply a combination of images in the same way as Dio's much later application of the word.⁷³ What I do read is that Augustus deliberately separates the three kinds of objects in this section into *ornamenta*, *statuae argenteae*, and *dona aurea*. Neither the appearance and feature of the *ornamenta* nor the *dona* are detailed in the text, so we cannot know whether they included cult statues of the gods or not. The Greek text applies the same term, ἀναθήματα, to both the items plundered and the golden gifts, marking no linguistic difference between the two. From this difference in the Latin and the Greek, I conclude that the *ornamenta*, like the *dona*, were dedications in temples.⁷⁴

I follow Alison Cooley's suggestion that Augustus here represents an antithesis to Antony, taking what had been in private hands and making it public.⁷⁵ He reinstated items in Antony's private possession to their proper public places, and he repurposed the private silver *statuae* into public *dona aurea* in the Temple of Apollo. The pattern fits both the Latin and Greek terms for the three kinds of objects in the section: the

⁷³ Cf. section IIIB, n. 67 *supra* for the five uncertain applications of ἀνδριάντες in Dio. I posit that Dio uses the plural broadly as a term for statues of both gods and men; the context of each group would make them cult statues.

⁷⁴ Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 212. Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 173 suggests that the *ornamenta* and *statua* are linked phrases, demonstrating that the private dedicators of the silver *statuae* were Greeks "in thanks for the return of plunder [*ornamenta*] mentioned in the previous sentence." He adds these may have been Greek dedications adding, "if so, they illustrate the massive extension of the Greek system of honours to Rome itself," (173). The Greek and Latin texts do not directly encourage this reading, and we can assume that if it were so, the Greek translator would have emphasized the correlation. Earlier in the commentary (58), Cooley notes the marked differences between the Latin and Greek headings for the *Res Gestae*, and their appeal to their respective audiences. If the document begins with such differences, it seems unlikely that the Greek translator would overlook the Greek influence over Augustus' actions in 24.1-2.

⁷⁵ Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 211-2. Augustus did remove cult objects from his opponents whereas Antony had taken them from allies, but the greater difference is that Augustus frequently took private objects and put them on public display in Rome. For example, Cooley notes that Augustus took a statue of Athena Alea to Rome from Tegea in Arcadia because the city had supported Antony (211, citing Pausanias 8.46.1-5).

ἀναθήματα/*ornamenta* in private hands were restored to temples in the same way that the privately commissioned ἀνδριάντες/*statuae* were publically repurposed into ἀναθήματα/*dona aurea* in the Temple of Apollo. The text emphasizes through the terminology Augustus' pattern of action, whereby he restores cult objects to their proper, public spaces.

I add to Cooley's suggestion that the two scenes are antithetical, stating that the *statuae* were cultic statues. If the pattern of action is taking private items and restoring them to public temples, then the private ἀνδριάντες/*statuae* belonged in temples as ἀναθήματα/*dona aurea*, rather than in the city. In this way, the ἀνδριάντες/*statuae* were not honorific images of Augustus, since honorific statues do not belong in temples in the same way as the ἀναθήματα/*ornamenta* removed by Antony.⁷⁶ The emperor's actions in both instances are to restore objects to temples, so his reconfiguration of ἀνδριάντες/*statuae* into ἀναθήματα/*dona aurea* puts the images in their rightful place. He cannot place his ἀνδριάντες/*statuae* inside the temple in their cultic form since the official practice is that Augustus himself is not divine and he is not equal to Apollo in Apollo's cult place,⁷⁷ but he can reinterpret the private initiative of these ἀνδριάντες/*statuae* into objects that follow the official and public interpretations of his cult, incorporating and interweaving the new objects into the cult of Apollo on the Palatine (while preserving the names of the original dedicators).

⁷⁶ Suetonius, *Suetonius: Life of Divus Augustus; Vita Divi Augusti*, trans. David Wardle (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 373, citing Estienne, "*Simulacra Deorum versus Ornamenta Aedium*," 265-6, that the statues were honorific and not cult statues, so they could be reused as *dona* for Apollo and as coins. The fact that the ἀναθήματα/*ornamenta* and ἀναθήματα/*dona aurea* were all restored to temples undermines the label of honorific statues.

⁷⁷ Cf. Chapter 2, section IB for my interpretation of this official wording in libations and prayers on the emperor's behalf.

IV. Location

The location of a cultic statue of Augustus within the city of Rome permits and encourages the viewer to engage with the absent emperor in a way that fosters the negotiation of the imperial cult and anticipates his official, public cult. As I argued in the previous chapter, the compital altars of the *Lares Augusti* and the monuments of the Campus Martius promoted participation in the emperor's living, private cult; after his deification in 14 CE, these same places changed into cult places for the *Divus*, where participants engaged in similar practices. I assert that the same transition of practice occurred with cultic statues, in which ritual participants do not need to relocate the images after 14 CE, but continue to engage with the statues in their original settings. Given that the statues I examine in this study are non-extant, literary descriptions of their locations provide one of the bases for my analysis. These sources are often later, describing monuments and locations that had changed since Augustus' reign, but from their accounts we can ascertain their presentation of a viewer's perspective of the statue during the emperor's lifetime. Cultic statues of the *vivus* become cult statues of the *Divus* with no physical modification and change in location; I, in this section, assess post-14 CE accounts of cultic statues erected during the emperor's lifetime within the context of his private rather than public cult. I examine the locations of Augustus' statue atop his Mausoleum in the Campus Martius and in the Pantheon, and identify them as private, cultic statues in public locations. Eventually they would be reconceived as cult statues of the *Divus* Augustus.

IVA. Location: Campus Martius and the Mausoleum of Augustus

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, a bronze colossal statue of Augustus topped his Mausoleum in the Campus Martius.⁷⁸ The Mausoleum was a private monument in the civic cult place of the Campus Martius, where a viewer would see the *Ara Pacis*, *horologium*, and Mausoleum as participating in an Augustan narrative of living cult. Strabo is the only extant author who mentions the statue, describing it with the monument:

<p>Ἀξιολογώτατον δὲ τὸ Μανσώλειον καλούμενον, ἐπὶ κρηπιδος ὑψηλῆς λευκολίθου πρὸς τῷ ποταμῷ χῶμα μέγα, ἄχρι κορυφῆς τοῖς ἀειθαλέσι τῶν δένδρων συνηρεφές: ἐπ’ ἄκρῳ μὲν οὖν εἰκὼν ἐστὶ χαλκῇ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος, ὑπὸ δὲ τῷ χῶματι θῆκαί εἰσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν συγγενῶν καὶ οἰκείων, ὀπισθεν δὲ μέγα ἄλσος περιπάτους θαυμαστοὺς ἔχον...⁷⁹</p>	<p>The most noteworthy is the called the Mausoleum, a great mound on a high foundation of white marble, near the river, thickly shaded with ever-green trees to the very summit: in fact there is a bronze statue of Caesar Augustus on the summit, beneath the mound there are the tombs for himself, his kin, and his friends, behind it is a large sacred grove with marvelous walkways...</p>
--	--

Based on Strabo’s brief account, Paul Rehak concludes that the statue was colossal in size (more than eight to ten meters) due to Strabo’s ability to identify it as Augustus from ground level.⁸⁰ Strabo does not elaborate on the appearance of the statue, but its supposed colossal size and location atop the Mausoleum separate it from other, contemporary ground-level statues; no other known statue in Rome compared to this colossal statue.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Cf. Chapter 3, sections VC and VI for the Mausoleum as a private cult place.

⁷⁹ *Geographica* 5.3.8, the omitted section details the wall and fence of the Ustrinum and the landscaping of the site.

⁸⁰ *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*, ed. John G. Younger (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), 41. As a funerary monument, Rehak calls the statue “a remarkable innovation in a city where contemporary grave monuments tended to use life-size or smaller statues and reliefs, mostly made of limestone or marble and set close to the viewer at ground level,” (40). He connects the bronze image elevated above the viewer with a pair of bronze statues of Ptolemy II and his sister-wife Arsinoë in front of the Echo Colonnade at Olympia. Rehak adds, almost offhandedly, that the statue may have been gilded. He gives no support for this hypothesis; Strabo’s lack of description beyond the term *εἰκὼν* hinders much discussion. Lothar Haselberger, *Urbem Adornare: Die Stadt Rom und Ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus*, trans. Alexander Thein (Rhode Island: JRA Supplementary Series, 2007), 94 and Magness, “The Mausolea of Augustus,” 318 also believe the statue was colossal, but neither author provides an explanation for this rationale.

⁸¹ Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 41 locates a few stone colossal statues showing mortal/*divus* in the late-Republic (Pompey semi-nude in his theatre, *Divus* Julius in his temple in the Forum Romanum) but

The scale and location of the statue follows Pliny the Elder's later assertion that "*columnarum ratio erat attolli super ceteros mortales*," which Rehak translates as "the purpose of placing statu[e]s on columns was to elevate them above all other mortals," thus lifting the viewer's eye towards heaven.⁸² A viewer during Augustus' lifetime would then anticipate the emperor's deification and confirm his more-than-human status by witnessing the emperor rise above mortals towards the gods.

While we do not know the exact date for the Mausoleum's completion and the statue's addition, I address here later evidence and comparanda that elucidate a *terminus ante quem* during Augustus' lifetime for both. The design and construction of the monument fit within the narrative of Octavian/Augustus' early rule in Rome, and I present 23 BCE as the *terminus ante quem* completion date since we know Marcellus was interred there in that year.⁸³ As for the statue's date, that depends on the translation and implications of θήκαι in Strabo's account. Sarah Potheary argues for a Tiberian date, mainly based on the translation of θήκαι as "tombs," suggesting that Augustus had already died.⁸⁴ I take θήκη as literally as possible, meaning the place where a corpse may be placed or a mode of burial, but not necessarily an occupied tomb.⁸⁵ The Mausoleum was designed to serve as a victory monument and a tomb for members of the *Domus Augusta* (at least those in

concludes "otherwise, no living Roman had been represented at such a scale in any medium, except in the eastern Mediterranean." Rehak does not consider the statue head mentioned by Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 75-7 in his discussion and conclusion of absence of colossal images. Zanker (76) adds that this statue head "belongs to Augustus' earliest portrait type," and although it is certainly not the statue from the Mausoleum (bronze), it may have been a contemporary image. Sadly the head sheds no light on the specific type of statue for the Mausoleum's bronze.

⁸² *Naturalis Historiae* 34.12, as cited in *Imperium and Cosmos*, 43.

⁸³ Cf. Chapter 3, section IIIA, n. 75. Magness, "The Mausolea of Augustus," 318 cites Suetonius, *DA*, 100 for the completion range of 31-10 BCE, but von Hesberg, and Panciera, *Das Mausoleum des Augustus*, 54 prefer the 28 BCE completion date, albeit without archaeological support. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 73 does not believe a specific date is relevant, since the monument is best understood in the narrative of Rome before and just after Actium. I present 23 as the latest possible completion date.

⁸⁴ Sarah Potheary, "Strabo, the Tiberian Author: Past, Present and Silence in Strabo's 'Geography'," *Mnemosyne* 55, fasc. 4 (2002): 388.

⁸⁵ *LSJ*, s.v. "θήκη," III.

good standing),⁸⁶ so the ashes of Marcellus, Agrippa, Octavia Minor, Gaius, and Lucius Caesar, to name a few, were interred there before Augustus' death. Since there is no indication from *θηκαί* or elsewhere in the text that the statue was added post-14 CE, and the statue is not described as featuring the deified or divine Σεβαστός Καῖσαρ, I assert that we should adopt the *terminus ante quem* as 14 CE, and date the statue to the emperor's lifetime.⁸⁷

Further comparisons from contemporary mausolea support a statue of a living man atop the monument and a lifetime date for its addition. Although Jodi Magness demonstrates that the Herodion of Herod the Great and the Mausoleum of Augustus were not modeled on each other, but on the Mausoleum of Alexander,⁸⁸ she asserts that both mausolea (Herodion and Augustus') were intended to serve as a type of victory

⁸⁶ Cf. Chapter 3, section VC, n. 130 on Magness, "The Mausolea of Augustus," 320-5 explaining that the monument fulfilled different functions as victory monument and tomb with a combination of features. Cf. n. 89 below as well.

⁸⁷ Speculations as to the appearance of the statue are just that; since *εἰκών* is the only descriptor, we cannot know whether the statue was semi-nude in a Hellenistic representation of Poseidon, *capite velato*, driving a *quadriga*, or *statua lorica*. Rehak *Imperium and Cosmos*, 42-3 summarizes recent suggestions and adds a few of his own. He suggests that the image may have been a semi-nude, Hellenistic image of Augustus as Poseidon, calling to mind his victory over Sextus Pompey at Naulochus in 36 BCE. This image appeared on coins minted in Italy between 32-29 BCE (RIC I², 59 (no. 256)) and, Rehak argues, a semi-nude figure would have been an acceptable funerary statue (42). Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 204 challenges this idea slightly—Koortbojian finds no evidence of Augustus *vivus* depicted in the hip-mantle or nude in Rome in official or public monuments. The Mausoleum was a private monument but it seems unlikely that Octavian would go so far from the norm in such a grand scale. Rehak also suggests the *capite velato* type to call to mind Octavian's traditional values. John Pollini, "The Gemma Augustea: Ideology, Rhetorical Imagery, and the Creation of a Dynastic Narrative," in *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, ed. P. J. Holliday (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 285 suggests the *quadriga* like the statue group above the original Mausoleum in Halikarnassos. J.C. Richard, "Mausoleum: D'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis à Alexandrie," *Latomus* 29 (1970) suggests a *statua lorica*, which would have mirrored the image of Augustus in the Pantheon across the Campus Martius and resembled the statue of Augustus Prima Porta.

⁸⁸ "The Mausolea of Augustus," 314-7, 322. Herod's Herodion served as a victory monument over the Jews in 40 BCE (Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, I. 265). Magness' greater thesis is that the posthumously constructed Mausoleum of Alexander was a model for both later mausolea. She appears to find little weight in Reeder, "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus," 272 argument that the Mausoleum of Augustus was architecturally more Italic than Hellenistic.

monument (either for Actium or for Naulochus) as well as a final resting place.⁸⁹ As a part-victory monument for Actium or Naulochus, both being lifetime achievements, it would not be unusual there to be a statue of Augustus *vivus* rather than the *Divus*.

Following my *terminus ante quem* dates for both the monument and statue and the Mausoleum as a private cultic place (as argued in Chapter 3, section VC), the statue was a cultic statue of Augustus *vivus*. The statue becomes cultic when it is placed in the context of the Campus Martius as a cult place and as a colossal statue reaching towards heaven. The statue rising above mortals towards heaven is a symbol for Augustus' more-than-human status and divine qualities, while making him visually present in the Campus Martius. In combination with his more-human appearance on the south frieze of the *Ara Pacis Augustae* and his adjective-*cum*-epithet in the altar's name, the emperor is present while he himself is physically absent from the place. His images on the *Ara Pacis* and in the form of the statue, as well as the adjective-*cum*-epithet demonstrate to the viewer his progression from man to god, and the infusion of his private cult into the public and official cults of Rome.⁹⁰ Participants there could focus their ritual activity as they navigated the northern Campus Martius on the emperor's image and adjective-*cum*-epithet at the *Ara Pacis*, as well as the *horologium*, but the Mausoleum and its cultic statue embody their ritual aims: asserting the emperor's more-than-human status and divine qualities in order to make him present.

⁸⁹ Magness, "The Mausolea of Augustus," 322 in her argument for the Mausoleum of Alexander as the model notes that Actium symbolized Octavian's victory and mastery over the East, like Alexander before him. Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*, 42-3 hypothesizes that the monument celebrated Augustus' victory over Sextus Pompey at Naulochus in 36 BCE, but there is no concrete evidence for either interpretation.

⁹⁰ Cf. Chapter 3, section VA on Augustus' cult being interwoven into the cult of Pax, but not taking over her cult. Also cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 for interweaving and infusion as a part of the imperial cult and Chapter 2, sections IIB and III, and Chapter 3, n. 4 for the incorporation of Augustus (adjective-*cum*-epithet) in provincial and Roman cults as local participants demonstrating their awareness of Rome and Augustus.

IVB. Location: Pantheon

The bronze, colossal cultic statue atop the Mausoleum lay on a visual axis with another cultic statue of Augustus in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon to the south.⁹¹ Cassius Dio refers to this statue at two separate points in his history of Augustus, but the Pantheon by Dio's time would not have looked the same,⁹² but I assert that Dio presents the Augustan location of the cultic statue in his accounts. Dio provides the only description of both the Agrippan temple and its statuary, giving the reader no indication of the statue's relocation after Augustus' deification. I argue in the following paragraphs that Dio's language in describing the location of the cultic statue proves to the reader its status as a cultic statue, and also that this is the cultic statue's location during the emperor's lifetime. If we analyze the description of the statue in the *pronaos*, keeping Dio's specific uses of terms for statues in mind, then the statue is a cultic image of the emperor that shared in the sacred space of the Pantheon as a whole.

Dio first mentions the statue with the completion of the temple in 25 BCE:

Τό τε Πάνθειον ὠνομασμένον ἐξετέλεσε: προσαγορεύεται δὲ οὕτω τάχα μὲν ὅτι πολλῶν	[Agrippa] completed the building called afterwards the Pantheon: it is called by this
---	--

⁹¹ Paola Virgili and Paola Battiselli, "Indagini in Piazza della Rotonda e sulla fronte del Pantheon," *BullCom* 100 (1999):128; Carlos F. Noreña, "Locating the 'Ustrinus' of Augustus," *MAAR* 58 (2013), 55; Eugenio La Rocca, "Agrippa's Pantheon and Its Origins," in *The Pantheon: From Antiquity to the Present*, ed. Tod A. Marder and Mark Wilson Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 59-60, 64, 77; Lanciano Nicoletta and Paola Virgili, "The Urban Set of the Pantheon and the Mausoleum of Augustus in Rome, Between Architectural and Astronomical Symbolism," *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 16, no. 4 (2016): 251, 253, the locations of the public Pantheon and the private Mausoleum were situated on a visual, north-south axis, so that cultic statues in each monument faced each other. John W. Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 186 further speculates that the space between the Mausoleum and the Pantheon was lined with trees in order to emphasize the sight-line between the two monuments and link Augustus (*vivus* and *Divus*) to the gods.

⁹² Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples*, 187: "Agrippa's building stood until A.D. 80, when it was damaged by the fire of Titus. It was restored shortly afterward by Domitian. During the reign of Trajan, it was struck by lightning and burned a second time." This timeline is echoed by La Rocca, "Agrippa's Pantheon and Its Origins," 51. La Rocca (64) and Stamper (186) both assert that the roof on the Agrippan building would have been wooden and not concrete, and wider by about ten meters.

<p>θεῶν εἰκόνας ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι, τῷ τε τοῦ Ἄρεως καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ἔλαβεν, ὡς δὲ ἐγὼ νομίζω, ὅτι θολοειδὲς ὄν τῷ οὐρανῷ προσέοικεν. Ἡβουλήθη μὲν οὖν ὁ Ἀγρίππας καὶ τὸν Αὐγουστον ἐνταῦθα ἰδρῦσαι, τὴν τε τοῦ ἔργου ἐπὶ κλησιν αὐτῷ δοῦναι: μὴ δεξαμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ μηδέτερον ἐκεῖ μὲν τοῦ προτέρου Καίσαρος, ἐν δὲ τῷ προνάῳ τοῦ τε Αὐγούστου καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνδριάντας ἔστησε. Καὶ ἐγίγνετο γὰρ ταῦτα οὐκ ἐξ ἀντιπάλου τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ πρὸς τὸν Αὐγουστον φιλοτιμίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ τε τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον λιπαροῦς εὐνοίας καὶ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τὸ δημόσιον ἐνδελεχοῦς σπουδῆς, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὁ Αὐγουστος ἠτιάσατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἐτίμησε.⁹³</p>	<p>name perhaps because it received <i>eikones</i> of many gods among the <i>agalmata</i>, both that of Mars and that of Venus, but I believe that [it is because] the vaulted ceiling resembles heaven. Agrippa then wished to set up a statue of Augustus there also and to give his name to the structure: but when he refused both honors, he set up [a statue] of the former Caesar and in the <i>pronaos</i> <i>andriantes</i> of Augustus and himself. And this was done not out of rivalry or ambition on Agrippa's part to [make himself equal to] Augustus, but out of earnest loyalty to him and his constant zeal for the state; not only did Augustus not censure him for it, but more further honored [him].</p>
--	--

Simon Price, relying only on the setting of the statue in the *pronaos*, believes these ἀνδριάντες (that of Augustus and Agrippa) were honorific and received no cult. Stewart, in response to this, includes the *pronaos* in the context of the temple as a whole; to him, the “divine overtones,” of the Pantheon as a cult place prohibit an exclusion of the *pronaos* (and its statuary) from the entire complex.⁹⁴ Although Stewart falls short of labeling Augustus' statue as cultic/cult in his assessment, I concur with Stewart's reading of the “divine overtones” at the location, and add that the *pronaos* was a part of the sacred space of the site, not excluded from it.⁹⁵ Ton Derks provides the rationale for my

⁹³ 53.27.2-4. The verb ἰδρῦσαι can mean set up a statue with or without a religious sense; specifically in the middle voice, it denotes dedicating a statue or temple, but the word here is not middle; cf. *LSJ* s.v. “ἰδρύω,” II. Duncan Fishwick, “The Statue of Julius Caesar in the Pantheon,” *Latomus* 51, no. 2 (1992), 333 reads this verb as “to set up a statue of any kind, whether in a temple or elsewhere,” concluding that the verb refers to an honorific rather than cult statue. I disagree with this reading, arguing from the location and ritual activity that the statue could be a cult statue. Thomas, “The Cult Statues of the Pantheon,” 148-9 argues for this translation of “πολλῶν θεῶν εἰκόνας ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι, τῷ τε τοῦ Ἄρεως καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης; *eikones* of many gods among the *agalmata*, both that of Mars and that of Venus.”

⁹⁴ Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 25 n. 19 argues against Price, *Rituals and Power*, 178. What Stewart calls “divine overtones,” Estienne, “*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*,” 268 argues “showed clearly their lower status compared to the gods and at the same time their superiority to men,” i.e. in the language of this study, their more-than-human status. La Rocca, “Agrippa's Pantheon and Its Origins,” 52 agrees that the statue was not honorific, but only goes as far as calling the image ‘religious,’ which may be deliberately ambiguous on the author's part.

⁹⁵ The difference between an honorific statue and a cultic one is not binary, but I follow Stewart's reasoning to the logical conclusion that the image of Augustus was cultic.

view, asserting that the altar served as the main boundary between sacred and profane space in a cult place. The *pronaos* of the temple was a “relatively sacred space,” and beyond the temple doors, the *cella* symbolized the ‘other world’ which the gods of the pantheon inhabit.⁹⁶ I deliberately argue for Augustus’ statue being cultic, not Agrippa’s, since Dio’s language separates the two (as I argue in detail below). Additionally, Dio tells the reader that Augustus himself honored Agrippa for his acts, suggesting his image was honorific. In this way, the *pronaos* is the appropriate location for the more-than-human emperor and Agrippa, neither of whom could reside in the *cella*; the emperor from the *pronaos* maintains his reign on earth and anticipates for the viewer his place in among the gods.

Dio’s emphasis on the *pronaos* as the statues’ location preserves Agrippa’s original intent for Augustus’ statue to be a cultic statue among other cult statues, but admits through the emperor’s correction the proper location for a *vivus* emperor receiving private cult. This move from inside the *cella* to the *pronaos* would neither spontaneously reconfigure the appearance of the images as honorific nor have greatly separated it from the “divine overtones” of the Pantheon.⁹⁷ Within the setting of the Pantheon, the official

⁹⁶ *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices*, 210 for his explanation and chart explaining the relationship between architectural and cosmological categories.

⁹⁷ Thomas, “The Cult Statues of the Pantheon,” 181 reads “he [Augustus] resisted any idea of cult offered to him in Rome.” The emperor did not, in fact, resist the statues, but moved them so that they were still part of the Pantheon’s complex. This statue is often understood to have depicted Augustus *loricatus*, e.g. Rehak, *Imperium and Cosmos*,” 41; Michael Koortbojian, “Crossing the Pomerium: The Armed Ruler at Rome,” in *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*, ed. Björn C. Ewald and F. Noreña (Cambridge University Press, 2010), 263; Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 136. Dio additionally preserves that Agrippa only added his own image after Augustus refused the initial honor of a statue and to give his name to the structure. As will be addressed below, Agrippa’s statue was only ever honorific, since he did not possess the same divine qualities as the emperor.

and public cults of many gods shared space; the cultic statue of Augustus did not depict an official, public god, but represented a man who stood between gods and mortals.⁹⁸

The statue of Agrippa, although it shared the *pronaos* with the emperor, did not have the same status as a cultic image. I find evidence for this distinction in Dio's language. The "πολλῶν θεῶν εἰκόνας ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι; *eikones* of many gods among the *agalmata*," in the Pantheon clarifies that of the εἰκόνες of many gods, this includes ἀγάλματα of gods, Mars and Venus, and that the other images listed are a combination of cultic and honorific statues (Augustus', *Divus* Julius' and Agrippa's, respectively).⁹⁹ Dio cannot collectively term all of the statues as ἀγάλματα, because calling Augustus' statue an ἄγαλμα would make it an example of bad imperial behavior; nor can he say "πολλῶν θεῶν ἀνδριάντες," because Dio never uses ἀνδριάντες for public gods alone.¹⁰⁰ In this way, Dio signals to his reader that some statues are cult and cultic, like Mars and Venus (ἀγάλματα, cult), *Divus* Julius (ἀνδρίας, cult) and Augustus (ἀνδρίας, cultic), but that the statue of Agrippa (ἀνδρίας, honorific) is not. Dio telling the reader Augustus' reaction to Agrippa' image further guides his reader to conclude that Agrippa's statue is honorific and separate from Augustus' statue in its function.

He furthers this separation with his use of ἀνδριάντες when describing Agrippa's and Augustus' statues together. While this word in the plural cannot denote public gods alone, all five of Dio's uncertain applications of the word refer to groups of statues,

⁹⁸ Cf. section I, n. 10 for the role of a statue in a space.

⁹⁹ Εἰκόνες rarely (3%) refers to images of gods, but the genitive adds clarity to the statement. Examples of εἰκόνες in Dio referring to cult and non-cult images of the imperial family: 43.45.3, Caesar's statue in the Temple of Quirinus; 56.46.4 a golden image of *Divus* Augustus sharing the pulvinar with Mars; 59.16.10 a golden statue of Caligula carried up to the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter with hymns sung to him. Images that were honorific include: 47.25.3, the face of Brutus on a coin; 47.19.2, Caesar's εἰκών should not be part of a funeral procession after his deification; 56.34.1 and 56.46.4, Augustus' wax funerary εἰκών should not be part of funeral processions after his own funeral and deification; 51.3.6 the image of Augustus *vivus* on his official seal.

¹⁰⁰ Cf. section IIIB, p. 187-8 for chart.

which likely included images of gods, imperial images, and honorific statues of men.¹⁰¹ I read Dio as carefully distinguishing the different types of images and their functions in the ritual activity of the Pantheon, where Augustus in the *pronaos*, and *Divus* Julius, Mars, and Venus in the *cella* received ritual activity, but Agrippa's statue did not. To clarify my view, this chart labels the different types of statues within the Pantheon:

I posit that εἰκόνες refers to the images in the *cella* since they are labeled as πολλῶν θεῶν, but that Dio specifies the locations and statuses of the ἀγάλματα and ἀνδριάντες. Ἀγάλματα can include statues of public gods and deified emperors, so the term can describe Mars, Venus, and *Divus* Julius, even though the deified Julius' statue is not called this. Ἀνδριάντες as a plural never describes public gods alone, but it can describe groups of images; therefore, Dio's ἀνδριάντες include *Divus* Julius in the *cella*, Augustus as more-than-human in the *pronaos*, and Agrippa as a mortal man in the *pronaos*. *Divus* Julius could fall into either category, ἀγάλματα or ἀνδριάντες, because of his deified status, but Augustus as a not-yet deified emperor in Dio's account can only be an ἀνδρίας and belongs in the *pronaos*. Agrippa as a mortal man who is honored by the emperor is additionally an ἀνδρίας and belongs in the *pronaos*, but for different reasons.

¹⁰¹ Cf. section IIIB, n. 67 *supra* for the five uncertain applications as groups of statues.

Duncan Fishwick has a different view of the ἀνδριάντες in the *pronaos*, focusing on the last sentence of Dio's description. Fishwick asserts from Dio's language that neither *Divus* Julius, Augustus, nor Agrippa were in any way equal to the gods of Olympus.¹⁰² Regarding the statue of Caesar, Fishwick reads the μὲν... δὲ construction (underlined above) to mean that the ἀνδριάντες of Augustus, Agrippa, and *Divus* Julius were not intended to receive any cultic worship at the temple.¹⁰³ Rather than assuming Dio's language is syntactical variation, I counter Fishwick's reading based upon the specifics of his authorial proclivities with the terms; the historian applies all three terms (εἰκόνες, ἀγάλματα, ἀνδριάντες) in one passage, interweaving the types of images present within the different parts of the temple, where there are statues of divine, imperial, and human statues inside the *cella* and on the *pronaos*. This combination of three terms for statues in one passage is rare but not unique to the author; each of the two other instances denotes different types of images in a single cult place.¹⁰⁴ As I showed above (p. 203) in the chart for the statue of Agrippa, the specifics of Dio's language show that *Divus* Julius belonged

¹⁰² "The Statue of Julius Caesar in the Pantheon," 331, citing Price, *Rituals and Power*, 178ff. Price relies on location and language as an indicator of a cult statue, and does not try to recreate ritual activity, cf. section IIIA, n. 59.

¹⁰³ "The Statue of Julius Caesar in the Pantheon," 331-2 arguing that Augustus, being cautious and conservative in his approach to images, would not have permitted any cultic image of himself, Agrippa, or *Divus* Julius at the Pantheon. Thomas, "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," 152-3 admits that a portrait statue in the *cella* of a temple doth not a cult statue make, but following the deification of *Divus* Julius as addressed by Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 186, images of the new *Divus* were accepted publically and officially as cult statues. Cf. n. 93 *supra* for passage.

¹⁰⁴ Dio's combination of three terms for statues in one passage is rare but not unique; earlier in a description of portents at Jupiter's Capitoline temple from 64 BCE, Dio (37.9.1-2) lists: "ἐν γὰρ τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ ἀνδριάντες τε πολλοὶ ὑπὸ κεραυνῶν συνεχωνεύθησαν καὶ ἀγάλματα ἄλλα τε καὶ Διὸς ἐπὶ κίονος ἰδρυμένον, εἰκὼν τέ τις λυκαίνης σὺν τε τῷ Ῥώμῳ καὶ σὺν τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ ἰδρυμένη ἔπεσε; on the Capitol, both many *andriantes* and other *agalmata* were melted down by thunderbolts, [including] the statue (*agalma*) of Jupiter set on a pillar, and a dedicated *eikōn* of the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus fell down." Also in 43.45.2-3, Dio describes an ivory ἀνδριάς of Caesar that the senate voted to partake in a procession with the ἀγάλματα of the gods, and another εἰκὼν of Caesar was set up in the Temple of Quirinus with the Θεῷ ἀνικήτῳ inscription. Again, there is a distinction made between images of men and gods, but that does not mean the ἀνδριάς and εἰκὼν were not cult statues. Like the language describing the statues in the Pantheon, Dio is layering different types of images, where ἀνδριάντες is a general term and ἀγάλματα describes images of public gods, but all three images (εἰκόνες, ἀγάλματα, and ἀνδριάντες) share the same cult place there.

in the *cella* with other public gods, but that his statue could be described as ἀγάλματα or ἀνδριάντες in a way that the statue of *vivus* Augustus and Agrippa could not.

I add that Dio's specific language and the gods he names prove he is describing the *vivus* and not the *Divus* Augustus, calling to mind the layout of statues in the temple from the perspective of an Augustan viewer. As later source, Dio's layout of the statuary in the Pantheon is, at first glance, suspect. Thomas points out that Dio's language describing the statues in the temple is intentionally vague, only mentioning Mars, Venus, and *Divus* Julius in the *cella*.¹⁰⁵ He does not fault the imprecision of the description, noting, "that guardedness is a reason for taking him at his word: those were either the only three statues which he knew to have been definitely present in Agrippa's building or at least the ones most worth mentioning."¹⁰⁶ Beyond a possible lack of precision in his source materials, I emphasize the Augustan dynastic themes the statues communicated to the viewer—the statues of Agrippa, Augustus, *Divus* Julius, Mars, and Venus all shared in the *gens Iulia* of the imperial family.¹⁰⁷ Contrary to Thomas, I believe Dio specifically listed these statues knowing that they played a prominent role in Augustan Rome and the cults

¹⁰⁵ "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," 148-9, although we should be skeptical (but not entirely dismissive) of Dio's description, there are no manuscript issues with the phrase "πολλῶν θεῶν εἰκόνας ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι, τῷ τε τοῦ Ἀρεως καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης," Thomas counters the revisions of Adam Ziolkowski, "Prolegomena to any future metaphysics on Agrippa's Pantheon," in *Res Bene Gestae. Ricerche di storia urbana su Roma antica in onore di Eva Margareta Steinby*, ed. Anna Leone, Domenico Palombi, and Susan Walker (Rome: Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae Supplementum IV, 2007), 469 emending "ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι" to "ἐπὶ or πρὸς, in the sense of 'in addition to,' making the statues of the 'many gods' supplementary to the two cult statues of Mars and Venus," i.e. that the only cult statues were those of Mars and Venus. This distinction based on the language in this sentence alone overlooks the earlier terminology used in the passage, specifically the juxtaposition between εἰκόνες and ἀγάλματα: "πολλῶν θεῶν εἰκόνας ἐν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι, τῷ τε τοῦ Ἀρεως καὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, ἔλαβεν; it received *eikones* of many gods among the *agalmata*, both that of Mars and that of Venus." The manuscript tradition is unanimous in the original wording of the text. Thereby, following Thomas, Dio highlights the cult statues of Mars and Venus, but they are not the only ones in the building.

¹⁰⁶ Thomas, "The Cult Statues of the Pantheon," 149-50, basing the assertion of these statues on Dio's meticulous research.

¹⁰⁷ Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples*, 128; Filippo Coarelli, "Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo," *CARI* 10 (1983): 42.

of *Divus* Julius and *Divus* Augustus.¹⁰⁸ The fact that they are the only statuary mentioned marks the temple as the Agrippan iteration, rather than a later revision.

Additionally, Dio emphasizes that this statue of Augustus should be viewed as the *vivus*, cultic statue, as opposed to its *Divus*, cult form. As the frequency chart on p. 187-8 shows, Dio uses ἀγάλματα specifically for cult images of deified emperors and men, and only as a negative example for *vivi* emperors in the context of his narrative.¹⁰⁹ He identifies no architectural features, so the reader would only have his descriptions of statues to mark which iteration of the temple this was. By labeling the statue of Augustus as an ἀνδρίας, not an ἄγαλμα, Dio describes the statue as it would have been seen by a viewer during the emperor's lifetime. This may be a statement on his part about the practices of current emperors that statues of *vivi* should not be placed in the *cella*, but Dio does not comment on his intent.

A slightly later report of the statues confirms my reading of historian's application of terms and presentation of an Augustan context. Dio mentions the statues in the Pantheon a second time when he reports lightning striking the temple in 22 BCE (three years after the initial description):

Τῷ δ' ἐπιγιγνομένῳ ἔτει, ἐν ᾧ Μάρκος τε Μάρκελλος καὶ Λούκιος Ἀρρουντίος ὑπάτευσαν, ἥ τε πόλις πελαγίσαντος αὐθις τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐπλεύσθη, καὶ κεραινοῖς ἄλλα τε	The following year, when Marcus Marcellus and Lucius Arruntius were consuls, when the city was again submerged by the overflowing of the river, and many objects were struck by
---	---

¹⁰⁸ Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples*, 128 notes that “the combination of these [statues] clearly made it [the Pantheon] a sanctuary to the dynasty of the *gens Julia*.” I do not believe the *gens Iulia* was the sole focus of worship at the monument, but that Dio only listing those statues is an intentional statement to his reader that this was the Agrippan version, not any subsequent remodeling.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. section IIIB, n. 68-70 for the three uses of the term for *vivi* emperors. 69.11.4 describes statues of the deified Antinous that are specifically statues of a deified man: “καὶ ἐκείνου ἀνδριάντας ἐν πάσῃ ὡς εἰπεῖν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγάλματα, ἀνέθηκε; and he set up *andriantes*, which were called *agalmata*, in every part of the world.” He further clarifies that this is a crime when Caligula recuts an ἄγαλμα of Jupiter (59.28.4): “καὶ ἄγαλμα ἐς αὐτὸν ἠθέλησε τὸ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου ἐς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ εἶδος μεταρρυθμίσαι. μὴ δυνήθεις δὲ (τό τε γὰρ πλοῖον τὸ πρὸς τὴν κομιδὴν αὐτοῦ ναυπηγηθὲν ἐκεραυνώθη...; and to there (the Palatine) he wished to recut an *agalma* of Olympian Jupiter to resemble himself. But he was unable (the ship engineered to bring it [the statue] was shattered by thunderbolts...”

πολλὰ ἐβλήθη, καὶ οἱ ἀνδριάντες οἱ ἐν τῷ Πανθείῳ, ὥστε καὶ τὸ δόρυ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Αὐγούστου χειρὸς ἐκπεσεῖν. ¹¹⁰	thunderbolts, even the <i>andriantes</i> in the Pantheon, so that the spear fell from the hand of Augustus.
---	---

Dio does not specify that the ἀνδριάντες only includes the statues in the *pronaos*, but applies the term generally to all of the cult statues on the site. Dio never uses any form of ἀνδρίας alone to indicate statues of the pantheon, but here describes all of the statues including images of gods, imperial images, and honorific statues of men.¹¹¹ In this way, the ἀνδριάντες in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon and in the temple itself describes a mixed group of representations; the statues as a collective include images of the deities of the pantheon, *vivus* Augustus, and Agrippa.¹¹² This account does not describe in detail specific statues within the Pantheon, so Dio does not need to clarify the different groupings in different parts of the temple. Similarly, the statues are not collectively called ἀγάλματα, since in 22 BCE Augustus was not yet deified, and the term could not apply to him and Agrippa. Dio attempts to avoid anachronism and false presentations by recording how a viewer would have seen Augustus' cultic statue during the emperor's lifetime.

In Pompeii, archaeology provides us with another example of Augustus sharing in the “divine overtones” of a temple, but we have no literary accounts providing the term for the statue or the viewers reaction to it. Inside the *cella* of the Temple of Fortuna Augusta there is a platform for the goddess with niches on either side for Augustus and the

¹¹⁰ 54.1.1. The Loeb translation does not give any special significance to οἱ ἀνδριάντες, translating it as ‘statues.’ I contend that translation misses the mark. La Rocca, “Agrippa’s Pantheon and Its Origins,” 64 states that for Agrippa’s Pantheon, there was no concrete vault, but instead a wooden roof with a central oculus. The reality of lightning striking through the oculus in the wooden roof (and not setting fire to the whole temple), or just striking the porch is unclear. Gowing, “Cassius Dio and the City of Rome,” 121 citing Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, 77, 179 and Swan, “Cassius Dio on Augustus,” 8, 12, 43, 44 that Dio as a historian is more interested in portents than the science of lightning strikes.

¹¹¹ Cf. section IIIB, n. 67 *supra* for the list of uncertain applications.

¹¹² Cf. section IIIB, n. 68-70 and chart on p. 187-8 for Dio never calling an image of a mortal an ἀγάλμα, and for using the term for living emperor's a negative way.

temple's dedicator and benefactor Marcus Tullius.¹¹³ William Van Andringa follows Estienne in calling the statue *ornamenta* and serving an honorific purpose.¹¹⁴ While this was a different location from the Pantheon and the cult of Fortuna *Augusta* had different local aims, the presence of Augustus and the temple's benefactor sharing space with the god may suggest a different status for the images, where the former is more-than-human and the latter is honorific, but both share in proximity to the divine.

At the Roman Pantheon, the combination of the cultic statue in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon and the bronze, colossal cultic statue above the Mausoleum presented the viewer with a dual narrative of Augustus' progression towards the divine.¹¹⁵ Atop the private Mausoleum, Augustus *vivus*' cultic statue rose towards heaven among the public, monumental narrative of the northern Campus Martius. In the Pantheon, the cultic statue similarly advertised in a public cult place the divine qualities and more-than-human status of the *vivus*. After his death and deification, both statues (as they would have appeared in Dio's time) depicted the *Divus* Augustus and received his public cult.

V. Appearance: Silver Statues in the *Res Gestae*

The progression of private cultic statues into public cult statues of the emperor prohibits statues of the *vivus* from being visually distinguishable from the *Divus*.¹¹⁶

Literary sources often did not include a description of the statue, as was the case with the

¹¹³ Van Andringa, "M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae)," 104.

¹¹⁴ Citing generally Estienne, "*Simulacra Deorum* versus *Ornamenta Aedium*," on the difference between *simulacra* and *ornamenta*. He also cites Price, *Rituals and Power*, 146-56; D. Steuernagel, "*Synnaos theos*: Images of Roman Emperors in Greek Temples," in *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, ed. Joannis Mylonopoulos (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 241-56; and Van Andringa, "Statues in the Temples of Pompeii," 85-115.

¹¹⁵ By 'more-visible' axis I am referring to the fact that within the temple, the relationship between the two statues of Augustus would have been diminished when surrounded by other cult statues, cf. n. 91 *supra*.

¹¹⁶ Cf. n. 1 *supra*, Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 182-3, 185, 189, 226, where a change in the inscription would have been the only way to distinguish a cultic from a cult statue.

cultic statue atop the Mausoleum in Strabo and Dio's account of the statue in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon,¹¹⁷ since the features of the emperor's face and his garb bore little to no consequence on his status being divine. That is to say, Augustus had no accoutrements of divinity that would have marked his statues as statues of the *Divus* as opposed to the *vivus*. In light of this, I address in this section the appearance and material of the eighty silver statues of Augustus in the *Res Gestae* because these statues were destroyed and repurposed by the emperor himself. I argue that the statue types respond to official honorific statues throughout the city, and that silver as a medium did not provoke Augustus' response in the way that most scholars present it. The rededication of the statues as *dona aurea* redirects private ritual focus and activity into the cult of Apollo; thus, the private cult of Augustus is incorporated into the framework of his patron god on the Palatine.

While I cannot prove ritual activity towards these statues (in their original silver form), I can situate them within the structure of Augustus' private cult in Rome. These statues, like Ovid's and Aulus Virgilius Marsus', made the emperor present to viewers and ritual participants in Rome.¹¹⁸ They become cultic when they are "a sign or symbol for something else, is 'showing the invisible.'"¹¹⁹ In this instance, an individual wishing to make the emperor present to meet her needs, either hear her prayers, receive a libation, or offering of incense, would focus her ritual activities on the image of the absent emperor in a cult place. We do not have descriptions of how the silver statues' features affected

¹¹⁷ Cf. section IVA, n. 79 for Strabo and n. 87 for speculations on the statue's appearance at the Mausoleum, and section IVB, n. 93 and 110 for Dio and n. 97 for speculations on the statue's appearance at the Pantheon.

¹¹⁸ Cf. section II *supra* for my analysis of Ovid's ritual and statuettes, as well as other silver statues from Italy. Cf. n. 24 and 27 for the passages.

¹¹⁹ Cf. section III, n. 37 for Rüpke's definition.

the viewer and confirmed the emperor's more-than-human status and authority, but we do know that private individuals erected them throughout the city and that their features were not uniform. I interpret in the following paragraphs the features of the statues as private responses to official, honorific (not cultic) statues in the city.

Unlike most literary descriptions of Augustus' statues, both the Latin and Greek texts of the *Res Gestae* include their appearance: "*Statuae [mea]e pedestres et equestres et in quadrigis argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter; Ανδριάντες πεζοὶ καὶ ἑφιπποὶ μου καὶ ἐφ' ἄρμασιν ἀργυροὶ εἰστήκεισαν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐνγυὺς ὀγδοήκοντα.*"¹²⁰ The types of statues (on foot, horseback, and in a *quadriga*) relate to honorific statues of Augustus within the city, but the statue type does not designate its function.¹²¹ Two public and official statues (both possibly gilded bronze) of Augustus within the Forum Romanum depicted Octavian/Augustus on horseback and driving a *quadriga*, respectively. The first was placed on the Rostra in 43 BCE by order of the senate, and the second crowned his triumphal arch in 19 BCE.¹²² The official and public nature of these two statues suggest honorific rather than cultic images, at least at the time of their dedication; unlike the

¹²⁰ *Res Gestae* 24.2, "Nearly eighty silver statues, of me on foot, on horseback, and in a quadriga, standing in the city; The silver statues, on foot, on horseback, and in a war-chariot set up in the city, nearly eighty in number." Cf. section IIIC, n. 72 for the full passage. The different poses of the emperor do not include representations of Augustus in the guise of a god, so contrary to Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 75, who supposes "there is a distinct possibility that at least some showed him as godlike." We have no evidence they were transgressive in the same way as the ill-fated δωδεκάθεος banquet (cf. Chapter 1, section VB). At the banquet, Octavian dressed up as Apollo and his guests as the other Olympians for a private banquet while the people of Rome starved. Suetonius, *DA*, 70.1-2 records the people's rage at his "let them eat cake" attitude.

¹²¹ Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 75 rightly states that these would not have been public or official dedications.

¹²² Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 204 lists these statues in his discussion of public and official statues where nudity would not have been appropriate. He adds the *Ara Fortunae Reducis* in 19 BCE and the *Ara Pacis* in 13. Koortbojian does not mention the statue in the Pantheon, suggesting he does not view this as a public dedication. Prior to Augustus, only Sulla, Pompey Magnus, and Caesar had received the honor of a public, gilded equestrian statue. Velleius Paterculus 2.61.3 *equestri statua* does not say it was gilded but Appian, *Bellum Civile*, 3.51.8 "ἐπίχρυσόν τε αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα" implies that the statue was overlaid with gold. Some modern sources for the gilded statue: Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 105; Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, 38, 346; Galinsky, *Augustan Culture*, 46.

colossal bronze statue atop the Mausoleum and the statue in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon, these kinds of images are not unique to Augustus, and neither directly share in any “divine overtones” through their locations, nor do they emphasize the emperor’s more-than-human status to the viewer. Since the silver statues mirror these public and official statue types, I posit that their dedicators reinterpreted the official narrative of Augustus in a similar way to the private cult places utilizing Carrara marble – the types of silver statues recalled public statues commissioned by the senate.¹²³ The private statues did not deviate from the official narrative in the type and features of the statues, but their private dedicators emphasized Augustus’ more-than-human status and divine qualities in a way that provoked the emperor’s response.

I note that Augustus’ action in seizing the statues was not entirely legal, but it was not prompted by silver as the medium in the way that scholars suggest. Thomas Pekáry questions the legality of this act, since these statues were not public property: “Das Vorgehen des Augustus scheint also beispiellos und rechtlich durchaus nicht einwandfrei gewesen zu sein; the action of Augustus seems to have been unprecedented and legally not perfect.”¹²⁴ There is no indication in the *Res Gestae*, however, that silver as a Hellenistic medium incited the emperor to act. I argue in the paragraphs below that money and reinterpretation of his private cult were the dual motivations for Augustus’ actions.

Melting down statues for cash or dedications to a different god, particularly cult statues or votive offerings, were not unique to this instance in the Roman world: Sulla

¹²³ Cf. Chapter 3, sections IIIA and VI for the visual narrative a viewer would have seen between the private and public monuments.

¹²⁴ Pekáry, “*Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt*,” 105-6.

and Pompey had committed similar acts, as did Octavian and later emperors.¹²⁵ Dio, describing the act over two centuries later, argues that money alone, not cult, provoked Augustus' response. Many roads needed repairs and the senators were reluctant to pay for such costs *de sua pecunia*, so the emperor and the public shared the expense:

<p>Οὐ γὰρ δύνامي διακρῖναι τοὺς θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν, οὐδ' εἰ τὰ μάλιστα ὁ Αὐγουστος καὶ ἀνδριάντας τινὰς ἑαυτοῦ ἀργυροῦς, πρὸς τε τῶν φίλων καὶ πρὸς δήμων τινῶν γεγονότας, ἐς νόμισμα κατέκοψε τοῦ δὴ καὶ οἰκοθεν.¹²⁶</p>	<p>For I am unable to separate the funds, not even if Augustus especially coined into money certain silver <i>andriantes</i> of himself, which had been set up by certain friends and by some of the people; what is more [he claimed] this money [came from] his own expense.</p>
--	--

Augustus did not consider silver as an overly-Hellenistic medium, but it does, as Dio speculates, and Augustus himself admits in the *Res Gestae*, make money.¹²⁷ As a monetary source, however, scholars cannot agree on a single influx of *denarii* that would coincide with Dio's date of c. 29-27 BCE. Pekáry notes a link between Augustus' statues and a large issue of silver *denarii* in 29/28 BCE commemorating Actium and Apollo, as well as appeasing veterans in Southern Italy.¹²⁸ This suggestion correlates with the *Res Gestae*'s pattern of language: the private cultic statues become the *dona aurea* in the public temple and coins throughout the city and empire (with Augustus and Apollo

¹²⁵ Richard Duncan-Jones, *Money and Government in the Roman Empire*, 9-10, n. 41-73 comments on the trend, identifying Pompey's dedication to Minerva (12,060 gold coins and 307 talents of silver) "taken from sacred statues and images in the lands he conquered," cf. Diodorus 40.4; Pausanias determines that the deaths of Sulla, Caligula, and Nero were acts of divine vengeance for taking Greek statues from their temples (cf. 9.33.6, 9.27.3), but the author excuses Augustus' similar actions (8.46); Octavian's forces took votive offerings from Roman and Italian temples to raise funds (Suetonius, *Iul.*, 54.2; Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, 48.12.4; Appian, *Bellum Civile*, 5.24). Also, cf. section IIIC, n. 75 for Augustus taking a statue of Athena Alea to Rome from Tegea because the city had supported Antony.

¹²⁶ 53.22.3. Wallace-Hadrill, "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus," 79 mentions *cura viarum* had been the concern of *triumphatores* in the early 20s. He gives no reason for Augustus' interest in the project.

¹²⁷ Cf. n. 125 *supra* and cf. section IIIC, n. 72 for the passage in Latin and Greek.

¹²⁸ "Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt," 98, summarizing that Augustus took money any way he could, cited by Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 212.

sharing the obverse and reverse of the coin).¹²⁹ This convergence of the two cults preserves the private motivations of participants in the Augustus *vivus* cult in the *dona aurea* dedications, while at the same time allowing an ulterior use for the cash.

Carol Sutherland counters Pekáry's assertion on two points: first, she argues for 27 BCE as the date to which Dio refers, but she does not believe that Augustus would have needed to turn the statues into the cash after acquiring the treasury of the Ptolemies.¹³⁰ Second, *contra* Pekáry's argument for a 28/27 BCE issue, her study of Roman coin issues finds no "substantial" minting of *denarii* in the West until 19 BCE; she concludes from this that the statues were not melted for coinage and that Dio is mistaken, since there was no shortage or sudden abundance of silver at that time.¹³¹ I counter that the lack of a single, large minting of silver overlooks a more complex opportunity in light of a simple, economic one. Sutherland does not define "substantial," and we have no indication from the *Res Gestae* that every statue was solid silver and none were gilded. I argue that Augustus' motivation in repurposing the statues is not a straightforward process and we should not use the fact that he had other sources of cash to discount his actions. As Pekáry illustrates, "Und so konnte dieser gewiegte Politiker mit einer einzigen Tat vieles Verschiedene erreichen: seine Bescheidenheit in Rom demonstrieren, ohne alle seine

¹²⁹ E.g. *denarius* minted at Rome 27/29 BCE: RIC I, 272, with Augustus in the guise of Apollo on the obverse (for image, see [http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1\(2\).aug.272](http://numismatics.org/ocre/id/ric.1(2).aug.272)). Andrew Burnett, "The Augustan Revolution Seen from the Mints of the Provinces," *JRS* 101 (2011): 21 finds that in the provinces, the portrait of Augustus on coins becomes standard in a way previously unseen. This is similar to Pompey's dedication to Minerva (cf. n. 125 *supra*), but rather than the transition from private to public, foreign images become Roman.

¹³⁰ C. H. V. Sutherland, *Roman History and Coinage, 44 BC-AD 69: Fifty Points of Relation from Julius Caesar to Vespasian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 12.

¹³¹ Sutherland, *Roman History and Coinage*, 12-3 does not define 'substantial,' but operates on the exchange rate of twenty-five *denarii* to one *aureus*. A large number of silver *quinarii* were minted (with the legend *Asia Recepta*) between 29-26 BCE, having an exchange rate of fifty to one *aureus*. The large series of 19 BCE was "a very large series, not individually abundant, but very abundant in aggregate." Pollini, *From Republic to Empire*, 75, 122 n. 43 cites her analysis.

Bildnisse opfern zu müssen... und schliesslich für die Münzprägung Silber gewinnen;¹³² and so this wily politician with a single act [seizing the statues and repurposing them] could achieve many different things: to demonstrate his modesty in Rome without having to sacrifice all his images... and finally win silver for coinage.” Despite the influx of money from the Ptolemies and the conquest of Egypt, Augustus as a politician has no incentive to turn down another source of cash. Richard Duncan-Jones finds this act (taking cultic statues and turning them into cash) to be common throughout Rome’s history.¹³³ I argue that the date range of 28-27 BCE better captures Augustus’ motivation as it is presented in the *Res Gestae*,¹³⁴ since this range would coincide with the dedication of the Temple of Apollo Palatinus in 28 BCE. While it is possible that the act of seizing statues, turning them into money, and dedicating *dona aurea* in Apollo’s temple did not all take place in the same year, Augustus could not have placed the *dona aurea* in the temple until after 28 BCE.

Moreover, Sutherland and Pekáry both overlook the relationship between the emperor and moneyers; as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill argued, coins, like the imperial cult, are part of a bottom-up process.¹³⁵ As part of the private sphere, both the obverse and reverse images confirm the people’s acceptance of the emperor’s authority.¹³⁶ In this manner, the dedicator’s intent in erecting private, cultic silver statues is re-negotiated by emperor and

¹³² Pekáry, “*Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt*,” 108, adding that this process was not entirely legal. The omitted phrase refers to the illegality of the act “...einigen ihm unliebsamen Personen eine Strick drehen; to turn a rope around some unwelcome persons...”

¹³³ Duncan-Jones, *Money and Government*, 10 n. 73 speculates that Augustus and his moneyers may have needed new sources of silver; he finds this act to be common throughout Rome’s history. Cf. also n. 125 *supra* on examples of this practice.

¹³⁴ Cf. section IIIC, n. 72 *supra* for the Latin and Greek text.

¹³⁵ “Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus,” 67, cf. Chapter 2, section IV, n. 143. Wallace-Hadrill draws no connection between coins and the imperial cult –that correlation is my own.

¹³⁶ Wallace-Hadrill, “Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus,” 68-70 on the obverse and reverse as a whole communicating a message of authority, while at the same time being value-laden, persuasive, and serving both an economic and non-economic purpose. Coins communicated with the emperor in giving and confirming information he already possessed.

citizens in multiple respects: Augustus' destruction of the eighty cultic statues and their rededication as *dona aurea* allowed him to augment his more-than-human status and relationship with Apollo; at the same time, the private motivations behind the statues were redirected into the *dona aurea* and repeated in subsequent silver coinage that featured Augustus' more-than-human status or divine qualities;¹³⁷ finally, the emperor made a little money from his seizure of the private statues.¹³⁸ Through all of these outcomes, Augustus engaged in the negotiation of his private cult without condemning it or its participants.

We know from Ovid and Aulus Virgilius Marsus that other private silver statues existed in the Roman Empire, and silver, contrary to modern scholars, is not a specifically Hellenistic medium used in ruler cult. As I argued in Chapter 1, silver, in comparison to other statuary media, did not necessarily evoke excessive or Hellenistic divine honors in a negative way;¹³⁹ moreover, creating a hierarchy of divine and mortal images based on the material alone is suspect at best.¹⁴⁰ Several modern historians associate silver statues with the honors of Hellenistic kings, but silver statues are not specifically listed as divine

¹³⁷ This is not to say that coins featuring the emperor were cult images, only that the images of Augustus on the coins confirmed the elements behind private worship of the emperor in a public medium.

¹³⁸ Duncan-Jones, *Money and Government*, 9 n. 59, 65 notes a trend in taking foreign statues to mint Roman coinage, but the act of taking Roman images, although not unprecedented, would have been difficult to justify (cf. n. 125 *supra* for the actions of Octavian's forces). Since these were statues of Augustus himself, the justification may have been easier to make in contrast to stealing divine statues or statues of other men. Pekáry, "*Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt*," 105-6 finds that the seizure and destruction of the statues was not-quite legal, and was very close to an act of *maiestas*, cf. n. 124 *supra*.

¹³⁹ Cf. Chapter 1, section I, especially n. 20-3.

¹⁴⁰ Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 9, stating that a hierarchy of representations of gods and men cannot be based exclusively on material: "Ancient authors do not seem to have favoured any specific material [e.g. bronze, marble, terracotta, gold and ivory, or wood], although wood and gold were often endowed with special significance."

honors for Hellenistic kings in Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*, the source oft-cited to support this view.¹⁴¹ Pliny mentions:

<p>Argenti usum in statuas primum divi Augusti temporum adulatione transisse falso existimatur. Iam enim triumpho Magni Pompei reperimus translatam Pharnacis, qui primus regnavit in Ponto, argenteam statuam, item Mithridatis Eupatoris et currus aureos argenteosque.¹⁴²</p>	<p>It is falsely supposed, due to the cringing flattery of the times, that the use of silver in statues first pervaded the reign of <i>Divus</i> Augustus. We find already a silver statue of Pharnaces, who first reigned in Pontus, being carried at the triumph of Pompey Magnus, as well as one of Mithridates Eupator, and silver and gold chariots (were used).</p>
---	---

Pliny labels silver statues as “cringing flattery,” but I read this as evidence of private practice and the imperial cult (i.e. individuals representing to themselves the ruling power).¹⁴³ He states that the statues were pervasive, but neither affirms that they were entirely Hellenistic honors, nor that they did not receive ritual worship.¹⁴⁴ I agree with Pekáry that our evidence does not permit us to say every metallic statue was part of a cult, imperial or otherwise.¹⁴⁵ In light of Augustus' actions in the *Res Gestae*, I assert that these silver statues were cultic because of their function in making the emperor present, either in the city of Rome or in Apollo's temple. The majority of metallic statues as divine

¹⁴¹ Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 212 and Scott, “The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship,” 101 both citing Pliny the Elder for the Hellenistic reference; Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society*, 172-3 does not cite Pliny, but calls the statues “an unrivalled spontaneous expression of loyalty by the Roman populace in the language of Hellenistic honours,” (173). More generally, Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 22 states “At Rome, however, custom was different, and such [divine] honors, indistinguishable from monarchy if not divinity, were unacceptable: whom the Greeks chose to enshrine by means of their institutions had no purchase in Roman culture.” Cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 20-1 for authors citing Pliny the Younger's *Panegyricus* 52.3 to advise against silver statues.

¹⁴² 33.54.151.

¹⁴³ Cf. Chapter 1, n. 1 for Price, *Rituals and Power*, 29-30 defining ruler cult.

¹⁴⁴ Pliny the Elder makes no statement about ritual function, other than the presence of Pharnaces' and Mithradates' statues in Pompey's triumph.

¹⁴⁵ Pekáry, “*Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt*,” 104: “Statuen aus Edelmetall bedeuten also keine göttlichen Ehrungen und sind auch keine Reservatrechte für Staatsoberhäupter... nichts spricht dafür, dass dazu eine Statue aus Edelmetall gehört hätte; Statues made of precious metal do not mean divine honors and are not reserved rights for heads of state... there is nothing to suggest that a statue made of precious metal would have belonged to it [the cult of Roman officials in the Greek East during the Republic].” Pekáry concludes with the statement that the eighty statues “mit Kultbereich wenig oder gar nichts zu tun hatten; had little or nothing to do with cult.” I agree with his analysis but not his concluding remarks; the eighty silver statues are repurposed into the public cult of Apollo, preserving the dedicator's private actions.

honors for Hellenistic kings or queens were actually gold or bronze, rendering the bronze colossal statue above the Mausoleum more Hellenistic than these eighty silver ones.¹⁴⁶

Therefore, we cannot assume that silver private images were transgressive and Hellenistic.

I addressed above in section IIIC that Augustus' presentation of the event follows a pattern of action, in which the emperor takes what had been in private hands and returned it to public temples. I read from this pattern that Augustus in relocating, repurposing, and rededicating the statues as *dona aurea* in the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine, incorporates his private images into the public and official cult of Apollo. The statues as *dona aurea* did not have the same appearance (as far as we can tell), but the emperor emphasizes that he preserved the names of the original dedicators, and adds his own:

*“exque ea pecunia dona aurea in aede Apollinis meo nomine et illorum, qui mihi statuarum honorem habuerunt, posui; ἐκ τούτου τε τοῦ χρηήματος ἀναθέματα χρυσᾶ ἐν τῷ ναῷ[ι] τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ τε ἐμῷ ὀνόματι καὶ ἐκείνων, οἵτινές με [τ]ούτοις τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ἐτείμησαν, ἀνέθηκα.”*¹⁴⁷

I interpret this as the emperor preserving the private motivations of his private cult, and enhancing those motivations by interweaving them into the framework of his patron, public god. Just as Augustus had remade Pax as an official goddess with his adjective-*cum*-epithet, so that her presence and cult place recall

¹⁴⁶ Scott, “The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship,” 101-3 listing golden statues of Ptolemy Soter and Berenike at Dodona (driving chariots), Ptolemy Philadelphus with two golden statues on columns (driving chariots), the Decree of Canopus in 238 BCE lists gold statues for Princess Berenike's cult, Antiochus I Soter was voted a gold equestrian statue during his lifetime, Attalus I had in his lifetime a colossal gold statue next to Apollo's, to list a few. Even in his description of statues for regular men (not kings), the images are bronze and gold. Pharnaces and Mithridates Eupator are the only foreign kings Scott lists with silver statues. Following Scott's list, gold would have been a far more Hellenistic medium than silver.

¹⁴⁷ Cf. section IIIC, n. 72 *supra* for full passages. “... and from the money I placed golden gifts in the temple of Apollo in my name and in the name of those who had honored me with the statues; ... and from this money I set up golden dedications on the temple of Apollo both in my name and in the name of those who honored me with these statues.”

him and infuse him (his image, deeds, status, and authority) into her cult,¹⁴⁸ this repurposing of private acts incorporates Augustus into the cult of Apollo and directs his private worshippers to that cult place (as I address in detail in section VIA below). The statues as *dona aurea* in this way are cultic in that they make the absent emperor (since the statues are gone) present in the cult of Apollo (who happens to be the emperor's neighbor). The ritual activity the statues would have received in the city of Rome (which is unfortunately undocumented) becomes the ritual activity Augustus and Apollo share (where one is more-than-human and the other divine) in the temple of Apollo. The preservation of the names of the dedicators preserves their ritual intent and participation in private cult, adding that to the framework of Apollo's cult on the Palatine.

Therefore, I assert that the appearance of these silver statues, in their original form, incited a reaction in individual participants in Augustus' *vivus* cult much like Ovid's, where the absent emperor is present through his image to meet the viewer's needs. When Augustus repurposed the images into *dona aurea* in Apollo's temple, preserving the dedicators' names and adding his own, the original intent and cultic force of the images is transferred and infused into the cult of Apollo, where the emperor is now present even without his image. The private dedicators' names in place of their silver statues continue their private intent (participating in the cult of Augustus *vivus*) and the addition of the emperor's own upholds his side of the negotiation. Augustus gains from the act (taking what had been private and placing it in a public temple) silver currency and the confirmation of his relationship with Apollo; private individuals gain the confirmation of the private goal, making Augustus *vivus* present to meet their local needs, with the enhanced backing of Apollo.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Chapter 3, section VA for the infusion of Augustus into the cult of Pax.

VI. Conclusion: Ritual Activity

In the conclusion of this chapter I reconstruct the kinds of ritual activities that would have surrounded the cultic statues of Augustus in the Pantheon, atop his Mausoleum, and the eighty silver statues described in the *Res Gestae*. I end with this element since it is ritual more than appearance or terminology that transformed a statue into a cult statue.¹⁴⁹ I connect the statue as the focus of the ritual to the narratives of the locations; a cultic or cult statue cannot encourage participation in the ritual activity of *vivus* or *Divus* Augustus beyond boundaries of the statue's location.¹⁵⁰ In this way, Augustus' presence in each statue is unique to each location, making his image multilocular and multifarious depending on the needs of the participants. Each statue then has a different ritual function and I analyze them based on their contexts, but within the same narrative of Augustus' private cult in Rome, where private participants were not barred from public and official presentations of Augustus and Rome. I first identify ritual activity at locations where the cult of *vivus* and *Divus* Augustus was interwoven with public and official cults, and next examine ritual activity at the Mausoleum as Augustan cult place, where there was little to no incorporation of the emperor's worship with members of the pantheon.

I caution again that the ritual activity surrounding a cult statue, as I present it, is speculation based upon the context of the statue (the terminology used, its location, and its appearance). A shortcoming of any analysis of cultic statues is that in literary sources,

¹⁴⁹ Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 7: "ritual defined cult statues, not the other way round." *Contra* arguments like Price, *Rituals and Power*, 176; Fishwick, "The Statue of Julius Caesar in the Pantheon," and Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, that use location, language, or appearance (respectively) independently to identify a cult statue.

¹⁵⁰ Lipka, *Roman Gods*, 13-14 argues that no cult statue could function outside of its spatial context, cf. section I, n. 10. Also cf. n. 4 for Derks, *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices*, 133 where ritual focus is a required component of a cult place.

where many of these statues are placed within their original context, the ritual activity and viewer's reaction to the statue are not often included in the narrative.¹⁵¹ I aim to extrapolate ritual activity based on other known elements surrounding a cultic or cult statue as it is described in literature, and in doing so address how the emperor would have been made present by the communication and line of vision between participants and his statue.

A cult statue was the means of communication between the ritual participant and the god, evoking the god's presence, allowing the viewer some say in that cultic nature of the statue.¹⁵² Just as the adjective-*cum*-epithet *Augustus* allowed worshippers to adapt the emperor's more-than-human status and divine qualities to their own needs in the *vici* and in the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, creating multiple places where the emperor and his cult are present, a private cultic statue made the emperor a *praesens* god for local participants in his cult. This ritual activity, like a statue's appearance, stands outside of time –the participants do not differentiate the *vivus* from the *Divus* Augustus, instead their practices adapt to the transition from private to public worship. Much in the same way that Augustus' Mausoleum as a cult place both anticipates and affirms Augustus' more-than-human status and deification,¹⁵³ their adaptation makes Augustus (*vivus* and *Divus*) present to every citizen, incorporating his private cult into existing cult places and rituals. Ritual participants communicate and negotiate the terms of their worship with the emperor, establishing the practices that continued after his official deification.

¹⁵¹ Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 12 cautions against identifying cult statues from literary or epigraphic sources alone, but I believe this eliminates a large amount of our evidence. Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 31 on Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 96 and the absence of living cult in Hellenistic sources. I see a repeated absence in Roman sources, but we do have Ovid's reaction to his silver statuettes in *Ex Ponto* 2.8.5-10, 57-60 (cf. section II, n. 24 for the passage), where his gaze gives them their power.

¹⁵² Mylonopoulos, "Divine Images *versus* Cult Images," 7.

¹⁵³ Cf. Chapter 3, sections VC and VI for the Mausoleum resisting a single reading of pre- or post-14 CE.

VIA. Ritual Activity: Incorporating Cults within Public Temples

On a local level in Rome, the private cultic statues of Augustus were incorporated within the existing framework of public cults, and shared in the ritual activity of their settings. I address in the following paragraphs the incorporation and infusion of the private *vivus* cult within established public cults in order to foster private ritual activity directed at the emperor's cultic images during his lifetime. Of the statues I analyzed in this chapter, the eighty silver statues and the statue of Augustus in the Pantheon benefited the most from this incorporation. As I argued above, the repurposing of the silver statues connects the cult of Augustus to that of Apollo, through the now-absent images and the names of the emperor and dedicators.¹⁵⁴ Then, I argue that the incorporation of Augustus' cult with the cults practiced at the Pantheon encourages the ritual participant to view Augustus' cultic statue as the embodiment of the living emperor's role in rituals of Rome's renewal.

In melting down and dedicating *dona aurea* to Apollo in the name of those who had privately honored him, the ritual focus of the statues as cultic objects is redirected from locations throughout the city to the emperor's new temple (and connected *domus*) on the Palatine. This incorporation of cults allows both Augustus and Apollo to share in the ritual activity of the space, being present even when physically the living emperor was absent. As was previously argued, the emperor's motivation in repurposing the statues was not the obliteration of his private cult, rather his response to the actions of his citizens.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. section IIIC and V *supra* for this incorporation in the context of terminology in the *Res Gestae* and the appearance of the statues.

Through the *dona aurea* and the names of the original dedicators, the emperor shared in the ritual activity of worshipping Apollo in his new temple. Augustus was already present in his adjective-*cum*-epithet at cult places like the compital altars to the *Lares Augusti* and at the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, but most of those locations did not feature a cultic image of him.¹⁵⁵ The preservation of the original dedicators' names and the addition of his own to the *dona aurea* in Apollo's temple transferred that communication from throughout the city to a fixed location with an established cult. There, the private cult of Augustus *vivus* is enfolded into the public and official cult of Augustus' Apollo. Even though the cultic images were repurposed and the emperor's private cult was not officially recognized (it was not called the Temple of Apollo and Augustus Palatinus), this addition met the needs of the local population who wished to recognize the cult of Augustus *vivus* and the cult of Apollo, the emperor's favored god. Augustus in these acts (repurposing the statues and adding his name, the moneyers minting coins from the proceeds with both his and the god's image), maintains the original dedications of his private citizens and confirms his status, all while asserting that he is still more-than-human but not fully divine.

The change in medium from silver to gold additionally promoted the emperor's role in bringing about the *aurea saecula*, as it was celebrating during the *ludi Saeculares* at the Temple of Apollo on the Palatine in 17 BCE, further interweaving the private and public cults together. If we follow my proposed range for 28-27 BCE for the seizing statues, turning them into money, and dedicating *dona aurea* in Apollo's temple (which did not

¹⁵⁵ The exceptions are the emperor's appearance on the south frieze of the *Ara Pacis* and *capite velato* on the altar of the *Vicus Sandaliarius* (cf. Chapter 3, section IIIA, n. 78-9 for the altar and section VA, n. 116 of the same chapter for the image of Augustus on the south frieze of the *Ara Pacis*).

have to take place all in the same year),¹⁵⁶ then the performance of the *Carmen Saeculare* in front of the Palatine in 17 BCE would have further promoted the connections between Augustus and Apollo, where the man manifests the will of the gods in his deeds. Although Horace does not mention the eighty silver statues or the *dona aurea* specifically, the themes of his *Carmen Saeculare* participate in a similar dialogue of Augustus' status.

In the *Carmen*, the voices of the performers make Augustus and Apollo present in the ritual moment of the hymn; both the emperor and god (and Diana) are credited for the glory of Rome's present and future.¹⁵⁷ Augustus' presence in the Horatian hymn follows his practice in the four books of *Carmina*, in which Horace imparts to his readers that the emperor's actions on earth warrant their sacrifices. Augustus, on account of his actions and morality on earth, should be recognized as more-than-human and sacrifices should be offered to his divine aspects.¹⁵⁸ The *Carmen Saeculare* follows by one year his moral legislation of the *leges Iuliae* and was performed in the same year as his adoption of Gaius and Lucius.¹⁵⁹ Morality and fertility are repeatedly referenced in the hymn, granting divine honors to Augustus' lifetime actions while praising Apollo and Diana.¹⁶⁰ Additionally, Horace's use of Sapphic meter would have made the hymn sound like a

¹⁵⁶ Cf. section V, n. 134 and p. 214 for my argument.

¹⁵⁷ Putnam, *Horace's Carmen Saeculare*, 5 on the hymn celebrating "the Rome that has been realized up to, and during his [Augustus'] regime." He adds (54-5) that the language of the hymn suggests merged temporal spheres of the divine and human, where the gods "have always been, and will always be, worshipped (*o colendi/semper et culti*)." He cites lines 2-3.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Chapter 2, section IIB for my discussion of Horace's use of Hellenistic traditions to present his argument to his reader.

¹⁵⁹ Putnam, *Horace's Carmen Saeculare*, 49. Cf. Chapter 2, section IIB, n. 43 for examples of social and legal policy in allusions to Augustus' *leges Iuliae* of 18 BCE in his *Carmina*.

¹⁶⁰ Lines 17-20 name the legislation in a prayer to Diana is addressed specifically as Ilithyia: "*Diva, producas subolem patrumque Prosperes decreta super iugandis Feminis prolisque novae feraci lege marita*; Goddess, nurture (our) offspring, further the decrees of our fathers in addition to joining women in matrimony and the marriage law, productive of new offspring."

wedding song, calling to mind the oncoming maturity and marriage of the chorus.¹⁶¹

Horatian Sapphics, unlike Catullus' use of the meter, always made the fourth syllable of the hendecasyllabic line long.¹⁶² This lengthened syllable seems to have fit better with the Roman accent when a *carmen* was read aloud.¹⁶³ For the *Carmen*, though, the presence of a trochaic caesura in one in three of the hendecasyllabic lines makes Horace's meter follow the correct *ictus* of the Greek meter.¹⁶⁴ In this way, the sound, themes, and figures of the *Carmen Saeculare* as part of ritual performance promoted Augustus' lifetime deeds, more-than-human status, and his relationship with Apollo; Augustus' morality and the promise of future generations are the focus of the hymn. Although the *dona aurea* are not mentioned in the hymn, the ritual intent of making Augustus present and recognizing his status relative to Apollo and the ritual participant remain the same. The private motivations for dedicating silver statues throughout the city are realized in the hymn's celebration of Augustus' and Apollo's deeds in Rome.

Elsewhere in the city of Rome, the statue of Augustus in the Pantheon received ritual activity from the incorporation of the emperor's cult into the "divine overtones" of the temple as well as the temple as a location. This differs from the eighty silver statues in the fact that the cultic image of the emperor and the cults with which it shared a space

¹⁶¹ Wayne B. Ingalls, "Ritual Performance as Training for Daughters in Archaic Greece," *Phoenix* 54, no. 1/2 (2000): 2, 13 on Sapphic poetry and meter, as well as the prominence of Artemis, Aphrodite, and Hera in Sappho's poetry, all oversee a young girl prior to marriage. Her participation signifies to them and to the community that they are nearing or have reached marriageable age.

¹⁶² Edgar H. Sturtevant, "Horace, *Carm.* 3.30.10-14, and the Sapphic Stanza," *TAPA* 70 (1939): 296, Catullus and the original Greek would occasionally make the fourth syllable long, but followed no regular pattern of lengthening or shortening, as also explained by L. P. Wilkinson, "Accentual Rhythm in Horatian Sapphics," *CR* 54, no. 3 (1940): 132.

¹⁶³ Wilkinson, "Accentual Rhythm in Horatian Sapphics," 132-3 explains this habit of the Roman accent with the categories of 'educated' readers, who would have known their Greek meters and not had a problem with a long or short fourth syllable, and the 'wide public,' who would have butchered a short syllable.

¹⁶⁴ Wilkinson, "Accentual Rhythm in Horatian Sapphics," 133 imagines that without the caesura, "the choir gaily singing the right notes to the barbarous Roman time..."

were limited to that space –the silver statues were repurposed in the Temple of Apollo Palatinus as well as on coins depicting the emperor and Apollo, distributing the association of the two and thereby the shared ritual connotations if not practice beyond the perimeters of the temple itself. Any ritual activity directed at the cultic statue in the *pronaos* was limited to the Pantheon as a location.¹⁶⁵ In this way, the statue’s location in the temple complex regulated the incorporation and infusion of the cults and ritual activity directed at those cults. I examine in the following paragraphs rituals we know to have taken place in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon and how the cultic image of Augustus there would have added his cult to the ritual recipients.

The records of the *fratres Arvales* detail rituals after Augustus’ deification, but we can trace their origins to the emperor’s lifetime. The *Arvales* document that the ritual of announcing (*indictio*) the dates for the festival of *dea Dia* in 59 CE took place in the *pronaos* of the Pantheon.¹⁶⁶ No other location is listed before 59 CE, but after that year, the Pantheon is listed as the location of the *indictio* until 63 CE, when it is moved to the *Aedes Concordiae*. John Scheid admits he cannot prove the *indictio* occurred at the Pantheon in the time of Augustus, but he argues that such a precedent fits with the motivations and timing of the rite; although, we have no evidence prior to 59 CE, given the regularity of the festival’s location post-59 and post-63, it is unlikely that the rite took place somewhere other than the Pantheon’s *pronaos*.¹⁶⁷ The festival itself did not include

¹⁶⁵ Cf. section IVB for my argument for the cultic statue’s place in the temple.

¹⁶⁶ Scheid, *Romulus et ses Frères*, 176-7. Kjeld De Fine Licht, *The Rotunda in Rome: A Study of Hadrian’s Pantheon* (Copenhagen: Jutland Archaeological Society, 1968), 191, cited in Stamper, *The Architecture of Roman Temples*, 202 suggests that prior locations were the Temple of Apollo Palatinus and the *Aedes Concordiae*, but Scheid finds no evidence of this.

¹⁶⁷ *Romulus et ses Frères*, 177, 461: “Le témoignage de 59 ne suffit malheureusement pas pour prouver que sous les Julio-Claudiens, et dès Auguste, les arvales célébraient l’*indictio* au Pantheon. Mais si c’était le cas, les connotations gagneraient encore en précision; The testimony of 59 [CE], unfortunately, is not enough to

(as far as we know), any specific rituals or prayers for the living or deified emperor, but beyond the ritual of *indictio*, the *Arvales* did make vows and sacrifices for the emperor on his birthday, accessions, and on the event of his death and deification.¹⁶⁸ Although not listed, I argue that a pre-14 CE date for the *indictio* infuses the Augustan themes of rebirth, peace, and the dynasty of the *gens Iulia* with the agricultural rites of the goddess. This proximity of Agrippa's honorific statue promotes this dynastic intent, especially after his marriage to Julia in 21 BCE, and the adoption of Agrippa's sons Gaius and Lucius in 17 BCE. Augustus, through his cultic statue in the *pronaos*, was a *praesens vivus* who is 'present' with *dea Dia* at the *indictio*, where both the emperor and the goddess preside over the rebirth and growth of Rome. We know there was a statue of *dea Dia* in her *aedes* in the grove of the *Arvales*, but the *fratres Arvales* do not mention moving that the statue to the Pantheon for *indictio*, making Augustus in the *pronaos* the only visibly present god.¹⁶⁹

The presence of Augustus in the *pronaos* asserts his more-than-human status and divine authority on earth.¹⁷⁰ Given that the *indictio* took place in the *pronaos*, not inside the *cella* of the Pantheon, the nearby cultic statue of Augustus communicated to the ritual

prove that under the Julio-Claudians, and from Augustus, the *Arvales* celebrated the *indictio* at the Pantheon. But if that were the case, the connotations would gain even more precision."

¹⁶⁸ Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I, 195 on the *Arvales* making vows "for the emperor's safety." The actual passage for the phrase is not given, but we can assume the *Arvales* used the phrase in the same way as the official wording of the private citizens offering prayers "*vota pro salute mea... pro valetudine mea supplicaverunt*," in the *Res Gestae* 9.2, cf. Chapter 2, section IB, n. 14 for passage, section IV, n. 151-2 for further analysis. Derks, *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices*, 217 n. 11 clarifies that the *Arvales* could not make *vota* "for the welfare of the state and the senate (this was reserved for the magistrates and the great colleges of priests), they could, like any other college, take action for the safety of the emperor."

¹⁶⁹ Mary Beard, J. North, and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. II: *A Sourcebook* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), locate a statue of *dea Dia* in her *aedes* in the grove of the *Arvales*, but neither they nor Scheid mention the statue of *dea Dia* being present at the *indictio*.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Chapter 2, section IIA, n. 39 for Horace's use of *praesens* for Augustus, and in that same chapter section III, n. 93 for Ovid's characterization is that Augustus *vivus* is a *praesens deus* here to help.

participants his shared presence in the rite.¹⁷¹ After his deification, the cult statue continued to convey the Augustan themes of the rites of *dea Dia*, making clear to those performing the ritual and the spectators the Augustan associations with peace, the agrarian rites of *dea Dia*, and the *gens Iulia*.¹⁷² The cultic statue of Augustus in *pronaos* shared in the “divine overtones” of the Pantheon, participating in ritual activity both inside and outside the temple’s *cella*. Ritual participants communicated with the statue of the emperor, making him a *praesens* god.

VIB. Ritual Activity: Campus Martius and Ritual Activity

Unlike the cultic statue in the Pantheon, where the location controlled the incorporation and infusion of cults, the statue atop the Mausoleum was not connected to a public cult, but received ritual activity from its location –the cult place of the northern Campus Martius. I addressed in the previous chapter the northern Campus Martius as a cult place to the *vivus* Augustus,¹⁷³ and I employ the arguments of Jane Clark Reeder and Penelope Davies to recreate the ritualized movement of circumambulation within and outside of the monument, focused on the cultic statue of Augustus.¹⁷⁴ While we cannot know or reconstruct what an individual would have been thinking during this movement,

¹⁷¹ Scheid, *Romulus et ses Frères*, 461 points out that the commentaries on the event specifically locate the rite in the *pronaos*.

¹⁷² Scheid, *Romulus et ses Frères*, 461-2: “Ainsi le temps et le lieu de l'*indictio* établissent des connotations très claires entre Auguste, la *gens Iulia*, les rites agraires, les confrérie archaïques, le retour de la paix, la bonne entente des citoyens et la clémence d'Auguste. Quels que fussent, au demeurant, la date ou le sanctuaire choisis, les acteurs et les spectateurs ne pouvaient manquer de constituer l'essentiel des associations suggérées; Thus the time and place of the *indictio* establishes very clear connotations between Augustus, the *gens Iulia*, the agrarian rites, the archaic brotherhoods, the return of peace, the good understanding of the citizens and the clemency of Augustus. Whatever may be the date or sanctuary chosen, the actors and spectators could not fail to miss the bulk of the suggested associations.”

¹⁷³ Cf. Chapter 3, section VC.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 33 for Reeder, “Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus,” 298-300; Davies, *Death and the Emperor*, 59, 125.

I argue that the act of circumambulation within the monument (elite participants) and around it (non-elite participants)¹⁷⁵ was ritualized movement that recognized Augustus' lifetime status as bridging the mortal and the divine, where he would not reside among the dead, but due to his exceptional deeds (documented in the surrounding monuments) would rise like his statue towards heaven. In this way, while I cannot pinpoint exact moments of active ritual participation, I identify how and to what end a ritual participant would have done such activity.

Reeder asserts that the inner corridors of the Mausoleum forced a visitor to circle the sepulchral chamber twice before entering.¹⁷⁶ She believes this act of circumambulation makes the Mausoleum both a cultic and funerary monument; the ritual made the monument a temple to the living emperor, and later a place where daily sacrifices could be performed for the *Divus*.¹⁷⁷ Her argument does not include non-elite participants, and she does not address the motivations for worshipping the living emperor at a tomb. I

¹⁷⁵ Reeder, "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus," 298-300 argues for an elite ritual, with access to the interior of the private monument limiting participation; Davies, *Death and the Emperor*, 59, 125 qualifies Reeder's claim, pointing out that the monument itself was private and would have been closed to visitors except at times of ritual activity. Additionally, she adds that a visitor would have had a choice of paths to the burial chamber, but puts in an in-text parenthetical that this choice would still accommodate circumambulation (59). Strabo, *Geographica*, 5.3.8 and Suetonius, *DA*, 100 describe public walkways encircling the Mausoleum that would have accommodated more inclusive ritual participation in circumambulation.

¹⁷⁶ Reeder, "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus," 298-300.

¹⁷⁷ Reeder, "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus," 300. She uses Dio's inconsistent language in describing the site to support her argument for living and deified cult: "Dio Cassius as a rule used the term *mnemeion* or *mnema* for the tombs of Augustus and of Hadrian and reserved the term *heroon* for a sanctuary whose erection followed the consecratio of an emperor. But Dio Cassius reported that the text of the *Res Gestae* that Augustus had engraved on bronze *stelai* was put up *pros to heroon*, that is, as is known, before the Mausoleum. Likewise Dio Cassius (63.26.5) used the term to *Augousteion* to designate both the Mausoleum and the Temple of the Divinized Augustus." Diliانا Angelova, *Sacred Founders: Women, Men, and Gods in the Discourse of Imperial Founding, Rome through Early Byzantium* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2015), 47 states that rituals of circumambulation at the Mausoleum first honored the *genius* of the living emperor and then to the *Divus* Augustus, but she is incorrect in identifying any ritual being given to the *genius Augusti* before the reign of Caligula (cf. Chapter 2, section IIC, n. 83 and Chapter 3, section IV, n. 87 and 99 on Scheid, "To Honor the Princeps and Venerate the Gods," 281).

build upon her analyses of ritual circumambulation to propose reasons for a non-elite participant to worship the living emperor at his private tomb.

The monument itself was private, thus limiting access to the interior to members of the *Domus Augusta* and members of the Roman elite.¹⁷⁸ During Augustus' lifetime, this elite ritual participant and visitor would respond to and express the liminality of the monument as well as Augustus' status (as represented by the statue above); their circumambulation within the monument would separate the fate of Augustus from his family members. The participants' circling of the interior monument confirmed the liminality of *vivus* Augustus' status in contrast to other mortals interred there; Augustus after death would ascend like his statue toward heaven through his more-than-human status.

Circumambulation within the private monument both confined and protected the dead while compelling the living to move "dangerously between the realms of the living and the dead."¹⁷⁹

Outside of the Mausoleum's passageways, the location of the Mausoleum in the Campus Martius was a public, civic space. This change in space permitted a more inclusive form of circumambulation to occur outside the Mausoleum's walls, where non-elites could participate in a similar ritual practice with similar aims. Both Strabo and Suetonius record the public walkways around the Mausoleum: "*circumiectasque siluas et*

¹⁷⁸ Suetonius, *DA*, 100 recounts for the remains of Augustus that "*Reliquias legerunt primores equestris ordinis tunicati et discincti pedibusque nudis ac Mausoleo condiderunt*; the foremost men of the equestrian order, bare-foot and in ungirt tunics, collected the remains and placed them in the Mausoleum."¹⁷⁸ Davies, *Death and the Emperor*, 125 qualifies Reeder's claim, pointing out that the monument itself was private and would have been closed to visitors except at times of ritual activity. Additionally, she adds that a visitor would have had a choice of paths to the burial chamber, but puts in an in-text parenthetical that this choice would still accommodate circumambulation (59).

¹⁷⁹ Davies, *Death and the Emperor*, 125-6. The author initially began this line of argument regarding circumambulation and imperial funerary monuments (which includes commemorative monuments as well as tombs) in "The Politics of Perpetuation: Trajan's Column and the Art of Commemoration," *AJA* 101, no. 1 (1997): 41-65. The viewer of Trajan's column (which was a funerary monument) would have circumambulated the monument in order to interpret the frieze.

ambulationes in usum populi iam tum publicarat; [the Mausoleum] at the same time had made public the encircling groves and walkways for the use of the public.”¹⁸⁰ The public space surrounding the Mausoleum encouraged the same ritual participation as the private interior; the paths wrapped around the Mausoleum (*circumiectas*), allowing the ritual of circumambulation to take place both inside and out. The Mausoleum was not just a tomb for the dead, but a liminal space where the emperor’s living victories might be celebrated and the divine will eventually disengage from the mortal. Elite and non-elite Romans circumambulating the Mausoleum and its cultic statue participated in and recognized the living emperor’s more-than-human status. Likewise, in the time before the dedication of his own public temple in 37 CE, ritual circumambulation inside and outside of the Mausoleum, centered on the cult statue above, which served as a cult place (like the Forum Augustum)¹⁸¹ where participants engaged in the official cult of *Divus* Augustus.

The interior and exterior pathways made the ritual activity of circumambulation directed towards the *vivus* and the *Divus* very similar, whereby a participant engaged with the complex status of the living man who possessed divine qualities. The contrast between the private and public space of this monument and its utilization of both motivates ritual participation beyond the limited number of participants who could have entered the Mausoleum. As I argued in the previous chapter, the monumental narrative of the Campus Martius encourages the viewer to interpret the private Mausoleum as part of the public narrative, allowing the emperor to incite participation in his own cult; whether that is the *vivus* cult or the *Divus* cult remains up to viewer and is not dictated by the

¹⁸⁰ Suetonius, *DA*, 100, referring to the time of Augustus’ sixth consulship. Strabo (*Geographica* 5.3.8, translated *supra*) mentions “ὀπισθεν δὲ μέγα ἄλσος περιπάτους θαυμαστοὺς ἔχον; behind it is a large sacred grove with marvelous walkways.” Cf. section IVA, n. 79 for passage.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Chapter 3, section VC and VI on the Mausoleum before and after 14 CE.

Mausoleum or its statue.¹⁸² The explicit cooperation and negotiation of the Roman populace and emperor at the site created that narrative of Augustus' cult and divinity. Augustus built the monument as a private citizen, but the people of Rome would have participated in circumambulation of their own volition, not in response to an imperial mandate. Just as the living person did not belong among the dead, but still owed them proper obeisance and knew she would one day reside among them, ritual participants acknowledged in their circumambulation that the living Augustus did not quite belong among the dead or the gods; they offered both their due respect and anticipated Augustus' future place among both (where the mortal would reside in the Mausoleum and his divine aspects would join the gods). The position of his living cultic statue atop the Mausoleum reflected to the viewer on the Campus Martius this ritual activity and the liminality within—an image of a living man rising *super ceteros mortales* towards the gods.

VIC. Ritual Activity: Conclusion

The cult statues of *Divus* Augustus, due to the progression of cult and the lack of distinction between the *vivus* and *Divus* in their representation, promoted both private and public responses to the divine image of the emperor. Private individuals were able to erect and worship cultic statues to the *vivus* Augustus in public and civic locations, and also in their homes, making the emperor present throughout the city to meet their local needs. In the case of the eighty silver statues, this private intent was interwoven with the cult of Apollo on the Palatine, making the emperor present and sharing in ritual practice

¹⁸² Cf. Chapter 3, section VC that as a private monument, the Mausoleum's close proximity to its public neighbors suggests a public interpretation of the site.

there. The ritual activity and cult places of the *vivus*, on account of this ongoing negotiation, were able to transition with *Divus* Augustus after 14 CE.

As I demonstrated in the previous chapter, the cult of *Divus* Augustus persisted throughout the reign of Tiberius without his temple and an official, public cult statue there.¹⁸³ In this gap, the private cultic statues of Augustus pervaded the multilocular cult places in the city, allowing individuals to engage in multifarious ritual activities with the deified emperor, recognizing his more-than-human status and making him present. In this setting, the language and appearance of cultic and cult statues did not restrict the ritual activity surrounding them; rather, the ritual activity, language, and location of statues throughout the city (even without the eighty silver *statuae*), made these images cult statues. In the absence of a cult statue in the Temple of *Divus* Augustus, individuals focused their worship around private and public statues in the city.

¹⁸³ Cf. Chapter 3, section VI, n. 142 on the use of previously-private cult places in the gap between 14 and 37 CE.

Chapter 5 A *PRAESENS* GOD IN ROME

I have argued in this dissertation that private acts of worship (sacrifices, cult places, and cultic statues) demonstrate the ways Augustus received private cult during his lifetime in Rome. I have countered the *communis opinio*, that Augustus received no lifetime worship in Rome, identifying the framework and individual practices for recognizing the more-than-human status and divine qualities of the emperor. These private practices transitioned into the public and official cult of *Divus* Augustus after his senate-decreed deification in September 14 CE; the same people participated in both the *vivus* and *Divus* cults of Augustus, and the transition marks Augustus' transformation, not a transformation in the minds of the people.

As the *universi cives* negotiated with the *princeps* the terms of his divinity, living and posthumous, they both anticipated the emperor's official senate-decreed deification. This awareness, along with individuals' recognition of Augustus' authority and their desire to make the emperor present, created numerous iterations of the emperor's cult throughout the city of Rome as well as the empire. The 'real' Augustus did not need to compete with private presentations of his image, deeds, status, and authority, since the people were able to interpret both the 'real' and evoked emperor as the same god; he was multilocular and his cult multifarious much in the same way that Vesta and Aesclepius had simultaneous cults and cult places throughout Rome and the empire.¹ The emperor's presence throughout the empire to meet the needs of his people did not hinder his posthumous cult,

¹ Cf. Chapter 3, section I, n. 12 on Vesta and Aesclepius' cults in Rome.

since after his death the cult places, sacrifices, and images of the deified emperor remained unchanged, with more additions in the future.²

A private and people-centric focus on the imperial cult, rather than public and emperor-centric, permits the participants to have made adaptations to and interpretations of the Augustus over the course of his reign; their reception selected which aspects of Augustus met their local needs, and integrated those into their local framework of cults. Their private selection (as opposed to public and official dictation) allows for trends and patterns to emerge as participants engaged with and adapted public and official iterations of Augustus' reign. The cultural memory attached to each aspect of cult blurs some of the individual and societal differences of each group within the city of Rome.³ Private individuals worshipping in this way are neither mandated by official statements of the senate, nor are they denied participation in the emperor's cult until 14 CE. This cause-effect relationship suggested choice (real or imaginary), to recognize and worship the more-than-human status of Augustus and his divine qualities. We cannot know the degree to which this choice was voluntary, from a place of self-preservation, or a reaction to the emperor's authority,⁴ but the people could still deny or even not demand that the senate confirm divinity, as was the case with Tiberius.

² This counters the views of Fishwick, "Numen Augustum," 255, who claims that Augustus never moved from possessing a *numen* to being a *numen*, and if he had and was openly worshipped as a divinity both in Rome and the provinces, "why bother to deify him?" Cf. Chapter 2, sections IIC and IIIC for my analyses of *numen* in the poetry of Horace and Ovid.

³ Cf. Chapter 1, section V, n. 74-6 on collective memory and individual experience.

⁴ Cf. Chapter 2, section III, n. 95 Kennedy, "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference," 35: "The power of Augustus was a collective invention, the symbolic embodiment of the conflicting desires, incompatible ambitions and aggression of the Romans, the instrumental expression of a complex network of dependency, repression and fear." Ovid's incense recognizes Augustus' absolute authority as a Jupiter-on-earth, but is supported by Ovid's position of fear (cf. Chapter 2, section IIIB, n. 122 Gaertner, *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto*, Book I, 9).

I have argued in each chapter that in the specific aspects of worship (sacrifice, the creation of cult places, and cultic statues), we can see that the people of Rome recognized the living divinity of Augustus and participated in his cult. Unlike late-Republican exceptional men like Pompey, the motivation and majority of expenses lay with the people, not from the man himself or the senate. This bottom-up response permitted divinity and its terms to be negotiated rather than dictated, allowing for a progression where the agency of divine status lay with the people, rather than a constant upkeep of divine status by the individual. Private individuals created an image of the emperor that displayed their awareness of Rome and imperial themes, while at the same time addressed their local needs. This invited, but did not necessitate, imperial interaction and reinterpretation. The emperor could anticipate his own divinity, but the Roman people established the features of his cult in Rome, which the senate confirmed.⁵

In terms of sacrifice and ritual, these private acts in civic and domestic spaces interpreted a public and official practice.⁶ Even later descriptions, like Dio Cassius at *Historiae Romanae* 51.19.7, who combined the private and public spheres for his third-century reader, did not discount these practices.⁷ Modern assurances that the living emperor received no direct prayers and sacrifices, other than those on his behalf,

⁵ In the Roman process, the senate officially makes the emperor into a god, so we have a specific moment when what had been private becomes public, but I find no specific change in practice; Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, 6, 23-24; and Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 21 both identify the senate's unique role in this decision. The senate in response to the people can deny posthumous divinity or withdraw or limit it at a later date. Cf. Chapter 1, section I and the chart on p. 8 for the cause-effect relationship.

⁶ I do not add prayers to this list because, although prayers in poetry demonstrate the speaker's awareness of public and official practice, the idea that private prayers are a requirement of religion is particular to Christianity, and should not be mapped onto the imperial cult or any other non-Christian religion (cf. Chapter 2, section IB, n. 26 on Price "Gods and Emperors," 91-2 and Clauss, "*Deus Praesens*," 427).

⁷ Cf. Chapter 2, section IB, n. 19 for Dio's description of the official and unofficial libation to the emperor.

overlook the relationship between the individual and the absent emperor.⁸ The individual may pray or make sacrifices to Augustus *vivus* as a god who is present and able to help, without making supernatural requests. For example, Ovid offering words of prayer (*precantia verba*)⁹ and worship (*colo*)¹⁰ to the absent Augustus makes no supernatural or impossible request of the emperor. The goal of Ovid's surviving acts and those I recreate in the city of Rome aim to make the absent Augustus present, but do not assume or request any supernatural or impossible response.

These unofficial sacrifices and rituals pervaded the city as individuals engaged with the emperor on a local level.¹¹ The places where these events occurred, at private domestic shrines, at compital altars, in the Campus Martius, or where the emperor's cult is interwoven and incorporated into the framework of a public and official god, evoke the emperor's presence for the populace, often focused on his cultic statue. Location and statuary limited the rituals to a place and focus. These locations, either with the adjective-*cum*-epithet or with the emperor's image, incorporate Augustus into the extant cults and sacred places of the city. In the same way that scholars have recognized this infusion and incorporation in provincial contexts, I have argued that it also occurred in Rome.¹² In

⁸ Cf. Chapter 1, n. 3, especially Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 121 that Augustus never fulfilled any prayers and sacrifices were not offered to him "in hope of supernatural blessings;" Chapter 2, section IIIA, n. 101 on Fishwick asserting that "there is no reason to think that prayers were ever addressed to the living, [*vivus*] emperor as one who might answer in a supernatural way."

⁹ *Ex Ponto* 4.9.111, see Chapter 2, section IIIA, n. 98 for full excerpt.

¹⁰ *Ex Ponto* 2.8.60, see Chapter 4, section II, n. 24 for full excerpt.

¹¹ Cf. Chapter 1, section II, n. 30 and also section IV, n. 62 Habicht, *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities*, 99, 102 n.31 on the difference between sacrifices on behalf of a person and to a person, where the former is not proof of cultic worship but the latter is.

¹² For provincial contexts: cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 13 Price, *Rituals and Power*, 1: "The answer to the problem [accepting subjugation to the authority of the emperor] lay in finding a place for the ruler within the framework of traditional cults of the gods." Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West, Vol. II.1*, 440-5; Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty*, 5-6; Van Andringa, "Statues in the Temples of Pompeii," 110; Lott, "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome," 146-7. For Rome cf. Chapter 3, section VA on Augustus' cult being infused into the cult of Pax, but not taking over her cult, and Chapter 4,

both the provinces and the city, the imperial cult did not persist on its own, but shared in the established cults and practices of the local populations.

The negotiation between people and *princeps* manifests during the emperor's lifetime as the awareness and reception of practice, both private and public. Private interpretations of public practice are reactions to official acts, those conducted or mandated by the emperor and senate; as I argued in Chapter 2, private domestic prayers and libations to the emperor respond to official prayers and libations on behalf of his health. In terms of cult places, I argued in Chapter 3 that the private use of Carrara marble in the compital altars of the *Lares Augusti* responds to the public and civic narrative of monumental architecture, as well as the private Mausoleum of Augustus. In a different way, I argued in Chapter 4 that the private statues of Augustus *vivus* are reinterpreted by the emperor into golden gifts in Apollo's temple, thus incorporating his own cult into that of his patron god.¹³ The two sides of the negotiation were able to partake in this process and progression of divine status, thereby cultivating a thoroughly Roman divinity that met the needs of the populace at Rome.

To overlook these private acts of worship ignores fundamental aspects of Roman ruler cult. The Roman imperial cult encompasses the ways individuals represent the emperor, his more-than-human status and divine qualities, to themselves through a cause-effect relationship with the goal of evoking the absent emperor (see chart on p. 8).¹⁴ As

sections IIIC, IVB, V, and VIA on the interweaving and incorporation of Augustus into the Pantheon and Temple of Apollo Palatinus.

¹³ This incorporation included hymns, like the *Carmen Saeculare* which identified Augustus as the gods representative on earth (cf. Chapter 4, section VIA); the cult place of the northwestern side of the Palatine, as Cecamore, *Palatium*, reconstructs it, with the temple and *domus* sharing space; and the image of the god sharing space with the *dona aurea*, which preserved the private intent and added the emperor's name.

¹⁴ Price, *Rituals and Power*, 1, 29-30 defines Roman ruler cult as "a permanent institution, created and organized by the subjects of a great empire in order to represent to themselves the ruling power" (1), cf. Chapter 1, n. 1.

Manfred Clauss has argued, interpretations of the imperial cult should not arbitrarily castrate its cultic aspects: “Auf keinen Fall darf der Begriff "Herrscherkult" zu einem Gegensatz zwischen Herrscherkult und Götterkult führen. Um es zu wiederholen: Auch beim sogenannten Herrscherkult geht es um Götterkult, allerdings für besondere Götter, für *dei praesentes*: In no case may the term “ruler cult” lead to a contrast between ruler-cult and god-cult. To repeat it: even in the so-called ruler cult it is about god cult, but for special gods, for *dei praesentes*.”¹⁵ Understanding Augustus *vivus* and *Divus* as a *deus praesens* allows us to interpret the private cult of Augustus, its aspects and evolution, in a different way that confirms the elements of this project.

I. *Praesens* Augustus

I located in the conclusions of previous chapters elements of worship that bridged the gap between private and public cult, but I did not address in full the impact of Augustus, *vivus* and *Divus*, as a *praesens* god in Rome. Participation in the *vivus* cult made Augustus present for local groups and individuals, who sought an emperor-*cum*-god to address their needs on a local level. I have argued against the notion that the imperial cult only encompasses the deified cult of the deceased emperor. Another way to look at the living cult of the emperor, without the distinction of private or public, is to consider the emperor as a *praesens deus*. The terms *divus* and *deus* should not be interpreted here as mutually exclusive; Cicero applied *divus* to both *Divus* Julius and the gods, and Ovid repeatedly called Augustus a *deus*.¹⁶ Rather, the application of *deus* to the emperor in this

¹⁵ Clauss, “*Deus Praesens*,” 427.

¹⁶ E.g. Cicero: *Philippics* 2.110.4 “*divo Iulio*,” *De Legibus* 20.5-6 “*Divisque aliis alii sacerdotes, omnibus pontifices, singulis flamines sunt*”; There will be several priests for several gods, *pontifices* for all gods, and *flamines* for individual gods,” *De Legibus* 2.21.4 “*divorumque iras*...” Ovid: *Met.*, 15.746 “*Caesar in urbe*

context puts his cult on par with that of Jupiter or Apollo. Augustus as a *praesens deus* is further demonstration that the emperor's private living cult transitioned into his public cult; the recognition of the emperor as a "divinity who is immanent and helpful," by the *universi cives* applies to both his private and public cult.¹⁷ In the following paragraphs, I analyze Augustus as *praesens* during and after his lifetime, in terms of the individual relationships between the man and his people.

As a marker of time, *praesens* can achieve and convey far greater nuance than my application of the terms *vivus* and *Divus*. *Praesens* "stands in a neutral relationship to past and future," so that a god who is *praesens* cannot be limited to a single moment in time; to represent a *praesens deus* "does not privilege or even distinguish a backward or forward perspective. Instead, it centers purely upon the impact of making something *praesens*, with all its associations of salience, immediacy, face-to-face contact, concern, readiness, efficacy, and availability."¹⁸ To label Augustus as *praesens*, then, eliminates any confusion or distinction between the acts of the *vivus* or *Divus*. A statue, offering, or a cult place of Augustus *praesens* includes both aspects of his cult, without a distinction between living or dead, public or private.

This characterization also unifies the goals of both private and public cult: to make the absent emperor present. The emperor's physical absence from a place during his lifetime,

sua deus est," *Tristia* 2.1.53-4 "*per mare, per terras, per tertia numina iuro, per te praesentem conspicuumque deum*;" I swear by the sea, by the land, by the three *numina*, and by you, a present and visible god," (cf. Chapter 2, section IIC, n. 85); *Ex Ponto* 4.9.108 "*numina iam facto non leviora deo*;" their *numen* no less now he's become a god," (cf. Chapter 2, section IIIA, n. 98).

¹⁷ Ker, "Roman *Representatio*," 349, although Ker does not apply this specifically to the Roman emperor or imperial cult, I apply his interpretation to add further insight to my analysis. The *universi cives* in *Res Gestae* 9.1-2 (cf. Chapter 2, section IB, n. 14) offer prayers and libations on Augustus' behalf. In Chapter 3, I identify the *populi universi Romani*, who, as *universi* (elites and non-elites), all engaged in the negotiation of Augustus' cult; their recognition of Augustus' authority and status allowed for disparity and variance in their local representations of him.

¹⁸ Ker, "Roman *Representatio*," 349 on the relationship between *praesens* and the verb *representare*.

or from the world of men after his deification, further proves his divine qualities and more-than-human status.¹⁹ Augustus as a *praesens* god was a visible manifestation of his powers and the authority the *universi cives* imbued in him; “The power of Augustus was a collective invention, the symbolic embodiment of the conflicting desires, incompatible ambitions and aggression of the Romans, the instrumental expression of a complex network of dependency, repression and fear.”²⁰ I examined this manifestation of power in my analysis of sacrifices in the corpora of Horace and Ovid; Ovid responds to Horace, taking his presentation of Augustus’ divine aspects to a logical conclusion: his divine and far-reaching anger. Augustus cannot possess this divine anger unless the *universi cives* recognize it in the emperor first; the people must first imbue him with a divine authority and power, and then the emperor embodies those on earth.²¹ This negotiation of power mirrors the negotiation of cult, where the onus rests with the people to identify and recognize the divine deeds and aspects of the emperor. As a *praesens* emperor, the *universi cives* grant Augustus a greater status than *primus inter pares* since he visibly manifests beyond his physical person whatever authority the people have given him. In this way, when Augustus returns his powers to the senate and people of Rome, it demonstrates that he does not require the legality of power when he already possesses, in

¹⁹ Petridou, *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*, 24 characterizes absence as an essential part of *praesens*: “absence – sudden and unaccountable absence to be more precise – may also be perceived as evidence of divine presence too.” Price, *Rituals and Power*, 1 finds that provincial cults in Asia Minor thrived without the physical presence of the emperor.

²⁰ Kennedy, “‘Augustan’ and ‘Anti-Augustan’: Reflections on Terms of Reference,” 35, which I apply in Chapter 2, section III, n. 92 to Ovid’s presentation of Augustus as an angry god, a Jupiter-on-Earth (as McGowan, *Ovid in Exile*, 72-3 notes).

²¹ Clauss, “*Deus Praesens*,” 428 elucidates the relationship between the *res publica* and the *princeps*, where each benefited from the other. Augustus’ divine anger does not benefit Ovid in the literal sense, but Ovid calls into question for his readers the new imperial *libertas* as ‘freedom’ (through a *princeps*)” (cf. Chapter 2, section IIB, n. 59 on Kennedy, “‘Augustan’ and ‘Anti-Augustan’,” 31-5).

the minds of the *universi cives*, the authority and power of a “divinity who is immanent and helpful.”²²

Augustus as a living (and also deified) *praesens* god could receive cultic worship from the Roman populace with the goal of making him present on a local level. The multilocular interpretations of his cult throughout Rome and the empire utilized local visual language and an awareness of official imperial trends to achieve this goal. Variations in imagery and language do not lessen the value of their motivations, and an understanding of individual and local relationships with Augustus’ cult illuminates the individual’s role in deifying the emperor (rather than merely accepting his senate-decreed divinity).

II. What is Left?

The relationship between individuals and collectives participating in the private and public cult of the emperor still requires further analysis; my study neither includes an in-depth assessment of Tiberius’ engagement with Augustus’ cult, nor the possible reasons for his own un-deified status (I am not satisfied with assurances that Caligula is to blame, since the senate reacting to the will of the people ultimately deified emperors, not other emperors).²³ Tiberius’ treatment of Augustus’ statues and accusations of *maiestas* would

²² *Res Gestae* 34.1: *In consulatu sexto et septimo, postquam bella civilia extinxeram, per consensum universorum potitus rerum omnium, rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli*; during my sixth and seventh consulships, after I had put an end to civil wars, **although by universi consensus I had power over everything**, I transferred the state from my power into the control of the Roman senate and people.” My translation follows Cooley, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 98 for the phrase “although by everyone’s agreement I had power over everything...”

²³ Cf. Chapter 3, section VI, n. 142 on some inconsistencies in scholarship regarding Tiberius’ relationship with the imperial cult. The senate did not deify Caesar until January 42 BCE, partially in response to political pressure from the Second Triumvirate, but mostly due to pervasive public practice (cf. Chapter 1, section I, n. 19 for the senate’s role and in that same chapter section VA, n. 96 for Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus*, 21-30, 35 for the deification of *Divus Julius*).

add further light on the difficulties of Roman deification and its official, senate-decreed practice after 14 CE. Additionally the role of imperial women, as participants, priests, and *divae* needs to be examined from the perspective of private worship. The nature of the negotiation between private Roman women and the women of the imperial family most likely differs from that of emperors and their heirs, since female *vivae* and *divae* would be able to address different, local needs from their male counterparts.

In the future my project may also expand beyond the city of Rome to reveal a greater awareness of imperial narratives and trends throughout the empire. As Harriet Flower cautions, gods of one place cannot be mapped onto another,²⁴ but a greater exchange of trends and ideas and shared influence may come to light. For example, the repeated motif of conquered *nationes* and *ethne* with the image of the emperor, as it initially appeared in the Theater of Pompey, then Augustus' nearby addition of the *Porticus ad Nationes* to the site, in the Forum Augustum, at the funeral of Augustus, and also at imperial cult places at Lugdunum and Aphrodisias.²⁵ The relationship between triumphal images of conquest and representations of conquered peoples, both in Rome and abroad, could reveal a different aspect on negotiation as represented by imperial victory.

²⁴ Cf. Chapter 3, section IIA, n. 21 on the dangers of this type of argument. Gods of one place and evidence of a specific practice cannot be relocated and mapped onto each other without a close consideration of the change in context and change in viewer.

²⁵ As noted by Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, 310-14 and described by R.R.R. Smith, "Simulacra Gentium: The Ethne from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias," *JRS* 78 (1988): 71-2, citing Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, 36.41 and Suetonius, *Nero*, 46 for Pompey's Theater; Servius, *ad Aeneid*, 8.721 and Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, 36.39 for the *Porticus ad Nationes*; Velleius 2.39.2 for the Forum Augustum; Dio, *Historiae Romanae*, 56. 34. 2 and Tacitus, *Ann.*, 1.8.4 for Augustus' funeral. *Res Gestae* 26-33 lists many of these *nationes*, and they appear on the north portico of the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias, whose private construction began under Tiberius but was completed under Nero (51-9, 75, 77). The presence of similar images at Lugdunum is described by Strabo, *Geographica*, 4.3, and Duncan Fishwick, "The Sixty Gallic Tribes and the Altar of the Three Gauls," *Historia* 38, no. 1 (1st Qtr., 1989): 111-2.

III. The Living, Divine Augustus

I have aimed to prove with my dissertation that analyses and examinations of Augustus as a living, divine man in Rome bring to light the roles of individuals in cultivating and creating the imperial cult. Individuals make the emperor divine, and their acts culminate in the senate's declaration of divinity, not the other way round. My analyses of sacrifices in poetry, cult places, and cultic statues counter long-held assertions that a living Roman emperor cannot be considered or addressed as divine in Rome until after his senate-decreed deification, which undermines the nature of ruler-cult. The negotiation between individuals and the emperor creates the parameters for his later, public cult, but both participants in the private and the public iterations seek the same end—to make the emperor present to meet their needs on a local level.

Bibliography

- Adler, Eric. "Cassius Dio's Agrippa-Maecenas Debate: An Operational Code Analysis." *AJPh* 133, no. 3 (2012): 477-520.
- Alföldi, Andreas. *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus*. Bonn: R. Habelt, 1973.
- Alton, E. H., D. E. W. Wormell, and E. Courtney. *P. Ovidius Naso Fastorum libri sex*. Munich: K. G. Saur Verlag, 2005.
- Anderson, James C., Jr. *Roman Architecture and Society*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Ando, Clifford. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Angelova, Diliana. *Sacred Founders: Women, Men, and Gods in the Discourse of Imperial Founding, Rome through Early Byzantium*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2015.
- Arnold, Dieter. *Temples of the Last Pharaohs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Ashley, Kathleen. "Art in Ritual Context: Introduction," *JRS* 5 (1992): 1-11.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. "Poetry, Praise, and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's 'Odes'." *ClAnt* 15, no. 1 (1996): 5-47.
- . "Learned Eyes: Poets, Viewers, Image Makers." In *Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 281-305. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Beard, Mary. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Beard, Mary, J. North, and S. Price. *Religions of Rome, Vol. I: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . *Religions of Rome, Vol. II: A Sourcebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Belayche, Nicole. "Religious Actors in Daily Life: Practices and Related Beliefs." In *A Companion to Roman Religion*, edited by Jörg Rüpke, 275-91. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Bernard, Seth G. "Pentelic Marble in Architecture at Rome and the Republican Marble Trade." *JRA* 23, no. 2 (2010): 35-54.
- Billows, R. "The Religious Procession of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Augustus's *supplicatio* in 13 B.C." *JRA* 6 (1993): 80-92.
- Blevins, Susan Ludi. "Rhetoric, Repetition, and Identity in the Frieze of Sacred Objects on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus." In *Gods, Objects, and Ritual Practice*, edited by Sandra Blakely, 233-60. Georgia: Lockwood Press, 2017.
- Blyth, Elizabeth. *Karnak: Evolution of a Temple*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

- Bodel, John. "Cicero's Minerva, *Penates*, and the Mother of the *Lares*: An Outline of Roman Domestic Religion." In *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*, edited by John Bodel and Saul M. Olyan, 248-75. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
- Bömer, Franz. *Ovidius Naso: Die Fasten*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1957-8.
- Bosworth, A. B. "Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis." *JRS* 89 (1999): 1-18.
- Bowditch, Lowell. "Palatine Apollo and the Imperial Gaze: Propertius 2.31 and 2.32." *AJPh* 130, no. 3 (2009): 401-38.
- Bowersock, G. W. "Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century A.D." In *Le Culte des souverains dans l'empire romain*, edited by W. den Boer, 179-206. Vandoeuvres-Geneva, 1973.
- Bowman, A. K. and G. Woolf, ed. *Literacy and power in the ancient world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Buchner, Edmund. "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis." *Römische Mitteilungen* 83 (1976): 319-65.
- Burnett, Andrew. "The Augustan Revolution Seen from the Mints of the Provinces." *JRS* 101 (2011): 1-30.
- Campbell, Brian. *The Roman Army, 31 BC–AD 337: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Carey, Sorchia. *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Cecamore, Claudia. *Palatium: Topografia storica del Palatino tra III sec. a.C. e I sec. d.C.*, Bullettino della Commissione archeologica comunale di Roma. Supplementi, 9. Roma : L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2002.
- Champlin, Edward. "Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins." *JRS* no. 101 (2011): 73-99.
- Claasen, Jo-Marie. "Tristia." In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by Peter E. Knox, 170-83. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.
- Clark, Anna. *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Clauss, Manfred. "*Deus Praesens*. Der römische Kaiser als Gott." *Klio* 78, no. 2 (1996): 400-33.
- Coarelli, Filippo. "Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo." *CARI* 10 (1983): 41-6.
- Cole, Spencer. *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Commager, Steele. "Horace, Carmina, I, 2." *AJPh* 80, no. 1 (1959): 37-55.
- Conlin, Diane Atnally. *The Artists of the Ara Pacis: The Process of Hellenization in Roman Relief Sculpture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- Cooley, Alison E. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- Cornwell, Hannah. *Pax and the Politics of Peace: Republic to Principate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Crawford, Michael. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Crenshaw, Ben R. "The Nature of the Gods: Absolute vs. Relative Divinity in Roman Emperor Worship." Paper presented at the regional meeting of the American Academy of Religion-Society of Biblical Literature-American Schools of Oriental Research, Boulder, Colorado, March 24-25, 2017.
- Cucchiarelli, Andrea. "Ivy and Laurel: Divine Models in Virgil's 'Eclogues'." *HSPH*, no. 106 (2011): 155-78.
- Daut, Raimund. *Imago: Untersuchungen zum Bildbegriff der Römer*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1975.
- Davies, Penelope J. E. "The Politics of Perpetuation: Trajan's Column and the Art of Commemoration." *AJA* 101, no. 1 (1997): 41-65.
- . *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- . *Architecture and Politics in Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- De Fine Licht, Kjeld. *The Rotunda in Rome: A Study of Hadrian's Pantheon*. Copenhagen: Jutland Archaeological Society, 1968.
- Degrassi, A. "Fasti Consulares et Triumphales." *Inscriptiones Italiae* 13.1 (1947).
- Derks, Ton. *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideals and Values in Roman Gaul*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1998.
- Dubourdieu, A. "Voir les dieux à Rome." In *Perception et construction du divin dans l'Antiquité. Rivista di Storia delle Religioni*, edited by P. Borgeaud and D. Fabiano, 19-34. Geneva: Droz, 2013.
- Duncan-Jones, Richard. *Money and Government in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Dyson, M. "Horace Carmina 4.5.36-37." *CPh* 86.2 (1991): 126-9.
- Elsner, Jaś. "Inventing Imperium: Texts and the Propaganda of Monuments in Augustan Rome." In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, edited by Jaś Elsner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- . *Roman Eyes: Visuality and Subjectivity in Art and Text*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Elsner, John. "Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae." *JRS* 81 (1991): 50-61.
- Estienne, Sylvia. "Simulacra Deorum versus Ornamenta Aedium: The Status of Divine Images in the Temples of Rome." In *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, edited by Joannis Mylonopoulos, 257-71. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Fant, J. C. "Augustus and the City of Marble." Paper presented at the fourth international symposium of the Association for the Study of Marble and Other Stones used in Antiquity, University of Bordeaux 3, October 9-13, 1995.
- Fantham, Elaine. *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- . "Images of the City: Propertius' New-Old Rome." In *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, edited by Thomas Habinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, 122-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Favro, Diane. "'Pater urbis': Augustus as City Father of Rome." *JSAH* 51, no. 1 (Mar., 1992): 61-84.
- Feeney, Dennis. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Feldherr, Andrew. *Playing Gods: Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Fishwick, Duncan. "Genius and Numen." *HTHR* 62, no. 3 (1969): 356-67.
- . "The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire." *ANRW* II.16, no. 2 (1978): 1201-1253.
- . "The Sixty Gallic Tribes and the Altar of the Three Gauls." *Historia* 38, no. 1 (1st Qtr., 1989): 111-2.
- . *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol. I.1*. Boston: Brill, 1987.
- . "Dio and Maecenas: The Emperor and the Ruler Cult." *Phoenix* 44, no. 3 (1990): 267-75.
- . "Votive Offerings to the Emperor?" *ZPE* 80 (1990): 121-30.
- . "Ovid and the Divus Augustus." *CPh* 86, no. 1 (1991): 36-41.
- . *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol. II.1*. Boston: Brill, 1991.
- . "The Statue of Julius Caesar in the Pantheon." *Latomus* 51, no. 2 (1992): 329-336.
- . "On the Temple of Divus 'Augustus'." *Phoenix* 46, no. 3 (Autumn, 1992): 232-55.
- . "Numinibus Domus Divinae." *ZPE* 159 (2007): 293-6.
- . "Numen Augustum." *ZPE* 160 (2007): 247-55.
- Flower, Harriet I. "The Tradition of the Spolia Opima: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus." *CIAnt* 19, no. 1 (2000): 34-64.
- . *The Dancing Lares and the Serpent in the Garden: Religion at the Roman Street Corner*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017.
- Fraschetti, Augusto. *Rome et le Prince*. Translated by Vincent Jolivet. Paris: Belin, 1994.
- Frischer, B. and J. Fillwalk. "A Computer Simulation to Test the Buchner Thesis. The Relationship of the Ara Pacis and the Meridian in the Campus Martius, Rome." Paper presented at the Digital Heritage International Conference, October 28- November 1, 2013.

- Gaertner, Jan Felix. *Ovid Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book I*. Edited and translated by Jan Felix Gaertner. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gagé, J. *Apollon romain: essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du ritus Graecus à Rome des origines à Auguste*. Paris: E. De Boccard, 1955.
- Galasso, Luigi. "Epistulae ex Ponto." In *A Companion to Ovid*, edited by Peter E. Knox, 196-206. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.
- Galinsky, Karl. "Venus, Polysemy, and the Ara Pacis Augustae." *AJA* 96, no. 3 (Jul., 1992): 457-75.
- . *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- . *Augustus: Introduction to the Life of an Emperor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Gilhuly, Kate and Nancy Worman. "Introduction." In *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*, edited by Kate Gilhuly and Nancy Worman, 1-20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Gowing, Alain. "Cassius Dio and the City of Rome." In *Cassius Dio – Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, edited by C. Lange and J. Madsen, 117-35. Boston: Brill, 2016.
- Gradel, Ittai. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Green, Steven J. "Undeifying Tiberius: A Reconsideration of Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* 1.2." *CQ* 60, no. 1 (2010): 274-6.
- Gregory, Andrew P. "Powerful images: responses to portraits and the political uses of images in Rome." *JRA* 7 (1994): 80-99.
- Gros, Pierre. "Apollo Palatinus." In *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, edited by Eva Margareta Steinby. 2nd ed., Vol. 1. Rome: Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, 1993.
- Grusendorf, Stephen. "Bourdieu's Field, Capital, and Habitus in Religion." *JSIRS* 6, no 1 (2016): 1-13.
- Gurval, Robert. *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Güven, Suna. "Displaying the *Res Gestae* of Augustus: A Monument of Imperial Image for All." *JSAH* 57, no. 1 (1998): 30-15.
- Habicht, Christian. *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities: The Early Cases*. Translated by John Noel Dillon. Michigan: Michigan Classical Press, 2017.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Translated by L. A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hales, Shelley. *The Roman House and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Hano, M. "À l'origine du culte imperial: les autels des *Lares Augusti*: Recherches sur les themes iconographiques et leur signification." *ANRW* 2.16.3 (1986): 2333-81.

- Hardie, Alex. "The Pindaric Sources of Horace "Odes 1.12"." *HSPH* 101 (2003): 371-404.
- Hardie, Philip. *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Haselberger, Lothar. *Urbem Adornare: Die Stadt Rom und Ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus*. Translated by Alexander Thein. Rhode Island: JRA Supplementary Series, 2007.
- Heslin, Peter. "Augustus, Domitian and the So-Called Horologium Augusti." *JRS* 97 (2007): 1-20.
- Hijmans, Steven Ernst. *Sol: The Sun in the Art and Religions of Rome*. diss., University of Groningen, 2009.
- Hirt, Alfred Michael. *Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World: Organizational Aspects 27 BC – AD 235*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Hunter, Richard. *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Edited and translated by Richard Hunter. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
- . *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Ingalls, Wayne B. "Ritual Performance as Training for Daughters in Archaic Greece." *Phoenix* 54, no. 1/2 (2000): 1-20.
- Jacobs, Paul W. III and Diane Atnally Conlin. *Campus Martius: The Field of Mars in the Life of Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Johnson, Patricia J. *Ovid Before Exile: Art and Punishment in the Metamorphoses*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008.
- Kennedy, Duncan F. "'Augustan' and 'Anti-Augustan': Reflections on Terms of Reference." In *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, edited by Anton Powell, 26-58. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.
- Ker, James. "Roman *Representatio*." *AJPh* 128, no. 3 (2007): 341-65.
- Kleiner, Diana. "The Great Friezes of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Greek Sources, Roman Derivatives, and Augustan Social Policy." *MEFRA* 90 (1978): 753-85.
- Koortbojian, Michael. "Crossing the Pomerium: The Armed Ruler at Rome." In *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*, edited by Björn C. Ewald and F. Noreña, 247-74. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- La Follette, Laetitia. "Parsing Piety: The Sacred Still Life in Roman Relief Sculpture." *MAAR* 56/57 (2011/2012): 15-35.
- Laird, Andrew. "Ut Figura Poesis: Writing Art and the Art of Writing in Augustan Poetry." In *Art and Text in Roman Culture*, edited by Jaś Elsner, 75-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Laird, Margaret. *Civic Monuments and the Augustales in Roman Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

- La Rocca, Eugenio. "Agrippa's Pantheon and Its Origin." In *The Pantheon: From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by Tod A. Marder and Mark Wilson Jones, 49-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Latte, K. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1960.
- Lauffray, J. "Abords occidentaux de premier pylône de Karnak: le dromos, la tribune et les aménagements portuaires," *Kemi* 21 (1971): 118-21.
- Letta, C. "Le images Caesarum di un praefectus castrorum Aegypti e l'XI coorte pretoria." *Athenaeum* 56 (1978): 3-19.
- Levene, D. S. "Defining the Divine at Rome." *TAPA* 142, no. 1 (2012): 41-81.
- Lipka, Michael. *Roman Gods: A Conceptual Approach*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Lott, J. Bert. *Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . "The Earliest Augustan Gods Outside of Rome." *CJ* 110, no. 2 (December-January 2014-2015): 129-15.
- Magness, Jodi. "The Mausolea of Augustus, Alexander, and Herod the Great." In *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs*, edited by Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, 313-30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Manuwald, Bernd. *Cassius Dio und Augustus: philologische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern 45-56 des dionischen Geschichtswerkes*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1979.
- Martin, S. D. *The Roman Jurists and the Organization of Private Building in the Late Republic and Early Empire*. Brussels: Collection Latomus, vol. 204, 1989.
- McDonough, Christopher Michael. "The Hag and the Household Gods: Silence, Speech, and the Family in Mid-February (Ovid Fasti 2.533-638)." *CPh* 99, no. 4 (2004): 354-69.
- McGowan, Matthew. *Ovid in Exile*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- McKenzie, Judith. *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt c. 300 BC to AD 700*. Yale: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Millar, Fergus. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- . *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- . *Rome, the Greek World, and the East, Volume 1: The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*. Edited by Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Miller, John F. *Apollo, Augustus, and the Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Mommsen, T. "Die Letteraturbriefe des Horaz." *Hermes* 15 (1880): 103-15.
- Mylonopoulos, Joannis. "Introduction: Divine Images *versus* Cult Images. An Endless Story about Theories, Methods, and Terminologies." In *Divine Images and Human*

- Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, edited by Joannis Mylonopoulos, 1-20. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Nicoletta, Lanciano and Paola Virgili. "The Urban Set of the Pantheon and the Mausoleum of Augustus in Rome, Between Architectural and Astronomical Symbolism." *Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry* 16, no. 4 (2016): 249-55.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Margaret Hubbard. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Nock, A. D. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World, 2 Vols.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Noreña, Carlos F. "Locating the 'Ustrinus' of Augustus." *MAAR* 58 (2013): 51-64.
- Oliensis, Ellen. *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Osgood, Josiah. *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Ostrow, Steven E. "Augustales" along the Bay of Naples: A Case for Their Early Growth." *Historia* 34, no. 1 (1985): 64-101.
- Orlin, Eric. "Octavian and Egyptian Cults: Redrawing the Boundaries of Romanness." *AJPh* 129, no. 2 (2008): 231-253.
- Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Combined ed. Edited by P. G. W. Glare. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Panciera, Silvio. "Ancora tra epigrafia e topografia." In *L'Urbs: espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Collection de L'École française de Rome, 98, 60-86. Rome: École française de Rome, Palais Farnèse, 1987.
- Pekáry, Thomas. "*Statuae meae... argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter, quas ipse sustuli*: Interpretationen zu *Res gestae divi Augusti* 24." In *Monumentum Chiloniense: Studien zur augusteischen Zeit*, edited by Eckard Lefèvre, 96-108. Amsterdam: Verlag Adolf M. Hakkert, 1975.
- Pensabene, Patrizio. "The Quarries at Luni in the 1st Century AD: Final Considerations on Some Aspects of Production, Diffusion, and Costs." In *Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone: Proceedings of the IX Association for the Study of Marbles and Other Stones in Antiquity (ASMOSIA) Conference (Tarragona 2009)*, edited by Anna Gutiérrez García-M, Pilar Lapuente Mercadal, and Isabel Rodà de Llanza, 731-43. Tarragona: Institut Català d'Arqueologia Clàssica, 2012.
- Pensabene, Patrizio and Enrico Gallochio. "Neue Forschungen zum augusteischen Komplex auf dem Palatin." In *Augustus ist tot – Lang lebe der Kaiser! Internationales Kolloquium anlässlich des 2000. Todesjahres des römischen Kaisers vom 20. – 22. November 2014 in Tübingen*, edited by Manuel Flecker, Stefan Krmnicek, Johannes Lipps, Richard Posamentir, Thomas Schäfer, 157-204. Rahden: Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, 2017.

- Petridou, Georgia. *Divine Epiphany in Greek Literature and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Pfeiffer, Stefan. "Imperial Cult in Egypt." In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, edited by Christina Riggs, 83-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Pollini, John. "Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate." In *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, edited by Kurt A. Raaflaub and Mark Toher, 334-63. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- . "The Gemma Augustea: Ideology, Rhetorical Imagery, and the Creation of a Dynastic Narrative." In *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*, edited by P. J. Holliday, 258-98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *From Republic to Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2012.
- Popkin, Maggie. *The Architecture of the Roman Triumph: Monuments, Memory, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Pothecary, Sarah. "Strabo, the Tiberian Author: Past, Present and Silence in Strabo's 'Geography'." *Mnemosyne* 55, fasc. 4 (2002): 387-438.
- Poulsen, Birte. "Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology." *SO* 66 (1991): 119-46.
- Price, Simon. "Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult." *JRS* 70 (1980): 28-43.
- . *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- . "Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Cult." *JHS* 104 (1984): 79-95.
- Putnam, Michael. *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- . *Horace's Carmen Saeculare: Ritual Magic and the Poet's Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Race, William H. "Horace's Debt to Pindar." In *A Companion to Horace*, edited by Gregson Davis, 147-73. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2010.
- Ragavan, Deena. "Heaven on Earth: Temples, Ritual, and Cosmic Symbolism in the Ancient World," *Oriental Institute Seminars* no. 9 (2013): 1-16.
- Reeder, Jane Clark. "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: Tumulus and Tholos." *ClAnt* 11, no. 2 (1992): 265-307.
- Rehak, Paul. "Livia's Dedication in the Temple of Divus Augustus." *Latoma* 49 (1990): 117-25.
- . "Women and Children on the Ara Pacis Augustae." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, St Louis, Missouri, April 16, 2004.

- . *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*. Edited by John G. Younger. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.
- Renberg, Gil H. "Public and Private Places of Worship in the Cult of Asclepius at Rome." *MAAR* 51/52 (2006/2007): 87-172.
- Richard, J. C. "Mausoleum: D'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis à Alexandrie." *Latomus* 29 (1970): 370-88.
- Robinson, Matthew. *Ovid Fasti Book 2*. Edited by Matthew Robinson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Rose, Charles Brian. "'Princes' and Barbarians on the Ara Pacis." *AJA* 94, no. 3 (Jul., 1990): 453-67.
- Rubincam, Catherine. "The Nomenclature of Julius Caesar and the Later Augustus in the Triumviral Period." *Historia* 41, no. 1 (1992): 88-103.
- Rudd, Niall. *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars Poetica')*, edited by Niall Rudd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Rüpke, Jörg. *The Religion of the Romans*. Translated and edited by Richard Gordon. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.
- . "Representation or Presentation? Picturing the Divine in Ancient Rome." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 12 (2010): 183-96.
- . *On Roman Religion: Lived Religion and the Individual in Ancient Rome*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2016.
- Russell, Amy. *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Ryberg, Inez Scott. "Rites of State Religion in Roman Art." *MAAR* 22 (1955): 1-227.
- Sauron, G. "Le complexe pompéien du Champ de Mars: nouveauté urbanistique à finalité idéologique." In *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire, I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.-III. siècle ap. J.-C. Atti del Coll. Internazionale Roma 8-12*, 457-73. Rome: Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 1985.
- . *Quis deum? L'expression plastique des idéologies politiques et religieuses à Rome*. Rome: Collection de l'École Française de Rome, 1994.
- Scheid, John. *Romulus et ses Frères: Le Collège des Frères Arvales, Modèle du Culte Public Dans la Rome des Empereurs*. École Française de Rome, 1990.
- . "To Honor the Princeps and Venerate the Gods: Public Cult, Neighbourhood Cults and Imperial Cult in Augustan Rome." In *Augustus*, edited and translated by Jonathan Edmondson, 275-302. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.
- . *The Gods, the State, and the Individual*. Translated by Clifford Ando. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Schilling, Robert. *Ovid Les Fastes, Tome II, livres IV-VI*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003.
- Scott, Kenneth. "Emperor Worship in Ovid." *TAPA* 61 (1930): 43-69.
- . "The Significance of Statues in Precious Metals in Emperor Worship." *TAPA* 62 (1931): 101-23.

- . “The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C.” *MAAR* 11 (1933): 7-49.
- Smith, R.R.R. “*Simulacra Gentium*: The Ethne from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias,” *JRS* 78 (1988): 50-77.
- Stamper, John W. *The Architecture of Roman Temples: The Republic to the Middle Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Steuernagel, D. “*Synnaos theos*: Images of Roman Emperors in Greek Temples.” In *Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome*, edited by Joannis Mylonopoulos, 241-56. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Stewart, Peter. *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Stone, Shelley C., III. “Sextus Pompey, Octavian and Sicily.” *AJA* 87, no. 1 (Jan., 1983): 11-22.
- Sturtevant, Edgar H. “Horace, *Carm.* 3.30.10-14, and the Sapphic Stanza.” *TAPA* 70 (1939): 295-302.
- Suetonius. *Suetonius: Life of Divus Augustus; Vita Divi Augusti*. Translated by David Wardle. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Sumi, Geoffrey. “Monuments and Memory: the Aedes Castoris in the Formation of Augustan Ideology.” *CQ* 59 no.1 (2009): 167-86.
- Sutherland, C. H. V. *Roman History and Coinage, 44 BC-AD 69: Fifty Points of Relation from Julius Caesar to Vespasian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Swan, P. M. “Cassius Dio on Augustus: A Poverty of Annalistic Sources?” *Phoenix* 41, no. 3 (1987): 272-91.
- Swetnam-Burland, Molly. “‘Aegyptus Redacta’: The Egyptian Obelisk in the Augustan Campus Martius.” *ABull* 92, no.3 (2010): 135-153.
- . *Egypt in Italy: Visions of Egypt in Roman Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Syndikus, Hans Peter. “The Roman Odes.” In *A Companion to Horace*, translated by Gregson Davis and Christophe Fricker, edited by Gregson Davis, 193-209. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2010.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. “The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime.” *TAPA* 51 (1920): 116-33.
- . “Tiberius’ Refusals of Divine Honors.” *TAPA* 60 (1929): 87-101.
- . *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Connecticut: American Philological Association, 1931.
- Thomas, Edmund. “The Cult Statues of the Pantheon.” *JRS* 107 (2017): 146-212.
- Thomas, Richard F. *Horace Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*. Edited by Richard F. Thomas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Tissol, Garth. *Ovid: Epistulae ex Ponto, Book I*. Edited by Garth Tissol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Tomlinson, Richard Allen. "Dining-rooms." In *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by Stephen Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Torelli, Mario. "Augustus, Divus, Templum (Novum); Aedes." In *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, edited by Eva Margareta Steinby. 2nd ed., Vol. 1. Rome: Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, 1993.
- Tuan, Y.-F. *Passing Strange and Wonderful: Aesthetics, Nature and Culture*. Washington DC: Island Press, 1993.
- Van Andringa, William. "Statues in the Temples of Pompeii: Combinations of Gods, Local Definition of Cults, and the Memory of the City." In *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, edited by Beate Dignas and R. R. R. Smith, 83-115. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . "'M. Tullius... aedem Fortunae August(ae) solo et peq(unia) sua' Private foundations and Public Cult in a Roman Colony." In *Private and Public in Ancient Mediterranean Law and Religion*, edited by Clifford Ando and Jörg Rüpke, 99-113. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Van Den Berg, Christopher. "The 'Pulvinar' in Roman Culture." *TAPA* 138, no. 2 (2008): 239-73.
- Várhelyi, Zsuzsanna. *The Religion of Senators in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . "Statuary and Ritualization in Imperial Italy." In *Ritual Matters: Material Remains and Ancient Religion*, edited by Claudia Moser and Jennifer Knust, 74-87. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017.
- Virgili, Paola and Paola Battiselli. "Indagini in Piazza della Rotonda e sulla fronte del Pantheon." *BullCom* 100 (1999): 137-54.
- Von Glinski, Marie Louise. *Simile and Identity in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Von Hesberg, Henner, and Silvio Panciera. *Das Mausoleum des Augustus: der Bau und seine Inschriften*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vol. 108, 1994.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus." *JRS* 76 (1986): 66-87.
- . *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Wardman, Alan. *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
- Weinstock, Stephan. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Welch, Kathryn. *Magnus Pius: Sextus Pompeius and the Transformation of the Roman Republic*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2012.
- Welch, Tara. *Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2005.

- West, David. *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Wilkinson, L. P. "Accentual Rhythm in Horatian Sapphics." *CR* 54, no. 3 (1940): 131-3.
- Williams, Gordon. "Poetry in the Moral Climate of Augustan Rome," *JRS* 52, no. 1&2 (1962): 28-46.
- Wissowa, Georg. *Religion und Kultus der Römer (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft)*. Munich, 1912.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Translated by Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988.
- Zink, Stephan and Heinrich Piening. "*Haec aurea templa*: the Palatine temple of Apollo and its Polychromy." *JRA* 22, no. 1 (2009): 109-22.
- Ziolkowski, Adam. "Prolegomena to any future metaphysics on Agrippa's Pantheon." In *Res Bene Gestae. Ricerche di storia urbana su Roma antica in onore di Eva Margareta Steinby*, edited by Anna Leone, Domenico Palombi, and Susan Walker, 465-75. Rome: Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae Supplementum IV, 2007.

VITA

Claire McGraw was born in Woodstock, Illinois. Before attending the University of Missouri-Columbia, she attended Missouri State University, Springfield, where she earned a Bachelor of Arts in Classical Antiquities and Latin as well as a minor in Ancient Greek, with High Distinction, in 2011. From 2011 to 2014, she attended the University of Missouri-Columbia, where she received a Master of Arts in Classical Languages and a minor in Ancient Studies.

Claire has presented her research at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South five times in the past six years, in addition to two department workshops and three interdisciplinary, graduate student conferences at Mizzou.

In 2015 and 2016, Claire co-lead the Classical Studies Department's summer study abroad trip "From the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Empire" to Greece, taking nineteen students throughout mainland Greece, Santorini, Naxos, and Crete. She has taught courses as the Instructor of Record in Elementary Latin (I and II), Honors Elementary Latin (I and II), Intermediate Latin Reading, Roman Culture, and Latin and Greek in English. She has also worked as a paid volunteer with the Grant Elementary School Language Club, teaching Latin and Roman Culture to elementary students.

While at the University of Missouri-Columbia, Claire was elected President of the Classical Studies Graduate Student Association and served as Graduate Student Representative to the faculty. She initiated a graduate student and faculty coffee and snack hour, called *Carpe Crustulum*, in 2013. In 2017, the faculty presented her with the Society of Classical Studies Outstanding Student Award.

Currently, Claire is a Teaching Assistant in Dr. Anatole Mori's "Greek and Roman Characters and Ideals" course and is a Writing Center Fellow at the University of Missouri Writing Center.