

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

Susan Ludi Blevins

Date

Eternalizing the Emperor: Architecture, Cult, and Deification in Imperial Rome

By

Susan Ludi Blevins
Doctor of Philosophy

Art History

Eric R. Varner, Ph.D.

Bonna D. Wescoat, D.Phil.

Sarah C. McPhee, Ph.D.

Karl Galinsky, Ph.D.

Accepted:

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

Date

Eternalizing the Emperor: Architecture, Cult, and Deification in Imperial Rome

By

Susan Ludi Blevins
B.A. Emory University, 1993
J.D. College of William and Mary School of Law, 1997
M.A. Emory University, 2008

Advisors:
Eric R. Varner, Ph.D.
Bonna D. Wescoat, D.Phil

An abstract of
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Art History
2013

ABSTRACT

Honored with majestic temples that dominated the urban cityscape of imperial Rome and invoked repeatedly throughout the festal year as an integral part of maintaining the favor of the gods, the deified emperors were central to the religious and political development of the Roman Empire. The status of the deified emperors transcended dead mortals, while architecture and cult worship subsumed them within the totality of Roman religious remembrance. This dissertation offers a new approach to the phenomenon of deification through the lens of social and cognitive theories of collective memory.

Focusing on the early Empire, Chapter 2 assesses the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus as commemorative and theological models that shifted the memorial focus of the dead emperors from individual biography to universalizing, sacred history, categorizing the *divi* as eternal gods of the Roman state pantheon that reflected and constructed a Roman identity that sought divine legitimation through their deified rulers. Chapters 3-7 evaluate significant milestones in the development of deification in Rome: the Temple of Divus Claudius as a crucial turning point after the civil wars of 68-69, experimentation and mnemonic disjunction under the Flavians, the consolidation of a canon of good emperors under Trajan, the expanding and merging of ideologies related to the deified emperors and eternal Rome under Hadrian, and the concerted return to the beginning of the tradition under the Antonines with the conspicuous and well-publicized restoration of the Temple of Divus Augustus. A synchronic analysis suggests that despite ruptures in the dynastic transfer of imperial power, temples and cults of the deified emperors served as an index, a physical and ritual testament within the city of Rome to an eternal Empire encompassing the past, present, and future. Finally, by exploring how Romans negotiated imperial commemoration that simultaneously claimed superiority to, and alignment with, the past; and how and when emperors asserted dynastic legitimacy in the face of Senatorial ambivalence toward dynastic succession, this dissertation sheds light on pervasive tensions in imperial commemoration and self-representation.

Eternalizing the Emperor: Architecture, Cult, and Deification in Imperial Rome

By

Susan Ludi Blevins
B.A. Emory University, 1993
J.D. College of William and Mary School of Law, 1997
M.A. Emory University, 2008

Advisors:
Eric R. Varner, Ph.D.
Bonna D. Wescoat, D.Phil

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Art History
2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	1
Dedication.....	3
Chapter 1: Introduction: Remembering the Deified Emperors.....	6
Dead Emperors Mattered.....	6
Collective Memory.....	16
Identity.....	20
Chapter 2: Divus Julius and Divus Augustus: Memorial Models (29 BCE-68 CE).....	26
Introduction.....	26
Temple of Divus Julius.....	26
Temple of Divus Augustus.....	34
Building Eternity.....	40
<i>Collective Memory and Knowledge</i>	41
<i>Comparison and Categorization</i>	43
<i>Architectural Form</i>	45
<i>Aeternitas</i>	52
<i>Eternity of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius</i>	56
<i>Sculptural Program of the Temple of Divus Augustus</i>	62
Performing Eternity.....	66
<i>Inauguration and Dedication</i>	66
<i>Recurring Ritual and the Calendar</i>	74
<i>Temples and Processional Routes</i>	81
Suppression of Personal History.....	85
Dynastic Implications.....	91
Conclusion.....	98
Chapter 3: Julio-Claudian Divi, Divus Claudius, and Civil War: Negotiation and Novelty (54-69).....	103
Introduction: Uncertain Power and Divine Intervention.....	103
Julio-Claudian Divi and the Temple of Divus Augustus.....	107
Deification of Claudius: Addressing Contemporary Bias.....	113
Temple of Divus Claudius and Cult Under Nero.....	117
The Divi and the Civil Wars of 69-69: Bridging the Divide.....	127
Conclusion.....	134
Chapter 4: Flavian Divi: Affirmation, Experimentation and Mnemonic Disjunction (69-98).....	136
Introduction.....	136
Temple of Divus Claudius and the Flavians: Alignment with the Past.....	137
Aeternitas and the Flavian Divi.....	141
Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus: Emphasis on the Sacred.....	146
<i>Architecture</i>	147
<i>Sculptural Program</i>	150

<i>Architrave Inscription</i>	158
<i>Topography</i>	161
Restoration Coin Series of Titus and Divus Augustus.....	166
Commemoration and Cultic Experimentation Under Domitian.....	172
<i>Arch of Titus</i>	174
<i>Templum and Porticus Divorum</i>	176
<i>Temple of the Gens Flavia and the Imperial House</i>	178
<i>Temple of the Gens Flavia: Architectural Form and Topography</i>	181
<i>Temple of the Gens Flavia: Sculptural Program</i>	184
<i>Temple and Tomb</i>	188
Domitian as Son of a God and Father of Gods to Be.....	190
Conclusion.....	193
Chapter 5: Trajan: Consolidating the Good and Bad Emperors (98-117).....	194
Introduction.....	194
Domitian: Damnatio or Divus?.....	195
Divus Nerva.....	198
The Gist of the Matter.....	202
The Restoration Coin Series of Trajan: Consolidating the Good.....	216
<i>The Coins</i>	217
<i>Trajan as Restorer</i>	221
Trajan and the Temples to the Divi: Establishing Continuity.....	234
Conclusion.....	238
Chapter 6: Hadrian: Expanding and Eplicating the Tradition (117-138).....	240
Introduction.....	240
Hadrian's Divine Parents.....	241
The Elusive Temple of Divus Trajan.....	244
<i>Location</i>	244
<i>Date and Appearance</i>	247
<i>Topographical and Ideological Context</i>	252
Urban Context of Divus Trajan.....	258
<i>'Hadrianic' Pantheon</i>	258
<i>Temple of Diva Matidia</i>	262
Looking to the Present Past: Julio-Claudian and Flavian Divi.....	267
The Divi and Roma Aeterna.....	269
Conclusion.....	274
Chapter 7: The Antonines: Consistency and Commemoration (138- 192).....	276
Introduction.....	276
Hadrianeum.....	277
<i>Architecture</i>	280
<i>Reliefs of 'Provinces' and Trophies</i>	281

<i>Diagram of Imperial Eternity</i>	284
Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Divus Faustina: A Return to the Beginning.....	290
Restoration of the Temple of Divus Augustus: Renewing and Reinforcing the Imperial Past.....	296
Commemoration of the Divi Under the Antonines.....	299
<i>Apotheosis of Sabina Relief</i>	301
<i>Column of Antoninus Pius</i>	302
<i>Column of Marcus Aurelius</i>	303
<i>“Arae Consecrationis” and the Antonine Dynastic Complex</i>	304
Conclusion: Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius.....	308
Chapter 8: Conclusion: Accumulation and Inscription.....	310
Impact of Accumulation.....	310
Inscribing the City.....	312
Centrality of Rome.....	317
Figure List.....	320
Abbreviations.....	336
Bibliography.....	337
Figures.....	362

Acknowledgements

It is my great pleasure to acknowledge some of the many people and institutions that have contributed immeasurably to the progress and completion of this dissertation. First and foremost, I wish to thank my dissertation advisors Eric Varner and Bonna Wescoat without whom this project simply would not have been possible. It is difficult to overstate my gratitude. They have been generous with their time and expertise offering invaluable personal and professional support over the course of my career. I would also like to extend my most sincere thanks to Sarah McPhee for her time and energy in reading drafts of the dissertation and contributing her unique perspective on the city of Rome. I thank Karl Galinsky for his guidance, support, and enthusiasm for my project during its development and in the final stages when generously attended the defense. The Art History Department and its faculty at Emory University, including C. Jean Campbell, Gay Robins, Kathleen Carroll, Renee Stein, and Jasper Gaunt have been a source of support in diverse ways during the course of this project and my graduate career. I also offer sincere thanks to numerous colleagues who have discussed ideas and given valuable feedback and moral support including Maggie Popkin, Beth Gardiner, Clare Fitzgerald, and Liz Cummins.

Travel and research for this dissertation was funded generously by several institutions, which I would like to acknowledge individually. In the early stage of this project an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Interdisciplinary Dissertation Seminar Award allowed me to formulate the conceptual framework. I conducted preliminary research for the project in Rome thanks to a pre-dissertation travel award from Emory University. A Travel Fellowship in the History of Art funded by the Samuel H. Kress Foundation allowed me to conduct an extended research trip in Italy. I am indebted to the American Academy in Rome for generous use of the Academy library

and other resources during my research in Rome. My gratitude goes to Kathleen Coleman for her generous assistance in obtaining research privileges. Last, but certainly not least, I am most profoundly indebted to the Max Planck Society Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences for the two-year International Doctoral Fellowship that I received as part of the innovative *Memoria Romana: Memory in Roman Civilization* project, a product of the unique vision of Karl Galinsky. I am also grateful to the other *Memoria Romana* fellows for their time, experts, and expertise in reading drafts and offering stimulating discussion, invaluable suggestions, and critique.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to Alan, William, and Gage. Without them this world would surely cease to exist.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: REMEMBERING THE DEIFIED EMPERORS

Fame may not represent what men were; but it always represents what humanity needs them to have been.¹

Dead Emperors Mattered

During games and spectacles in honor of Divus Augustus in January of 41 the Roman emperor Caligula suffered a dramatic and bloody assassination at the hands of Senators, members of the Equestrian Order, and officers within the Praetorian Guard. Suetonius observes that Caligula's manner of death was remarkably similar to that of Julius Caesar eighty-five years earlier at a Senate meeting in the Theater of Pompey complex. In both instances the conspirators inflicted thirty stab wounds suggesting their intention to literally and symbolically terminate the events set in motion by the death of Caesar that led to the creation of the Roman Empire.²

Events in the immediate aftermath of Caligula's assassination were crucial in the survival of the Roman Empire. With the Senators overwhelmingly in favor of reestablishing the Republic as they believed it to be before Julius Caesar and Augustus came to power, they recognized the pressing need to address the memory of past emperors:

The conspirators too had not agreed on a successor, and the senate was so unanimously in favour of reestablishing the republic that the consuls called the first meeting, not in the senate house, because it had the name Julia, but in the Capitol; while some in expressing their views proposed that the memory of the Caesars be done away with and their temples destroyed.³

¹ Cooley 1992, 342.

² Suet. *Calig.* 4.58: As he lay upon upon the ground and with writhing limbs called that he still lived, the others dispatched him with thirty wounds; for the general signal was "Strike again." (*Iacentem contractisque membris clamitantem se vivere ceteri vulneribus triginta confecerunt; nam signum erat omnium: Repete*).

³ Suet. *Calig.* 4.60: (*neque coniurati cuiquam imperium destinaverunt; et senatus in asserenda libertate adeo consensit, ut consules primo non in curiam, quia Iulia vocabatur, sed in Capitolium convocarent, quidam vero sententiae loco abolendam Caesarum memoriam ac diruenda temple censuerint*).

An integral part of the proposed solution was to destroy the temples of the ‘Caesars’, of Divus Julius (**Fig. 1.1**) and Divus Augustus (**Fig. 1.2**), thereby abolishing their memory. Implicit in the Senators’ logic was a belief that the existence of the Republic and the memory of the Caesars were mutually exclusive.⁴ More important and as yet unrecognized, is the unequivocal association of the temples with the memory of the Caesars and the idea that destruction of the temples was tantamount to, and essential for, the destruction of memory. It is surely significant that in the brief period of chaos and uncertainty following Caligula’s assassination the very public contest over the Roman form of government was in part focused on the temples and memory of the *divi*, Rome’s deified rulers.

In a critical period of hesitation by the Senate and Consuls after announcing Caligula’s death, the army with the support of the populace declared Claudius emperor and sole ruler.⁵ His first official action as emperor was pivotal. In an effort to eliminate the memory of the two days when the Senate had considered changing the form of government, he decreed that all that had been said and done in those two days should be forgotten.⁶ In this case a double negative makes a positive. By declaring forgotten the attempt to destroy imperial memory Claudius powerfully affirmed the memory of the Caesars, the ongoing significance of the temples of *divi* and their cults, and by extension, the existence, visibility, and viability of the Roman Empire.

Twenty-seven years later Nero met his end in a far more private moment than Caligula when he committed suicide at the villa on the outskirts of Rome along the Via Nomentana belonging to his freedman Phaon. Though Nero’s manner of death was very different than Caligula, it too resulted in conflict and uncertainty at the apex of the Roman social, political, and

⁴ Flower challenges the traditional picture of a single monolithic Republic by presenting a new interpretation of Republican chronology and the dynamics that constituted the different Republics (Flower 2010).

⁵ Suet. *Claud.* 5.10.

⁶ Suet. *Claud.* 5.11.

religious hierarchy. Despite the definitive end to the Julio-Claudian dynasty over one hundred years after the death of Julius Caesar, the ensuing year of civil war saw a majority of coin issues from the primary operating mint in Spain evoking Divus Julius and Divus Augustus (**Fig. 1.3**). With no heir to the Julio-Claudian dynasty and no single contender for power on firm footing, these coins do not support the position of one prospective emperor claiming dynastic succession, rather, they affirm the legitimacy of a governmental system based on power concentrated in the hands of a single individual at a time when the drawbacks of not having someone in power, or worse of having a bad emperor in power, were becoming all too clear. These coins broadcast the message that a sole ruler like Divus Augustus provided the path to future peace and prosperity.

The emperor Vespasian ended the civil unrest of 68-69 and immediately demonstrated a marked interest in the power of memory. For example, he assumed the Herculean task of restoring 3000 bronze tablets destroyed by fire on the Capitol that constituted ancient records of Rome from the foundation of the city. Vespasian's major architectural works were the Temple of Peace, the Colosseum, and the rededication of the Temple of Divus Claudius allegedly destroyed by Nero to make way for a lavish nymphaeum (**Fig. 1.4**).⁷ Vespasian made no claim, real or fabricated, to Julio-Claudian ancestry, thus his motive for claiming to complete the Temple of Divus Claudius was not to gain legitimacy as a dynastic successor to the Julio-Claudians, rather Vespasian desired to bolster his status within the evolving imperial system. With doubts voiced about the deification of Claudius and no other emperor other than Claudius deemed worthy of deification since the death of Augustus, Vespasian's dedication of the Temple of Divus Claudius affirmed the cult housed in the temple and reinforced the existing cults of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius renewing their relevance in the present. After the Senate called for destruction of

⁷ On the building program of Vespasian generally, see Darwall-Smith 1996.

the temples of the Caesars in 41, without highly visible contemporary reinforcement of their cults in the later first century the demolition of the temples and the accompanying extinction of the memory of the *divi* they commemorated must have seemed like a real possibility.

This perspective highlights the link between the legitimacy of the Roman Empire and the way in which Romans collectively remembered the deified emperors. The concept of Weberian legitimacy has been called in to question as commonly applied to Roman Emperors. At one extreme Jon Lendon, for example, argues that Roman emperors felt very little need to legitimate themselves. He rightly questions the assumption that regimes have an absolute or nearly absolute ability, through communication and persuasion contributing materially to the ruler's power, to make their subjects think in ways that are opposed to their subjects' interests.⁸ This position begs the question of why persuasion, that is altering a group's view, belief, or understanding, must be opposed to the group's interest. Particularly relevant is Lendon's evaluation of the charismatic potential of the office of the emperor. Lendon concedes that in theory charisma could be handed down from an ancestor and/or invested in an office, but he maintains that in imperial Rome this was an either/or proposition in which Roman subjects evaluated the emperor rather than office.⁹ Examining the Roman construction of the deified emperors in the collective memory suggests that Lendon's position is too simplistic, that Roman emperors, some more adeptly than others, constantly negotiated the fine line between asserting their individual strengths and accomplishments along with those of their families on the one hand, and assimilating themselves into the line of emperors constituting the imperial tradition that had preceded, and would ultimately succeed, them.

⁸ Lendon 2006, 58-60.

⁹ Lendon 2006, 56-7.

Without completely rejecting the notion of legitimacy as a heuristic concept, Egon Flaig usefully distinguishes between the legitimacy of a ruler and the legitimacy of a form of government by pointing out that even in a stable monarchy the legitimacy of the ruler may be lost while the continuity of the monarchy remains uninterrupted.¹⁰ With respect to the ruler, rather than the form of government, he prefers the term acceptance as referring to the fact that the relevant sectors of the political community, in Rome the Senate, citizen soldiers, and plebs urbana, support the rule of a specific person by their explicit or implicit consent. In the context of imperial Rome the dead and deified emperors provide excellent material with which to think through the relationship between an individual emperor and the imperial office he holds, one at the apex of a governmental system that enables, constrains, and transcends each individual ruler. Rather than dwelling on the distinction between acceptance of the emperor and legitimacy of the Roman Empire, one focus here is the evolving and mutually constitutive relationship between emperor and imperial office as conceived through the lens of the dead emperors memorialized and consecrated as gods of the Roman state.

During the Roman imperial period the Senate officially deified sixty-three emperors and imperial family members. Their status as *divi* transcended dead mortals while architecture and cult worship assimilated the *divi* with the traditional gods who were classed as *dei*.¹¹ In the city of Rome during the imperial period the emperor's position was, at least initially under the first emperor Augustus, defined as first citizen, a role inherently inconsistent with religious worship of the reigning emperor as a god in the city of Rome. In Rome the emperor, empress, or member

¹⁰ Flaig 2010.

¹¹ The term 'traditional gods', refers to gods who were not alive within the living memory. As argued herein, the distinctions among gods were likely not so rigid as they appear from a modern perspective. While scholars have distinguished between *deus* and *divus* arguing that *divus* was a denigration, a lesser form of *deus*, recent consensus views *divus* simply as a subset of *deus* with no fundamental theological distinction. During the Republic the adjective *divinus* served as the adjectival form of both *deus* and *divus*. On these views and summarizing the evidence, see Wardle 2002.

of the imperial family could be worshipped as a god only after his or her death and deification. There is evidence of eleven temples or precincts dedicated to cults of *divi* in Rome: the Temple of Divus Julius in the Roman Forum, the Temple of Divus Augustus in the saddle between the Palatine and Capitoline Hills, the Temple of Divus Claudius on the Caelian Hill, the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the Roman Forum, the Porticus Divorum in the Campus Martius, the Temple of the Gens Flavia on the Quirinal Hill, the Temple of Divus Trajan at the north end of Trajan's Forum, the Temple of Diva Matidia in the Campus Martius, the Temple of Divus Hadrian in the Campus Martius, the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina in the Roman Forum, and a Temple of Divus Marcus in the Campus Martius. In addition, Agrippa's Pantheon and the later Hadrianic Pantheon in the Campus Martius may have been associated with the worship of the *divi*. Indeed, one-half of the twenty or so new state temples built in Rome between Augustus and Constantine were dedicated to *divi*.

Much has been written on the ritual of imperial funerals and the sequence of funeral and senatorial decree in the official declaration of a deceased emperor as a new god.¹² In his analysis Simon Price argues that by evoking two traditional and acceptable models, the Roman aristocratic funeral and cult of the gods, the imperial funeral and ritual of apotheosis was deliberately ambiguous between viewing the emperor in terms of his constitutional powers or in terms of the reality of autocracy.¹³ Cults of deceased rulers that developed after official consecration by the Senate, however, are the subject of this dissertation. Scholars have aptly characterized the cults of *divi* as a tool devised for dynastic purposes, an important function of

¹² See, e.g., Bickerman 1973; Boatwright 1985; Price 1987; Dupont 1989; Fishwick 2002; D'Ambra 2010. On the Senatorial decree of deification as declarative rather than constitutive of divinity, see Bickerman 1973, 13-4.

¹³ Price 1987.

which was to enhance the status of the living ruler, often a dynastic successor.¹⁴ The strong link between the imperial virtue of *pietas* and deification of an emperor's dynastic predecessor has likewise been amply demonstrated.

Studies of individual temples well-preserved in the archaeological record, such as the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus (**Fig. 1.5**), the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina (**Fig. 1.6**), and the Hadrianeum (**Fig. 1.7**) also tend to dwell on each monument's dynastic significance, concluding that the temples were built primarily to exalt the dynasty and celebrate the apotheosis of its members.¹⁵ Price analyzes deification from the perspective of the Senate arguing that it is a mechanism by which the senate can pass posthumous judgment on the emperor, a view Ittai Gradel takes one step further by interpreting the temples to *divi* in Rome as didactic showpieces in which the Senate displayed to the emperor the reward awaiting them if they ruled and behaved in accordance with the senatorial ideal.¹⁶

The suggestion in the brief introduction to the imperial *divi* above, that select Roman emperors remembered after death through their ontological transformation into gods became powerful symbols of the Roman Empire with the potential to legitimize not only a particular individual's fitness to be the head of the government but also the form of imperial government itself, complements earlier scholarship. Dynastic implications of the temples are certainly essential, but should hardly be the only aspect to understanding them. The temples to *divi* and cults they housed did not serve a single function, convey a single meaning, or embody a single ideal or ideology. Architecture, ritual, and image of the cults formed multivalent complexes of

¹⁴ See, e.g., Scott-Ryberg 1955; Gesche 1978; Haeckl 1996, 11; DeJong and Hekster 2008.

¹⁵ See, e.g., De Angeli 1992; Pensabene 1996; Sumi 2011.

¹⁶ Price 1987; Gradel 2008.

meaning and significance. This project proposes a theory of deification and memory centering on the materiality of Roman remembrance.

There is much more to the temples to the deified emperors than their function in short-term political maneuvering might suggest. This perspective is in sharp contrast to scholars who assert that the Romans cared very little about their emperors after they died.¹⁷ Already by the early second century the *divi* who received temples and cult in the city of Rome, despite complexities and variability in the memory of those emperors as historical persons, were conceived as a coherent group representing an imperial past.¹⁸ The common thread is memory: of deceased emperors and the gods that they became. As just one way of remembering the dead emperors, the granting of divinity and divine honors including a temple and cult did not preclude the parallel operation of other mnemonic strategies in monuments, ritual, and text. Despite the inherently memorial nature of deification as practiced in imperial Rome, however, scholars have yet to approach the phenomenon from a theoretical perspective drawing on the abundant and ever-increasing body of memory studies.

With the death first of Caesar and then Augustus approximately fifty years later Roman society found itself faced with the choice of how to remember rulers like Caesar and the first emperor Augustus who had enjoyed an unprecedented concentration of power and influence. By the death of Augustus, after forty-four years as emperor, and with the death of each succeeding emperor, the personal history and collective remembrance of individual emperors confronted the history of the Roman Empire.¹⁹ During the imperial period recollection and present

¹⁷ See, e.g., De Angeli 1992, 131.

¹⁸ See Chapter 5.

¹⁹ Connerton 1989, 18.

understanding of the Roman Empire became increasingly concretized in the images of the deified emperors.

That newly deified emperors were steadily added to the Roman state pantheon over the course of approximately 200 years, and that existing *divi* were repeatedly invoked in the present in various contexts well into the fourth century demonstrates the necessity of the past in the present and is a vivid example of Jan Assmann's assertion that, "the present is 'haunted' by the past and the past is modeled, invented, reinvented, and reconstructed by the present."²⁰ While Assmann highlights the interdependent relationship between past and present, his conception of the present echoes Maurice Halbwachs claim that "collective memory is essentially a reconstruction of the past [that] adapts the image of historical facts to the beliefs and spiritual needs of the present."²¹ As a consequence, it is logical to conclude that conceptions of the past that are no longer relevant disappear and that cults of *divi* survived because each cult held continued relevance even after the death of the honorand's dynastic successors.²² Indeed, Susan Alcock demonstrates that documenting the afterlife of a monument has the potential to elucidate what was deemed worthy to remember or forget.²³

Only recently has scholarship retreated from the marginalization of the cults of *divi* at Rome: "The temples of *divi* not only reflect the religious dominance of the emperor, they themselves added enormously to the monumental prominence of the emperors at Rome."²⁴ Although strictly speaking these cults may not be invested with a definable constitutional significance, as studies of *auctoritas* and other imperial virtues have shown, constitutional

²⁰ Assmann 1997, 9.

²¹ Halbwachs and Coser 1992, 7.

²² Halbwachs and Coser 1992, 80-1.

²³ Alcock 2002, 31.

²⁴ Beard, North and Price 1998, 254.

powers were only one component of the charismatic power of the emperor in Rome.²⁵ At the beginning of the Roman Empire, Augustus was cognizant of the need for a variety of messages for different audiences within the Roman state, “the language of constitutionality and restriction of power spoke well to a limited audience principally within the Roman elite; a message of a more charismatic ruler spoke better to a broader audience.”²⁶

I return to the quote by Cooley with which this introduction began, “Fame may not represent what men were; but it always represents what humanity needs them to have been.”²⁷ Although there is no single answer to this question at any given moment and the range of possible answers undoubtedly morphed over the course of the imperial period, this dissertation contributes to a new understanding of what the Romans needed the dead emperors to be and why. While scholars, most notably Robert Étienne, have certainly linked the deified emperors to the notion of imperial eternity, the emphasis has been on symbolism in political ideology rather than broader societal implications of the underlying religious tenets.²⁸

It is argued here that architecture and cult shifted the memorial focus of the dead emperors from individual biography to sacred history. Recalling why the emperors were deified was less important than declaring their categorization as eternal gods of the Roman state pantheon in the celestial realm. Yet, the memory of the deified emperors collided with the institutional memory of the Roman Empire, encouraging a belief in the stability of the Empire; a stability guaranteed not only through dynastic succession but also through the eternal presence of deified rulers. Hardt and Negri have described the notion of empire as boundless in time,

²⁵ Wallace-Hadrill 1981, 298; Galinsky 2005, 6; Hallett 2005, 254-5.

²⁶ Wardle 2005, 46.

²⁷ Cooley 1992, 342.

²⁸ Etienne 1986.

summoning the past and future within its own ethical order in order to appear permanent, eternal, and necessary.²⁹ In the practical operation of government the Roman Empire was defined in space and time, however, through the cults of the *divi* the emperors, senators, and people of Rome built imperial eternity.

Collective Memory

Before delving into how the Romans remembered their deified emperors, it is useful to ask what it means for someone to have, or something to be, held in collective memory. Alain Gowing has argued that although the term collective memory has been questioned the Romans clearly recognized the notion of a shared memory.³⁰ The issue of the difference between the memory of a collective and memories of an individual is no doubt a complex one, illuminated in the work of Barry Schwartz who argues that collective memory refers simultaneously to what is in the minds of individuals and to emerging conceptions of the past crystallized into symbolic structures.³¹ For Schwartz the process by which collective memory is constituted is crucial to understanding the difference between collective and individual memory:

Collective memory affects what individuals think about the past, but transcends the individual because it is constituted by what Alfred Kroeber called ‘suprapersonal’ properties which include narratives, pictorial objects, monuments and shrines, placenames, and observances that are accumulated and transmitted across generations. At this level, collective memory embraces not only events occurring during the lifetime of a population but also events occurring before any member of a population was born.³²

²⁹ Hardt and Negri 2000.

³⁰ Gowing 2005, 15.

³¹ Schwartz 2000, 6.

³² Schwartz 2000, 8.

While Schwartz and Kroeber refer to ‘suprapersonal properties’, Jacques LeGoff uses the term ‘mnemotechnologies.’³³ Additionally, the cognitive neuroscientist Merlin Donald has coined the term ‘external symbolic storage’, which he defines as the set of physical objects constructed, shaped, or used by humans to hold and communicate a symbolic meaning beyond mere utilitarian function.³⁴ Though not identical these concepts are comparable and all refer to the ways in which the past may be represented outside the minds of individuals. Recent psychological research has further acknowledged the role of social suggestion, or external influence, in the process of memory as not only a potentially distorting influence on memories, but a necessary feature of remembering that relies on the mediation of culture.³⁵

Brady Wagoner has proposed a new metaphor to describe memory processes, one not based on the outdated model of memory storage, but on the metaphor of construction in which remembering (rather than memory) is meaning construction in reference to the past, a meaning that is intimately related to the cultural tools used to represent it. In this new model collectives and individuals use external objects as cultural tools to construct meaning in reference to the past, however, “these cultural tools do not simply cue recall for something internal that is already formed, but instead shape the past into a particular cultural form and in so doing give it meaning.”³⁶

These shared recollections about the past, Wulf Kansteiner asserts, are at their most collective when they transcend time and space of the original event, unencumbered by individual memory.³⁷ The terms remembering and forgetting then, when used in regard to a collective, are

³³ LeGoff 1996, 52-7.

³⁴ Donald 2001, 311-23.

³⁵ Wagoner 2011.

³⁶ Wagoner 2011.

³⁷ Kansteiner 2002, 189.

employed metaphorically in the sense of memory not of memories. Events occurring or people existing in an individual's absence or before they were born are, "stored not in the mind, but in museums, libraries and schools; history books and biographies; monuments, statues, paintings, and relics."³⁸ According to this view Alon Confino has suggested that the phrase 'collective thought' about the past might be substituted for 'collective memory'.³⁹ This distinction is particularly important for what Assmann has called mnemohistory, a goal of this project, the aim of which is to analyze the importance that a collective ascribes to the past in the present by analyzing mnemonic traditions and discovering their hidden agenda.⁴⁰

This is not to imply that the individual is irrelevant to the discussion. Individuals remember collective as well as individual memories, and individual memories may determine the range of collective memorial possibility.⁴¹ Returning to Schwartz, commemoration is at its most intellectually compelling when it symbolizes values that past history documents.⁴² In terms of deification, the apotheosis of a particular emperor, construction of a major temple in honor of the new god, and annually recurring cult ritual are likely to be more compelling if individuals agree with the conception of the emperor formulated by the temple and cult, in which case they are active agents that may contribute to consensus in the shaping of collective memory of the dead emperors.

While Schwartz's articulation of how individuals 'remember' events at which they were not present or people who existed before they were born is helpful, he misses out on an essential

³⁸ Schwartz 2000, 9.

³⁹ Confino advocates that the study of collective memory should really emphasize collective mentalities in order to remedy the focus on distinct memories (Confino 1997); see also Climo and Cattell 2002.

⁴⁰ Assmann 1997, 7-15.

⁴¹ Hirst and Manier 2008, 183.

⁴² Schwartz 2000, 12.

step when he argues that collective memory is recalled not through neural synapse but through reference and commemoration. Though the initial construction of collective memory may take place in a social framework largely external to the cognitive processes of individuals, the potential for individual internalization is ever-present. The importance of symbolic structures are that memory no longer resides only in the human brain, it is also present in the symbolic structures that survive in some form, outliving those who initially constructed them and communicating comparatively stable symbolic meaning to later generations. Such symbolic structures testify “to a will or desire on the part of some societal group or disposition of power to select and organize representations of the past so that these will be embraced by individuals as their own.”⁴³ Thus, collective memory as embodied in temple and cult has the capacity to not only reflect individual’s preexisting conceptions, but also contribute to the shaping of new conceptions.

How does an individual embrace a collective memory? Paul Ricoeur’s emphasis on the reciprocal and interconnected constitution of individual and collective memory is elucidating. By informing individual memories, collective memory has the capacity to become an object of knowledge.⁴⁴ Conversely, individuals draw on individual memories and present experience to cognitively process collective representations of the past, which recollections of the past may or may not be distorted by present experience.⁴⁵ It is important to reiterate that the subject in memory studies is not the truth or falsity of what happened in the past, though it is relevant, but knowledge about the past that functions as a source of guiding principles.⁴⁶

⁴³ Wood 1999, 2.

⁴⁴ Schwartz 2000; Ricoeur 2004, 95.

⁴⁵ Connerton 1989, 2.

⁴⁶ Assmann 2006, 180.

Why does an individual embrace a collective memory? While the representation of the past is indeed external to the individual, if it does not resonate with meaning for at least some individuals and become incorporated into individual mentalities it will not survive. The goal-driven nature of memory, collective and individual, has been noted often: “For a collective memory to be formed and maintained, it must be functionally related to the achievement of the group goals of a community, and the content and structure of the memory have to exhibit meaningful relationships to these goals.”⁴⁷ Indeed identifying with a group’s conception of its past is part of the process of acquiring any social identity and familiarizing members with that past is part of a community’s efforts to assimilate them.⁴⁸ Thus, in the broadest conception collective memory sustains a community’s very identity and makes possible the continuity of its social life and cultural cohesion.

Identity

Individuals, in the process of knitting recollections into narratives, seek to link personal pasts with collective memory by revising personal components to fit the collectively remembered past, gradually ceasing to distinguish between them.⁴⁹ The active constructive process of collective remembering allows the community to preserve a conception of the past enabling the sense of what a community was in the past to give rise to a sense of who they are in the present.⁵⁰ In particular, the character and achievements of collectively remembered people such as deceased Roman emperors must echo the concerns of the present.⁵¹ In order to sustain the past

⁴⁷ Wang 2008, 306.

⁴⁸ Zerubavel 2003, 3.

⁴⁹ Lowenthal 1985, 196-7.

⁵⁰ Wang 2008, 307.

⁵¹ Schwartz 1990, 103.

such conceptions must remain ‘active’ in the sense that they continue to shape and inform behavior and identity.⁵² Though it is impossible to interview residents of imperial Rome to understand the complex interactions between individual self-conceptions and the extent to which people incorporate collective identity, empirical studies suggest that cultures, such as the Roman Empire, that emphasize shared fate and group belonging as opposed to personal uniqueness tend to have a higher degree of internalization of collective identity.⁵³

Collective identity may be described as the shared identity of the group constructed and contested by members of the collective as it remembers the past. Collective identity then, “is an achieved state negotiated in the social world,” a social world that also forms the framework for the identities of the individuals that makes up a collective.⁵⁴ The ongoing process of negotiation of identity, underscored recently by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill among others, results in a contingent state that may require constant evaluation and (re)negotiation.⁵⁵ As Andreae Huyssen has succinctly stated, “Remembrance shapes our link to the past, and the ways we remember define us in the present. As individuals and societies, we need the past to construct and anchor our identities and to nurture a vision of the future.”⁵⁶ Huyssen’s insight into our mental projections into the future acknowledges that as social beings and members of collectives the process of identity formation functions not only in the present with a view to the past but in anticipation of the future as well.

One avenue through which collectives form the narrative bases of their identities is the remembrance of important individuals or heroes. Societies celebrate those individuals that are

⁵² Climo and Cattell 2002.

⁵³ Wang 2008, 307.

⁵⁴ Alston 2008.

⁵⁵ Wallace-Hadrill 2008.

⁵⁶ Huyssen 1995, 250.

part of their acknowledged generational and cultural identity and common understanding. With an eye to the great men of early Rome, Gary Miles has observed that the fuzzy historical reality of *exempla* in Roman society was secondary to their role in dramatizing an ideologically true picture of Roman identity.⁵⁷ Miles' observation holds true for the *summi viri* of the Roman Empire, the emperors.

This brief introduction to some key concepts in collective memory studies is intended to emphasize a few things at the outset. First, although there is ample terminology within memory studies, the term collective memory is used herein because it effectively conveys the notion of creating a, "socially shareable memory system that encompasses memory processes at all levels from the individual to the communal to the cultural."⁵⁸ The notion of collective memory reflects, "a projection on the part of the collective that wishes to remember, and of the individual who remembers in order to belong."⁵⁹ Jeffrey Olick articulates two different concepts of collective memory: one refers to the aggregation of socially framed individual memories and one refers to the collective commemorative representations and mnemonic traces.⁶⁰ It is important to clarify that this project focuses on the latter and the constructive nature of collective memory. This position recognizes that collective remembrance is a condition of a group that is made up of individuals, the shared sociocognitive characteristics of which may give rise to group-specific context and organization of memory.⁶¹ When discussing deification in imperial Rome there is good reason to avoid Assmann's term cultural memory that he applies to the outer dimensions of

⁵⁷ Miles 1995.

⁵⁸ Wang 2008, 314.

⁵⁹ Assmann 2006, 7. Cf. Gedi and Elam who argue that all collective terms are problematic because they are conceived of as having capacities that are actualized only on an individual level (Gedi and Elam 1996).

⁶⁰ Olick 1999.

⁶¹ Olick 1999; Wang 2008, 314.

human memory, several generations in the past, and encompasses memory culture, Erinnerungskultur, and reference to the past, Vergangenheitsbezug.⁶² Through architecture and ritual it is possible to defy this distinction by constructing memories of people or events from recent history as though they existed in the distant past.

Second, acknowledging the importance of individuals in collective memory studies allows the incorporation of cognitive research, an approach long advocated by Jocelyn Penny Small and James Tatum for the study of classical antiquity and more recently in cognitive studies.⁶³ Understanding how individuals remember can shed additional light on what they remember. Viewing and experiencing temples, ritual, and images are activities that are dependent on memory and as such must take into account the peculiar strengths and limitations of human memory. As David Rubins persuasively argues in his study of narrative and poetic forms, “those traditions best adapted to mnemonic abilities and constraints will be the ones to survive in collective memory.”⁶⁴

Third, this theoretical stance suggests a new approach to the evidence. While memory sanctions enacted by the Senate against ‘bad’ emperors ensured a form of posthumous condemnation, senatorial decrees of consecration, on the other hand, which mandated temples and cult activated future remembrance. The nature of Roman religion, one grounded in place and action, justifies a focus on the material aspects of the cults of the deified emperors.⁶⁵ With few exceptions, the cults of deified emperors or family members only survived if they received a temple and cult. Starting from the premise that a mnemohistory of the cults of *divi* is coextensive

⁶² Assmann 1992, 19.

⁶³ Small and Tatum 1995. See also Barnier and Sutton 2008.

⁶⁴ Rubins 1995.

⁶⁵ Roman religion was one of place and action, rites and ceremonies handed down from ancestors, rather than doctrinal truths purporting to present essential and eternal truths (see, e.g., Turcan 1998, Gradel 2002; Orlin 2007,).

with the object life histories of their temples which functioned individually and cumulatively as the primary loci for their collective remembrance and the deified emperors' mark on Roman visual culture, this project is concerned with the deified emperors as figures of memory.⁶⁶ Mnemohistory is not about the past as it happened but only with the past as it is remembered, concentrating on those aspects of significance related to memory.⁶⁷ This project is not intended to be an exhaustive catalogue of the material evidence or construct a monolithic narrative, rather the goal is to investigate trends in architectural, epigraphic, numismatic, and sculptural evidence that shed light on how and why official views of deified emperors were forged in the public space, why they endured, and how they were transformed.⁶⁸

Object life histories and memory are inextricably linked because each action imprints the object with a set of meanings and memories.⁶⁹ Objects evoke and establish continuity because of their materiality, which provides a link with the past, present, and future, a mnemonic power of *monumenta* underscored by Varro.⁷⁰ Similarly, images of the past and recollected knowledge of the past are conveyed and sustained through ritual performance.⁷¹ Literary testimony articulating images and understanding of the gods and the legacy of the deified emperors are similarly germane to this endeavor. Indeed, ritual action, together with written discourse purporting to explain or describe ritual action, form religious and cultic experience.⁷² As a caveat, though the evidence may not reveal definitively what people believed or how strongly they felt, it can reveal

⁶⁶ 'Mnemohistory' is a term coined first by Assmann (1997) and then Zerubavel (2003).

⁶⁷ Consecration would have involved the creation of the statues of his cult including the *lex templum*, creating the name of the god, priest, and temple (Weinstock 1971, 390-4).

⁶⁸ See also Meskell 2004; Crawford 2007, 11.

⁶⁹ Assmann 1997, 7-16.

⁷⁰ Varro *Ling.* 6.49. Alcock defines monuments as, "places, structures, or objects deliberately designed or later agreed to provide memories" (2002, 28).

⁷¹ Rowlands 1993.

⁷² Connerton 1989, 2; Assmann 2004.

how people wanted to represent their beliefs. In sum, this project traces the flow of discourse and symbolic structures created and accumulated from the death of Julius Caesar in 44 BCE through the third century that the Romans used to represent and communicate their understandings of deified emperors.

CHAPTER 2

DIVUS JULIUS AND DIVUS AUGUSTUS: MEMORIAL MODELS (29 BCE-68 CE)

Introduction

From the first cults of *divi* in Rome, the cult of Divus Julius and the first deified emperor Divus Augustus, the temples were not mere copies of so-called traditional temples but carefully designed structures that conveyed a specific understanding of the deceased emperor. A cognitive approach to viewing and memory rooted in the mental faculties of comparison and categorization suggests that the architectural form and iconography of the temples, along with accompanying ritual as detailed in the religious *Fasti*, transformed the ontological status of the emperor into an eternal, heavenly god of the Roman state pantheon, in part by shifting the memorial focus from individual biography to sacred history. A discussion of the Latin meanings of *immortalitas* and *aeternitas* reveals that the conception of the new god was one that included the idea of total eternity implicating the past, present, and future. This universalizing *aeternitas* as applied to Augustus influenced a burgeoning view of the Roman Empire as the inevitable result of divine favor of the Roman state gods, a celestial group of which their deceased rulers were now members. As memorial models, the cults and commemoration of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus raised the possibility, but surely not the certainty, of future deification for Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius.

Temple of Divus Julius

The posthumous deification of the dictator Julius Caesar was different in process than any of the deified rulers who came after him, which is hardly surprising given that he was the

first. Rather than granting him status as a god of the Roman state pantheon by a decree that enumerated the honors accorded to the new god, in the case of Julius Caesar the Senate, at a meeting at the Temple of Tellus on 17 March 42 BCE, affirmed what the triumvirs and people of Rome had already decided.

During Julius Caesar's funeral in 44 BCE his body was displayed on the Caesarian Rostra at the northwest end of the Roman Forum atop an ivory bed draped in purple and gold within a chapel recalling the Temple of Venus Genetrix, a configuration that hinted at his imminent divinity.⁷³ Outraged at the assassination of Julius Caesar, the urban plebs sought what they believed to be a suitable location for the cremation. They carried the funeral bier to the Capitol, rather than the more customary funerary location already prepared in the Campus Martius, in order to bury the dead dictator in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and, as Appian recounts, to place him among the gods and burn down the temple.⁷⁴ A group of Roman priests prevented this violation of the sacred Capitoline, leaving the mob to choose what may be described as the second most visible and sacred spot in the city of Rome for the cremation pyre: the southeastern end of the Roman Forum between the Regia and the Temple of Vesta in full view of the Capitol, a sector also strongly associated with the plebs because of its proximity to the Temple of Castor and Pollux and the assemblies held at the temple (**Fig. 2.1**).⁷⁵

At the southeastern end of the Forum the urban plebs erected an altar that would later be incorporated into the podium of the Temple of Divus Julius, and an adjacent twenty-foot high column of Numidian marble inscribed with the words *parenti patriae*, 'To the Parent of His

⁷³ Suet. *Iul.* 84.1.

⁷⁴ App. *B Civ.* 2.20.148; 2.148.615.

⁷⁵ Cass. Dio 44.6.4. Hänlein-Schäfer 1985, 99-102. Livy states that Caesar was cremated in front of the Rostra (Livy *Per.* 116), while Appian says near the Regia.

Country.⁷⁶ The combined elements of column and altar, with its locale for libations and sacrifice, formed an abbreviated prototype of the grand temple that would one day be built on that very spot.⁷⁷ Though the *giallo antico* marble chosen may have referenced Caesar's conquest of Numidia, Barbara Burrell notes the exigent circumstances of the column's erection and points out that the choice was more likely motivated by opportunity.⁷⁸ The actions of the crowd prompted Suetonius to observe that Julius Caesar was placed among the number of the gods not only by decree but also by the belief of the crowd.⁷⁹ No mere token, the altar beside the grand column was the site of sacrifices to Caesar as through sacrificing to a god.⁸⁰

Soon after the funeral the consul P. Dolabella, who had supported the assassins and opposed Caesar's deification, removed the column and paved over the space where it stood. The removal of the twenty-foot tall monolithic column, a very public gesture no doubt requiring considerable resources and coordination in order to inhibit posthumous veneration of Caesar, indicates the importance of the memorial's location and monumental form to the nascent cult. As Geoffrey Sumi has rightly emphasized, the warring ideologies of Caesar's supporters and the conspirators revolved around the column and altar to Caesar.⁸¹ Ultimately Octavian restored the monument, confirming Caesar's divine status and marking an unambiguous rejection of the

⁷⁶ Suet. *Iul.* 85: (*postea solidam columnam prope uiginti pedum lapidis Numidici in foro statuit [in]scripsitque parenti patriae*). App. *B Civ.* 2.20.14.

⁷⁷ Cass. Dio 1.7.18; *CIL* 1.626; *CIL* 9.2028. Ryberg has observed the use of a single column as a convention of Greek vase painting to suggest the temple setting (1955, 16).

⁷⁸ Burrell 2012.

⁷⁹ Suet. *Iul.* In addition to the Temple of Divus Julius, other honors for Divus Julius included a festival in the public calendar on the dates of his birth and death, the consecration of his house of birth as a cult site, the declaration that his *imago* could not be carried in public funerals, and a priesthood.

⁸⁰ Dio 44.51.1-2.

⁸¹ Sumi 2011, 209.

conspirators who sought to justify their actions by denigrating Caesar's memory and portraying him as a tyrant.⁸²

That the impetus for deification in part came directly from the people counters the usual model of deification as a top-down phenomenon devised by the imperial elite to control the masses. This shift in perspective is necessary to understanding the role of all segments of society in Rome in the creation and perpetuation of the memory of deified emperors. According to Stefan Weinstock, provision for the temple came from an earlier decree of the Senate during Caesar's lifetime that temples should be built in his honor.⁸³ The fact that members of the Senate and elite such as Dolabella openly opposed his deification after death argues against Weinstock's interpretation and suggests looking elsewhere to understand the impetus behind the temple. While the decision of what honors would be accorded Divus Julius were ultimately made and financed by Octavian, likely with minimal input from the other triumvirs, the altar and twenty-foot column clearly reflected how the urban plebs conceived of Julius Caesar shortly after his death. Although cult in favor of the new god before dedication of the temple may have taken place at the Temple of Venus Genetrix as suggested by H. Gesche, it is equally plausible that it occurred solely at the altar spontaneously established at the future site of the temple in the Roman Forum.⁸⁴

When construction of the Temple of Divus Julius began is uncertain. The only surviving Augustan coin images of the temple, those issued in 36 BCE five years before its dedication,

⁸² On the notion of Caesar's column monument as contested space, see Sumi 2011, 214. Though the area was maintained by the urban plebs, Caesar's slaves and freedmen, and Caesar's veterans, Cicero parished Dolabella for removing it.

⁸³ Sumi 2011, 214.

⁸⁴ On the arguments, see De Angeli 1992, 133.

may have commemorated the beginning of construction.⁸⁵ Coins issued in Rome and in Africa in 36 BCE bear an image of the façade of a tetrastyle temple on a podium with a lighted round altar to the left recalling and emphasizing Caesar's apotheosis and the site of the initial cult (**Fig. 2.2**).⁸⁶ Alternatively, placement of the altar on the coin to the left of the temple may indicate that Octavian had not fully formed the temple's eventual design.⁸⁷ Temple construction probably began in the years following 1 January 42 BCE, when the Senate, under pressure from the people of Rome and the Second Triumvirate, officially recognized Julius Caesar as a god of the Roman state pantheon. This theory is in line with Helène Whittaker who observes that, with no real precedent for the cult of Divus Julius, the divinity of the new god had an air of impermanence. Reflecting the uncertainty of Octavian's position and that of Divus Julius, the issue of the coin in 36 BCE would have marked Octavian's intention to secure the cult by renewing building activity and completing construction.⁸⁸

In the coin the entablature of the temple bears the prominent inscription *DIVO IVL*, the dative case indicating a dedication to a god. A six-pointed star adorns the pediment no doubt in reference to the comet that appeared during Caesar's funeral games in July of 44 BCE, a cosmic ratification of Caesar's deification that seemed to signify to the people that Caesar's soul had been received into the company of the immortal gods.⁸⁹ Further unidentifiable acroterial embellishment is indicated along the roofline by a series of vertical lines. A space between the middle two columns highlights the cult statue of Divus Julius standing togate, veiled, and

⁸⁵ Gagé 1936, 207.

⁸⁶ *BMCRE* I no. 32.

⁸⁷ Weinstock 1971.

⁸⁸ Whittaker 1996. *Cf.* Sumi (2011, 221) arguing that construction probably began in 32 or 31, but that planning was underway in 36 B.C.E. when the coin was issued. Depictions of the cult statue came in two variations, one with lituus and one in which the torso is bare.

⁸⁹ Pliny *NH* 2.94.

holding a *lituus* in his right hand.⁹⁰ Sumi explains this curious choice of iconography as a result of Octavian's caution and reluctance to depict Caesar as a divinity; however, a cult statue that is by definition an image of a god situated within the god's monumental temple in the Roman Forum would seem to negate any effort at modesty.⁹¹ There was no question that Divus Julius was a god.

P. Gros similarly minimizes the theological significance of the Temple of Divus Julius as depicted in the coin image by arguing that the cella of the temple, with its wider doors and more open front, was designed less as a sanctuary and more as a display space for the cult statue.⁹² Discarding the assumption that nudity in imperial images necessarily denoted divinity, Christopher Hallett's analysis of images of *divi* demonstrates that most often *divi* were depicted wearing a toga. When a deceased emperor was shown nude or wearing the hip-mantle, an additional signifier of divinity such as the star or radiate crown was required for clarity.⁹³ The *lituus* referenced the ritual of augury, a procedure integral to the founding of Rome by Romulus, and so recalled the earliest mortal Roman to become an object of state veneration as the god Quirinus, a logical legendary and theological parallel to Divus Julius.

The coin image probably represents construction in progress giving us a summary idea of the temple's planned appearance. To knowledge of the temple's appearance provided by the coins may be added the remains in the Roman Forum, and Vitruvius who describes the temple as hexastyle, pycnostyle, with intercolumniations one and half times the diameter of the columns.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ Whittaker 1996, 87-9.

⁹¹ Cf. Simon who interprets the image represented in the temple as Augustus, elected augur in 43 B.C.E. consecrating the area where the temple was to be built (Simon 1986, 85-6).

⁹² Sumi 2011, 219-20.

⁹³ Gros 1976, 86.

⁹⁴ Vitr. *De arch.* 3.3.1.

The order of the temple when built is unknown, however, based on fragments of Corinthian capitals found near the podium later emperors restored the temple in the Corinthian order.⁹⁵ In the Forum Antiquarium are fragments belonging to the temple of a sculptural frieze with a repetitive acanthus scroll populated by gorgon heads alternating with acanthus swirls terminating in female figures that appear to be Victories (**Fig. 2.3**).⁹⁶ Projecting geison blocks in the Roman Forum that belong to the temple are adorned with vegetal motifs between the modillions (**Fig. 2.4**).

The temple stood approximately six meters above the Roman Forum atop a high podium of cement faced in travertine, the remains of which are still visible (**Fig. 2.5**). Viewers approached the temple's 26.67 m wide by 30 m long podium from the side to ascend one of two sets of lateral stairways to an intermediate platform known as the *rostra aedis divi Iulii* suitable for addressing a crowd in the Forum.⁹⁷ From construction of the temple until 18 BCE, viewers standing in the Forum facing the façade would have looked directly upon a semi-circular niche in the middle of the original site of the altar erected at Julius Caesar's funeral. In addition, the speaker's platform flanking the niche bore the beaks of enemy ships captured at the Battle of Actium, an element highlighted in a second century coin of Hadrian addressing a crowd from the speaker's platform (**Fig. 2.6**).⁹⁸ As R. Ulrich has observed, with its sacred connotations and impressive backdrop, an orator's platform appended to the front of a monumental temple could

⁹⁵ On divine attributes and the iconography of the deified emperors, see Hallett 2005, 223-31.

⁹⁶ Gros suggests that the Temple of Divus Iulius was Ionic under Augustus then later restored as Corinthian under the Flavians (Gros 1976, 209). On populated scrolls, see Toynebee and Perkins 1950.

⁹⁷ On the association between temples and speaker's platforms in Roman architecture, see Ulrich 1994.

⁹⁸ Cass. Dio 51.19. See Squarciapino 1957.

hardly have provided a more dramatic location for public display in an exterior setting.⁹⁹

Moreover, with beaks from the ships captured at Actium embedded in the façade, the new speaker's platform established an unmistakable visual and thematic link with the Republican Rostra on the northwestern side of the forum similarly bearing ships beaks from Republican naval victories (**Fig. 2.7**).

A monumental staircase led up to the columns of the pronaos from the intermediate platform. The corner pilasters of the cella terminated in antae that extended one bay into the three-bayed pronaos (**Fig. 2.8**). A 17 m wide cella occupied the entire width of the temple. From his campaigns in the east Octavian brought a painting by Apelles of Venus Anadyomene that he consecrated to Divus Julius and displayed inside the cella of the temple, purposefully replicating the practice of displaying spoils of war dedicated in the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus following triumphal processions.¹⁰⁰ In addition, Augustus also displayed in the temple a painting of the Castors, bringing to mind the similarity of Divus Julius to other examples of legendary mortals now occupying prominent positions in the Roman pantheon of state gods.¹⁰¹

On 18 August 29 BCE Octavian dedicated the Temple of Divus Julius as the culmination of the three-day celebration of his triple triumph signaling the end of the civil war and Octavian's triumphal return from Actium.¹⁰² Built in opposition to the Rostra moved by Julius Caesar from the Comitium to the north-west end of the Forum but nonetheless retaining its Republican connotations, the speaker's platform constructed directly in front of the Temple of Divus Julius

⁹⁹ With respect to the Temple of Divus Julius Ulrich notes that the tiers between the columns resulted in a distinct change of level between the platform and the temple, improving visibility of the temple and perhaps indicating the transition from secular to sacred space (Ulrich 1984, 313).

¹⁰⁰ Pliny *NH* 35.36.

¹⁰¹ Pliny *NH* 35.10.

¹⁰² Inscript. XIII 2, dated to 18 August 29 BC.

provided an imperial architectural backdrop and a divine genealogical context, as opposed to a Republican one, for the events enacted there.

A law of 9 BCE by T. Quinctius Crispinus, passed at the Temple of Divus Julius, provides evidence that Augustus changed the location of popular assemblies to the Temple of Divus Julius from their previous location at the nearby Temple of Castor and Pollux, perhaps for a similar reason.¹⁰³ This relocation of the popular assembly brought them further under the aegis of the emperor and his family, demonstrating that the ultimate authority rested with the emperor. Not only did Augustus move events that previously took place elsewhere to the Temple of Divus Julius, the temple also provided a topographic and ideological fulcrum to the Julio-Claudian building program in the Roman Forum. Dramatically renovating and enhancing the Roman Forum, additional Julio-Claudian structures in or bordering the Roman Forum included the Parthian Arch celebrating Augustus' return of the Roman standards from Parthia, the Basilica Julia begun by Julius Caesar and completed by Augustus along the southern side of the Forum in the names of his nephews Gaius and Lucius, an arch of Tiberius over the Vicus Tuscus, the Tiberian renovation of the Temple of Castor and Pollux and the Temple of Saturn, and finally, the Temple of Divus Augustus later built behind the Basilica Julia a short distance from the Temple of Divus Julius.¹⁰⁴

Temple of Divus Augustus

By Augustus' death on 19 August 14 the Temple of Divus Julius had dominated the Roman Forum and priests had performed annual ritual venerating Divus Julius for approximately thirty-eight years. Images of Divus Julius graced numerous sacred spaces throughout the city of

¹⁰³ On the ideological motivation for this change of venue, see Sumi 2009.

¹⁰⁴ On the transformation of the Roman Forum by Augustus, see Favro 1996.

Rome. Statues of the state gods in Agrippa's Pantheon included Divus Julius, Mars, and Venus, while statues of Augustus and Agrippa prominently adorning the Pantheon's vestibule greeted Romans entering the temple. Similarly, a statue group in the Temple of Mars Ultor, originally vowed to avenge Julius Caesar's death, contained images of Divus Julius and Venus Genetrix flanking Mars Ultor (**Fig. 2.9**). Augustus had ended the civil wars, expanded the Roman Empire to encompass much of the known world, and brought peace and prosperity after the prolonged period of unrest that lasted from Sulla's dictatorship until Augustus' unequivocal victory at Actium. Though the Republic was far from forgotten, Tacitus made the observation that, of those alive in 14 at Augustus' death, few had seen the Republic since most of the old men had been born during the civil wars.¹⁰⁵ Thus, for many at the time of Augustus' death, the idea of a temple to a deceased ruler was not as radical as it must have been when Julius Caesar died.

Augustus' last will and testament contained his *Res Gestae* summing up the achievements of his life as he wanted them to be remembered, outlined the specific details of his funeral, and named his successor. Though Augustus wisely did not presume to explicitly mention his own posthumous deification in his will, the prospect of his deification, which had been broached openly by Roman poets during his lifetime, was certainly on the minds of Tiberius, the Senate, and the people of Rome at the time of his death. Shortly after the reading of the will the Senate decreed a temple, state college of priests called the *Sodales Augustales*, special state priest called a *Flamen*, priestess called a *Flaminica*, cult statue, and games in his honor, all at state expense.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 1.3. Flower argues that the traditional republican civic life was already in serious political turmoil by 100 B.C.E. and collapsed by 88 B.C.E. (Flower 2000, 162).

¹⁰⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.8; Cass. Dio 56.46.3. See also Gradel 2002, 261-2.

Before dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus in 27 a gold statue of the god lay on a *lectisternium* in the Temple of Mars Ultor.¹⁰⁷ The necessity for an interim solution to a site of cult veneration for Divus Augustus, one located in an existing temple, emphasizes the importance of location and form in veneration of the new god. Furthermore, veneration of Divus Augustus in the Temple of Mars Ultor, dominating the Forum of Augustus with its statue galleries of great Romans of the past and esteemed members of Augustus' own family, would have been a logical choice configuring Augustus as the culmination of the elaborate program of the Forum of Augustus that he devised in his lifetime (**Fig. 2.10**).¹⁰⁸ The gold statue of Divus Augustus in the Temple of Mars Ultor faced the imposing statue of Augustus in a quadriga in the center of the Forum and complemented the 14 m tall statue of the Genius of Augustus at the end of the northern colonnade, possibly transforming the reception of the images in the Forum of Augustus.

A cult image of Divus Augustus did not, however, remain in the Temple of Mars Ultor. Although Livia and Tiberius financed construction of the Temple of Divus Augustus, Caligula dedicated it in late August of 37 after Tiberius' death.¹⁰⁹ No physical evidence of the actual structure survives and the precise location is unknown. Of the many opinions put forward the general consensus follows Duncan Fishwick who, based on a detailed analysis of literary sources, concludes that the Temple of Divus Augustus associated with the state cult is the one commonly referred to in antiquity as the *Templum Novum Divi Augusti* located in the low saddle between the Palatine and Capitoline Hills and bounded by the *Basilica Iulia* and the

¹⁰⁷ Cass. Dio 56.46.4.

¹⁰⁸ On the Forum of Augustus, see Kockel 1995.

¹⁰⁹ Tacitus (*Ann* 6.45) and Cassius Dio (54.46.3) inconsistently record that either Livia or Tiberius or both financed construction, but they were likely jointly responsible.

Velabrum (**Fig. 2.11**).¹¹⁰ Recent excavations that might suggest a location for the Temple of Divus Augustus in the area across the Vicus Jugarius, near Santa Maria Antiqua, that is generally associated with Domitian's extensions of his Palatine palace may reveal important new information. Both locations are consistent with Suetonius' assertion that, after won by entreaties to live with Jupiter himself, Caligula "built a bridge over the Temple of the Deified Augustus, and thus joined his Palace to the Capitol."¹¹¹ Either way, the temple was located in a prominent location in the heart of Rome near the Roman Forum between the Palatine and Capitoline Hills.

A coin issued to commemorate the dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus in 37 constitutes the best evidence for the temple's appearance at the time of construction. The visual focus of the extraordinarily detailed coin is on the emperor Caligula, togate and veiled, standing to the right of an altar over which he holds a *patera* (**Fig. 2.12**).¹¹² Sacrificial attendants accompany Caligula: the *victimarius* who leads a sacrificial steer to the altar, and the *camillus* who holds an *urceus* and *simpulum*. Rising up behind Caligula is the garlanded, hexastyle, Ionic temple. In contrast to the coin image of the Temple of Divus Julius, this coin presents an image of a temple with an elaborate sculptural program. In the center of the pediment appeared Divus Augustus wearing a toga and holding a scepter and *patera*. To the left was Mars holding a spear and shield, and to the right Venus draped and holding a bowl.¹¹³ Two reclining figures filled out the pediment. A quadriga with chariot surmounted the apex and on the slopes of the pediment were victories holding shields. Acroterial statue groups of Aeneas with Ascanius and Anchises

¹¹⁰ Other evidence supporting Fishwick is a fragment of the *Forma Urbis* showing the *Gracocostadium* with what appears to be a temple structure in the center that may be the *Templum Novum*. See Ulrich 1994, 17-8.

¹¹¹ Suet. *Cal.* 22.4: (. . . *et in contubernium ultro invitatus super templum Divi Augustus ponte transmisso Palatium Capitoliumque coniunxit*).

¹¹² *BMCRE* I no. 153. Based on the high level of detail Mattingly conjectures that the coin image may have been adapted from a monumental relief.

¹¹³ Cf. Gagé who interprets the figures in the temple pediment as Mars Ultor, Divus Julius, and Venus Genetrix (1930, 150-53).

on the viewer's right and of Romulus carrying the *spolia opima* on the viewer's left completed the sculptural program.

The cult statue is not visible in the coins issued by Caligula; however, scholars have argued that other coin images depicting Divus Augustus togate and seated on a curule chair holding a branch represent the cult image (**Fig. 2.13**).¹¹⁴ A similar image of Divus Augustus is found on a sestertius of Tiberius issued in 35-36 showing the procession of the gods in the Circus Maximus; a quadriga of elephants pulling a car bearing a radiate, seated, effigy of Divus Augustus holding a branch and scepter marked by the legend *DIVO AUGUSTO SPQR*.¹¹⁵ That the statue was seated may also be indicated by coins issued under Antoninus Pius showing the restored temple with seated cult statues of Augustus and Livia, though it is possible that the Antonine coins do not represent the format of the original cult statues (**Fig. 2.14**). A togate cult statue of Augustus would have been visually consistent with the togate image of Augustus in the center of the Temple's pediment.¹¹⁶ Claudius deified his grandmother Livia in 42, at which time she almost certainly received a cult statue in the Temple of Divus Augustus.¹¹⁷ The cult statue of Divus Augustus may have a radiate crown as well. Though the radiate crown as an attribute was normally associated with Sol and eventually became the prerogative of the living emperor, under the Julio-Claudians it adorned images of Divus Augustus primarily for its capacity to evoke the *sidus iulium* rather than as an attribute of the sun god.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ *RIC I*² no. 56.

¹¹⁵ *RIC I*² no. 62; *BMCRE I* no. 108.

¹¹⁶ Other togate representations of Divus Augustus from the Julio-Claudian period include the Grand Camée de France and a cameo portrait of Livia in Vienna showing Livia as a priestess of Divus Augustus holding a bust of her late husband (Hallett 2005, 226).

¹¹⁷ Cass. Dio. 60.5.2; Suet. *Claud.* 11.2. On the deification of Livia and her other honors including her image drawn in a chariot in the pompa Circensis and Vestals making sacrifices to her, see Grether 1946, 245-51. Records of Arvals show sacrifices to her also on 183, 218, 224 (Grether 1946, 251).

¹¹⁸ Thomas 2007, 35. Nero was the first emperor to appear with the radiate crown.

In addition, Tiberius consecrated paintings in the Temple of Divus Augustus that he brought back from Alexandria including one of Hyacinthus and one of the Danae, both by Antidotus, instructor of Nicias.¹¹⁹ Tiberius' placement of these paintings in the temple and the dedication of the temple soon after Caligula assumed office suggest that it was substantially completed under Tiberius. This runs counter to the idea that Tiberius' religious conservatism caused him to stall in completing the temple, a view sustained by Suetonius who said that Tiberius left unfinished only two building projects that he undertook, the Temple of Divus Augustus and the restoration of Pompey's Theater.¹²⁰

Instead it is possible that the elaborate nature of the temple and its sculptural program prolonged construction but that it had been substantially completed for some time and that Tiberius was attempting to time the dedication to coincide with the centenary of Augustus' birth in 37. The latter view is consistent with Tacitus who also points out Tiberius' deficiency in public building projects but states that Tiberius completed the Temple of Augustus and Theater of Pompey, yet was either "too scornful of popularity or too old to dedicate them after completion."¹²¹ Suetonius is further discredited in this instance by his claim that Caligula completed the half-finished (*semiperfecta*) temple, a statement that must have been hyperbole because even if Tiberius did not complete the construction the Temple was nearly done by his death.¹²² Moreover, it well known that Tiberius was responsible for the reconstruction of at least two other major monuments in Rome's center, both in the name of Tiberius and of his deceased brother Drusus: the Temple of Castor and Pollux dedicated on 27 January 6, and the Temple of

¹¹⁹ Pliny *NH* 35.40.

¹²⁰ Suet. *Tib.* 47.

¹²¹ Tacitus *Ann.* 6.45: (*Tiberius*) *tanto acceptius in vulgum quanto modicus privatis aedificationibus ne publice quidem nisi duo opera struxit, templum Augusti et scaenam Pompeiani theatri*).

¹²² Suet. *Cal.* 21.

Concordia dedicated on 16 January 10.¹²³ Edward Champlin's recent article on the Temple of Castor and Pollux makes clear that Tiberius understood the potential, particularly of religious architecture, to convey powerful associations between the imperial family and gods of Rome.¹²⁴

Building Eternity

The senatorial decrees declaring the deification Julius Caesar and Augustus officially outlined the divine honors accorded both men and also enumerated future obligations of memorial and religious practices.¹²⁵ A further significant element of the decrees was the inclusion of the new *divi* within the Roman state pantheon. The Roman state religion was dedicated to maintaining the *pax deorum*, the peace with the gods that sustained their favor. Roman society achieved the *pax deorum* through the maintenance of religious structures and proper religious observance. As Robert Turcan described, "Ancient Rome knew about religious procedures or, rather, the processes and formulas required in any given circumstances to ensure the effectiveness of divine assistance."¹²⁶ Down to the fourth century it was widely believed that the prosperity and safety of Rome depended on the accurate performance of traditional ceremonies. In other words, the Romans believed that if they failed to maintain the *pax deorum* the gods would abandon Rome. That such a dire situation was possible was fresh in the minds of Romans in the early imperial period because many believed that the civil wars were at least in part the result of a breach in the *pax deorum* caused by religious neglect.

¹²³ See Champlin 2011, 82.

¹²⁴ Concentrating on the dedicatory inscription of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in Rome, Champlin argues that Tiberius used the temple to convey a powerful public association between the Castor and Pollux and himself and his brother Drusus (Champlin 2011).

¹²⁵ Hallett 2005, 229.

¹²⁶ Turcan 1998, 2

Without implementation of the honors decreed by the Senate, the status of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus as gods would have meant very little in terms of religion and collective memory.¹²⁷ As Gradel and others have pointed out, Roman religion was one of place and action rather than dogma. There was clearly an absolute distinction between man and god; however, there was no single definition of what was a god. The senatorial decrees of deification included the *divi* in the Roman state pantheon, but it was the temple and sacrifices that incarnated and defined the new gods and ensured their remembrance. Velleius Paterculus succinctly summarizes this idea when he observes, “Caesar [Augustus] deified his father, not by exercise of his imperial command, but by his attitude of reverence; he did not call him a god, but made him one.”¹²⁸

What kind of gods were Divus Augustus and Divus Julius?

Collective Memory and Knowledge

While monuments such as temples were designed to endure and to perpetuate memory, they were also selective constructs that represented information in certain ways in order to make complex events “narratable, transmittable, and representable.”¹²⁹ Material culture offers a means through which nature or the metaphysical world may be comprehended and constituted as knowledge. It has the unique capacity to externalize ideas about the metaphysical world in a permanent way that remains accessible.¹³⁰ To posit Augustus or Julius Caesar as deified in

¹²⁷ On the senatorial decree of deification in the early imperial period as declarative rather than constitutive, affirming and recognizing the moment of the deceased’s celestial ascension, see Bickerman 1973, 13. On the duty to remember, see Ricoeur 2004, 87-92.

¹²⁸ Vell. Pat. 2.126.1: (*Sacravit parentem suum Caesar non imperio, sed religione, non appellavit eum, sed fecit deum*).

¹²⁹ Bickerman 1973.

¹³⁰ Assmann 1997, 14; on the role of architecture in the Roman Forum in concretizing memory, see Machado 2006, 160. Cf. Assmann (2006, 85-6) claiming that public memory is not concerned with storing memory but with making it visible and creating a symbolic order. On collective memory as a category of knowledge, see, e.g., Schwartz 1990, 81.

temples dedicated to them as gods was, at the most basic level, to declare not only the existence of the gods but their memorability as well. The temple revealed the god by putting him before the eyes, which, as Horace declares, moves people to remember more than things heard by the ears.¹³¹ Cicero recognized that, “from our childhood [the gods] Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Neptune, Vulcan and Apollo have been known to us with the aspect with which painters and sculptors have chosen to represent them.”¹³² The mnemonic process of material culture is then, at its essence, an act of cultural formation. Material culture not only designates what is memorable, but also gives definition and shape to that which is memorable.¹³³

In cases of sacred architecture it is the idea of imbuing divinity with form, of representing divinity at the same time as bringing it into being.¹³⁴ The properties of the architecture make aspects of the god’s character manifest. Ancient commentators highlight the close connection between divinity and materiality. Writing in the first century, Dio Chrysostom describes the natural yearning that all people have to worship deities in a manner that is material and immediate.¹³⁵ Significantly, he includes the visual arts as one of the four ways of understanding the divine. Cicero highlights the role of the artist, whose aim is to represent the essential nature of the divine subject.¹³⁶ In this sense the Temples of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius, along with dedicatory ritual, made visible the otherwise unknown character of the gods by creating and communicating their divine natures and making future commemoration accessible.

¹³¹ Hor. *Ars P.* 180-82.

¹³² Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.81: (. . . *a parvis enim Iovem Iunonem Minervam Neptunum Vulcanum Apollinem reliquos deos ea facie novimus qua pictores fictoresque voluerunt . . .*).

¹³³ See, e.g., Norberg-Schulz 1983, 63; Derks 1998, 19-20. Cf. Gowing (2005, 73) who distinguishes between memory and knowledge.

¹³⁴ See, e.g., Jones 2000; Meskell 2004, 58.

¹³⁵ Dio Chrys. *Or.* 12.

¹³⁶ Cic. *de Orat.* 8-10.

Attributing theological significance to the cults of the *divi* counters current scholarly trends that focus on the political significance of the phenomenon as a legitimation mechanism only for a dead emperor's immediate successors or as a way for the Senate to demonstrate their expectations to the living emperor. Yet it is only by appreciating the theological significance in conjunction with the political that the full implications of the cults of *divi* for imperial Roman society can be gauged. As has often been noted, however, labels such as political and religious are modern constructs that didn't exist for the Romans, who saw them as inextricably linked. Religious knowledge, Wallace-Hadrill has explained, "is just one aspect of knowledge intimately bound up with all other aspects of Roman custom and practice, or mores."¹³⁷ In effect, deification underscores the profound linkages between the religious and political in Rome.

Comparison and Categorization

Modern cognitive research has confirmed what Cicero described in the *Academica*, ". . . first comes sensation, then comprehensions grasped by the mind, that is a horse or a god . . . From this are imprinted our notions of things, without which all understanding and all investigation and all discussion are impossible."¹³⁸ In a mental mechanism similar to Cicero's notion of things, the divine status of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius were products of the urban culture of Rome and its organization of symbolic structures on which people relied to make sense of their experiences.¹³⁹ Such a structural system, in which meanings lie in the systematic positioning of objects in relation to each other, relies on cognitive theories of perception and

¹³⁷ Wallace-Hadrill 2005, 57-8.

¹³⁸ Cic. *Acad.* 2.7: (*Animo iam naec tenemus comprehensa, non sensibus. 'Ille' deinceps 'equus est, ille canis.'* . . . *Quo e genere nobis notitiae rerum imprimuntur, sine quibus ne intellegi quidquam nec quaeri disputerive potest*).

¹³⁹ For recent applications of the structural approach see, e.g., Beard 1987; Confino 1997, 1399; Zerubavel 2003, 7-9.

memory related to mental acts of comparison and categorization.¹⁴⁰ These theories situate memory as an entity in itself, as the ordered system of symbols that makes experience meaningful. Collective memory then, affects social reality by reflection, shaping and framing it.¹⁴¹

Applying this insight to artistic and architectural forms, Juhani Pallasmaa asserts that, “the experience of art is an interaction between our embodied memories and the world . . . to experience architectural meaning we must find a counterpart in the world of viewer’s experience.”¹⁴² Elaborate encoding, the mental process that allows people to integrate new information with what they already know, depends on the knowledge they already possess, generally understood as the foreknowledge and preconceptions resulting from past experiences.¹⁴³ Thus, Pallasmaa’s counterparts may be found in our world of experience through comparison and it is the comparison of events, people, and experiences in the mind that causes people to know, and hence remember, events as they do. Important to this process is the mind’s natural tendency to seek patterns through the juxtaposition of similarity and difference:

We can grasp the universe only by simplifying it with ideas of identity by classes, types, and categories and by arranging the infinite continuation of non-identical events into a finite system of similitudes . . . it is the nature of being that no event ever repeats, but it is in the nature of thought that we understand events only by the identities we imagine among them.¹⁴⁴

Thus, comparing the perception of new objects and experiences to prior knowledge allows people to form their conceptions of objects.

¹⁴⁰ Geertz 1973; Beard 1987.

¹⁴¹ Schwartz 2000, 19.

¹⁴² Pallasmaa 1996, 450.

¹⁴³ Schacter 1996, 56-70. See also, Lowenthal 1985, 39-40.

¹⁴⁴ Kubler 1962, 61.

Architectural Form

When viewing architecture, it is this comparison of site, form, and ornament, in which viewers automatically seek continuity with and departure from architectural tradition that enables understanding of buildings and produces new knowledge.¹⁴⁵ Although there are certainly exceptions, especially in plan, the predominant formal aspects of temple architecture in the early imperial period in Rome included a high podium, with monumental stairway, a columnar façade capped by triangular pediment, pronaos, enclosed cella containing a cult image, rectangular ground plan, and an accompanying altar. That this list also describes the artistic conventions for representing temples in sculptural reliefs and on coins highlights the canonical nature of these forms.¹⁴⁶ A list of just a few of the celebrated temples in the visual range of a viewer approaching the Temple of Divus Augustus or the Temple of Divus Julius affirms this generalization: the Temples of Castor and Pollux, Saturn, and, though lateral in plan, Concordia in the Roman Forum (**Fig. 2.15**); and the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline (**Fig. 2.16**).¹⁴⁷ Exceptions such as the round Temple of Vesta and the round temple by the Tiber, perhaps dedicated to Hercules Victor, exist but are less common than the rectilinear plan and their unique shape may be attributed to specific cult requirements.¹⁴⁸

The formal elements of Roman temple architecture in the early imperial period are readily apparent in the Temple of Divus Julius and the coin image of the Temple of Divus Augustus issued under Caligula. To state that the architecture of these temples copied so-called

¹⁴⁵ See Jones 2000, 66; Zerubavel 2003, 85-7; Feeney 2007, 39.

¹⁴⁶ Grunow 2002, 20-1.

¹⁴⁷ Temple of Castor: Nielsen 1993. Temple of Saturn: Coarelli 1999. Temple of Concordia: Ferroni 1993. On the late Republican and early imperial Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus: De Angeli 1996.

¹⁴⁸ According to Ovid the form of the Temple of Vesta remained the same as it has always been for good reason: the round temple with domed roof reflected Vesta's identification with the Earth, shaped like a ball equidistant from the surrounding heavens (Ov. *Fasti* 6.261-265). Temple of Vesta: Scott 1999. Temple of Hercules Victor: Coarelli 1996.

traditional temple architecture, as some scholars do, both hits the nail on the head and misses the big picture. With respect to the Temple of Divus Julius, Vitruvius explicitly made the connection between its pycnostyle architecture, in which the intercolumniations of the pronaos were one and a half times the diameter of the columns, and the similar style of the Temple of Venus Genetrix.¹⁴⁹ Even the terminology used to describe the temples to the *divi* and other temples were similar. Implicit in these statements is that a monumental, pedimented, trabeated Roman temple was the obvious choice to commemorate the first *divus*, Divus Julius, and was intended to convince people of something they might not otherwise believe.¹⁵⁰ Nevertheless, a temple in the traditional format may not have been the most obvious choice.

In choosing the format, designers relied on contemporary understanding of the specific entailments of form that could not have been lost on viewers who had the same foreknowledge and the same expectations of the architecture that derived from a shared cultural system. Even ancient sources, albeit much later than the first century, noted that the Temple of Divus Augustus was modeled on the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.¹⁵¹ It is the formal visible similarity to other temples of the state gods such as that of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and its marked difference from other commemorative monuments, including arches, columns, porticos, and funerary architecture that is key to understanding the Temple of Divus Augustus. Formal similarities and differences implied a sacred history for the new cult that predated Roman historical time, and reified the eternal, celestial nature of the *divus* inscribing the new god into the Roman state pantheon for the future. The temples' durable nature, combined with their prominent locations indicates that expectations of the future and prospective memories must

¹⁴⁹ Vitr. *De arch.* 3.3.2.

¹⁵⁰ Wallace-Hadrill counters the idea of propaganda in regard to poets who, he contends, were not false or insincere in their writing about the emperor (Wallace-Hadrill 1987, 222).

¹⁵¹ Prud. *C. Symm.* 1.245-250

have been a decisive motivation for building the monuments. Moreover, architectural form signaled that the god venerated within was central to the Roman state.

In early imperial Rome the temple form, a term used here to refer to that general combination of elements discussed above and consecrated to a specific god, was associated with the remote past. For Vitruvius temples were the most dignified of architectural forms because the orders, the system of symmetry and proportion, were handed down over many generations.¹⁵² This is an example of what Michael Rowlands calls the power of repetition in which an original or archetypal usage is somehow evoked.¹⁵³ As monuments designed to transcend the limitations of human time, temples, Edmund Thomas argues, have the capacity to blur distinctions between recent history and the mytho-historical past.¹⁵⁴ Ovid eloquently conveys this blurring of past and present when Janus ruminates, “We too delight in golden temples, though we approve of the ancient ones; such majesty befits a god. We praise the past, but use the present years, yet both are customs worthy to be kept.”¹⁵⁵

When Octavian built the Temple of Julius Caesar he had not yet restored the 82 temples that in part allowed him to boast that he found a city built of brick and left one built of marble; thus the Temple of Julius Caesar would have been one of his first temples built entirely of marble. That the new temples to *divi* were built of different materials than the most ancient of the Roman temples would not have mitigated the antiquity of their form. Vitruvius specifically

¹⁵² Vitr. *De arch.* 3. Related is the concept that it was the Romans’ duty to uphold beliefs about the gods that had come down to them from their ancestors and the rites and ceremonies and duties of religion (Cic. *Nat. D.*).

¹⁵³ Rowlands 1993.

¹⁵⁴ Thomas 2007, 167.

¹⁵⁵ Ov. *Fasti* 1.223-224: (*Nos quoque templa iuvant, quamvis antiqua probemus, aurea: maiestas convenit ista deo. laudamus veteres, sed nostris utimur annis: most tamen est aequae dignus uterque coli*).

anticipates that, because of its materials, a monument could look like it was just made despite the fact that it was very old.¹⁵⁶

In effect, the deliberate choice of the name Divus for the deified Julius Caesar and Augustus serves the same function. Language itself can be used as a memory system, explains Jeffrey Olick, and one of the clearest demonstrations of the genuinely collective nature of remembering because all words respond in some sense to the worlds that came before them.¹⁵⁷ In his analysis of the words *divus* and *deus*, Wardle notes that in the late first century BCE *divus* was a term with particularly ancient and powerful connotations, a deliberate archaism that, like the traditional architectural form, lent sanctity to the newly established tradition.¹⁵⁸ Cicero, by claiming that the ancient practice of divination handed down from mythical times may have derived from *divi*, a word meaning ‘gods’, implied that the word *divi* pre-dated the founding of Rome.¹⁵⁹

Temples evoked ideas of the remote past as well as the future because of their durability in time and ideal expectation that they would last forever. The Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus, like those that came after them, were not only monuments that embodied the past but were sacred structures for the future, a concept that Assmann called a prospective memory: an aspect of the ‘past present’ encoded in a form that was hoped to have an effect on a ‘future past.’¹⁶⁰ Although Romans recognized the lifecycle of monuments, temples were in theory expected to remain permanently present in the Roman landscape in order to fulfill the

¹⁵⁶ Vitruvius, *De arch.* 2.7.

¹⁵⁷ Olick 1999, 314 (drawing on Mikhail Bakhtin, 1963, *Speech Genres and Other Essays*, trans. W. McGee, Austin, TX, University of Texas Press).

¹⁵⁸ Wardle 2002, 188.

¹⁵⁹ Cicero, *De Div.* 1.1.

¹⁶⁰ Assmann 2006, 86.

religious obligations of the *pax deorum*. Vitruvius connects the durability of temples in a physical sense to their materials. When discussing the Temple of Diana at Ephesus he explains that the materials for the cult image and coffers were chosen for their imperishability.¹⁶¹ Vitruvius repeatedly underscores that temples endure for the ages (*aeternae*).¹⁶² By the end of the civil wars various ancient sources recount that the Roman religious infrastructure was in shambles from neglect. Yet, Augustus inserted his divine ancestor into this very system. Augustus' restoration of eighty-two temples and revival of the ancient rituals reinforced the religious system of which Divus Julius was now an integral part.

Of course, the individual architectural forms evoked particular associations in and of themselves. Cicero identified the *fastigium*, or triangular pediment, as giving the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus its essential dignity. Although the *fastigium* held associations with royalty and divinity, and the word itself meant something that was the highest physically or the pinnacle of power, it was not restricted to sacred architecture.¹⁶³ Perhaps most famously, in one of the highest signs of social honor the Senate voted a *fastigium* to Caesar's residence.¹⁶⁴ Thus, despite the significance of individual formal elements, exemplary architecture, such as the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus, had a power beyond their material constituents precisely because architectural form could attach long-term memory to the present as well as the recent past. This would have been essential to the legitimation of a new deity in the Roman state pantheon.

¹⁶¹ Vitr. *De arch.* 2.9.13: In the temple at Ephesus, the image of Diana, the coffers of the ceiling also, are made of these trees – as also in other famous temples – because of their durability (*Ephesi in aede simulacrum Dianae ex ea, lacunaria et ibi et in ceteris nobilibus fanis propter aeternitatem sunt facta*).

¹⁶² Vitr. *De arch.* 3.1: Therefore, since in all their works they handed down order, they did so especially in building temples, the excellences and the faults of which usually endure for the ages. (*Igitur cum in omnibus operibus ordines traderent, maxime in aedibus deorum, operum et laudes et culpae aeternae solent permanere*)

¹⁶³ Livy 6.38.13.

¹⁶⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 2.110.

Lindsay Jones has characterized the comparative process as the alternation of convention and innovation.¹⁶⁵ In an architectural context convention and familiarity in form draw a participant into engagement with the monument.¹⁶⁶ Once engaged, viewers expectations may be transformed through the presentation of new content, in this case the fact that an emperor who was alive within the living memory is now a state god. Pliny notes the difficulty in giving novelty to what is old and authority to what is new.¹⁶⁷ The selection of a perceptibly ancient architectural form would have cultivated a link with the past, lending an aura of facticity and authority to the new god.¹⁶⁸ Exaggeration of antiquity is a common mnemonic technique to legitimize something new because antiquity often implies priority and may persuade a collective body that they already hold certain beliefs or that such beliefs are natural or logical.¹⁶⁹

Assmann distinguishes cultural memory as a special form of collective memory with a different temporal structure, one that reaches past the three-generation cycle of living memory into the distant past.¹⁷⁰ By subsuming the *divi* within the totality of Roman religious remembrance, the temples and cult wreak havoc on Assman's temporal distinctions by inscribing the *divi* into 'cultural memory' long before passage of the three-generation cycle.¹⁷¹

Categorization of the Temple of Divus Augustus with the temples of the state gods would have been the natural and almost instantaneous result of its close visual similarities to temples of

¹⁶⁵ Jones clarifies that copying may not mean the attempt to maintain or revive the full symbolic and informational value of another structure, but may be one component in an architectural strategy of allurement (Jones 2000, 68-90).

¹⁶⁶ Jones 2000, 51.

¹⁶⁷ Pliny *NH*, 1.

¹⁶⁸ See also Geertz 1973, 87-125; Alcock 2002, 150.

¹⁶⁹ Zerubavel 2003, 104.

¹⁷⁰ In a similar phenomena, Hölkeskamp suggests that memories that are shared by an entire generation have the capacity to merge imperceptibly with a transgenerational memory made up of venerable myths, histories, and ancestors (Hölkeskamp 2006, 491).

¹⁷¹ Assmann 2006, 8-9.

other Roman state gods, with the inevitable conclusion that on some level the emperors are as important to the survival of the Roman state as are the gods. In the late fourth century in his *Oration Against Symmachus*, Prudentius cites the cults of the *divi* as an example of the worst of pagan religion and notes that the Temple of Divus Augustus was built with the appearance (*Iovis ad speciem*) of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline.¹⁷² Prudentius was not commenting on precise aspects of the original Temple of Divus Augustus, by the late fourth century both the Temple of Divus Augustus and of Jupiter Optimus Maximus had been restored and reconstructed many times; rather Prudentius was referring to the overall formal similarities of the temples. As a Christian writer attacking pagan practices, for Prudentius the similar architecture of the temples and the fact that Romans propitiated their deceased rulers with animal sacrifices was enough to prove that the Romans believed the *divi* to be deities akin to Jupiter, a belief that to a Christian in the late fourth century represented the degenerate nature of Roman religion.

Within the visual landscape in the city of Rome, the Temples to Divus Julius and Divus Augustus presented the *divi* as part of a divine conglomerate that had always existed, one with significance that transcended the present. Cognitively speaking, categorization and classification arranges the things into mental clusters so that similarities outweigh the differences and things lumped into categories become regarded as more or less similar variants of an essentially homogeneous group. By their very nature classificatory systems purport to represent the world.¹⁷³ In terms of the cognitive process of elaborate encoding, once the viewer is engaged in a conventional viewing experience, novel content, such as the new ontological status of the former emperor as a god in the Roman state pantheon, produces a hippocampal response in the brain,

¹⁷² Prud. *C. Symm.* 1.245-250. Discussed at length by Fishwick 1990.

¹⁷³ Smith 1987, 34.

and only then does another neural network make available a wealth of semantic associations and knowledge that are associated with the novel information.¹⁷⁴ Assmann points out that distinctions inherent in cultural categorizations must be remembered in order to render permanent the categories they construct.¹⁷⁵ In other words things are more likely to be remembered if they can be slotted into preexisting schema because of their typical resemblance or emblematic character. This cognitive process allows the inference that Romans would have understood and remembered the divinity of Divus Augustus as they understood the divinity of the Roman state gods, as *aeternus*, eternal.

Aeternitas

A number of scholars have addressed the connection between Roman ideas of eternity and the emperor. Franz Cumont was one of the first to broach the topic of eternity as a characteristic of imperial power in a comprehensive way. Although Cumont notes the complexity of the terms *aeternus* and *aeternitas* under the Roman Empire, he does not distinguish between the uses of eternity and immortality. Cumont, though he excludes the phenomenon of deification from his discussion, is one of the only scholars to discuss the notion of eternity without beginning or end, which he attributes primarily to eastern religions.¹⁷⁶ Robert Turcan focuses on the prospective aspects of eternity and *renovatio*, concepts that he argues implied the continuation of the world into the undetermined but potentially terminable future

¹⁷⁴ Schacter 1996, 56.

¹⁷⁵ Assmann 1997, 3.

¹⁷⁶ Cumont 1896, 435-43.

through the cycle of rebirth and renovation, viewing them as characteristics of the Urbs, while the eternity of the emperor was only a personal and temporary characteristic.¹⁷⁷

Concepts of *aeternitas*, *immortalitas*, and *memoria*, complex ideas far different from modern notions of eternity filtered through Judeo-Christian thought, were inextricably linked in ancient Roman culture and constitute critical concepts for the understanding of divine status in ancient Rome. For the Romans the notion of *aeternitas* subsumed *immortalitas*, which meant permanence, lasting remembrance, or without death. *Aeternitas* in the more limited sense, here referred to as ‘durational eternity’, denoted something that could extend through measurable time into the future ostensibly without end. Durational eternity is not concerned with the past but rather underscores the potential for something existing in the present to continue indefinitely into the future. Although much less frequently used the term *sempiternus*, perpetual, enduring, or everlasting, encompassed a similar idea but implied successive stages going on from one to the next unceasing. *Aeternitas*, on the other hand, was not divisible into stages.¹⁷⁸

Immortalitas incorporated the idea of endlessness in two ways. First, immortality was a quality of the gods that denoted their deathlessness or their existence without end. This was a common way of describing gods, who were often referred to by ancient authors as the immortal gods or simply by the nominalized adjective *immortales*, the immortals. In this sense the term immortal emphasizes an entity characterized by deathlessness as opposed to an entity that is mortal and subject to eventual death. The term immortal was not a commentary on an entity’s beginnings or lack thereof. Second, Romans used the various forms of the term immortal to implicitly suggest remembrance into the unending future. Although *immortalis* was a more

¹⁷⁷ Turcan 1983, 30.

¹⁷⁸ On the use of *aeternus* and its variants in ancient Rome, see Turcan 1983, 25-6. Yet another is *perpetuo*, which implies an extension into the future of indeterminate continuation but does not exclude the possibility of an end.

common way of evoking remembrance without end some form of *aeternitas* or *aeternus* could also be used, as when Pliny describes the happy man's anticipation of a good and lasting reputation in the knowledge of the fame that is to come, and admits that his own eyes are focused on eternity, or in this case what could also be called *immortalitas*, future remembrance.¹⁷⁹ Similarly, Suetonius recounts Nero's longing for *aeternitas*, which the context suggests should be translated as lasting remembrance because it is grouped with *perpetua fama*, undying fame; according to Suetonius, one of Nero's methods for achieving eternal fame was by renaming old buildings.¹⁸⁰

Aeternitas could also refer to the condition here defined as 'total eternity', that with no beginning or end. According to some views eternity was divided at any moment into two eternities: the past eternity, or *aeternitas a parte ante*, and the future eternity, or *aeternitas a parte post*. Understood from our temporal view, total eternity identifies the present moment as both uniting and dividing the past and present, all of which was encompassed in *aeternitas*. Total eternity could be envisioned spatially as a never-ending line extending in two directions with a point representing the present in the center. Plotinus succinctly explains:

Time in its ceaseless onward sliding produces parted intervals; Eternity stands in identity, pre-eminent, vaster by unending power than Time with all the vastness of its seeming progress; Time is like a radial line running out apparently to infinity but dependent upon that, its center, which is the pivot of all its movements; as it goes it tells of that center, but the center itself is the unmoving principle of all that movement.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Pliny *Ep.* 9.3.1-2.

¹⁸⁰ Suet. *Ner.* 6.55.

¹⁸¹ *Enneades*, 6.5.11, from Weiss 1941.

According to Plotinus eternity may also be represented spatially as a circle with a dot in the center.¹⁸² The center dot, eternity, is a point equally present to all the points on the circumference which are equated with time.

Total eternity may be distinguished from immortality in two important ways. First, total eternity was clearly intended to signify something with no beginning or end, the opposite of which would be something that may exist at some times and not in others. Aristotle is very explicit about this condition when he claims that that which is eternal does not come into existence or perish.¹⁸³ Second, total eternity was a concept that was timeless or outside of time, that is to say that something that was eternal was not subject to the inevitable change that time inflicted. In the *Metamorphosis*, which holds as a central theme the relationship between time and change, Ovid repeatedly reminds his audience that “There is nothing in all the world that keeps its form . . . Time itself flows on in constant motion, just like a river . . . For that which once existed is no more, and that which was not has come to be.”¹⁸⁴ Gods, however, were not considered to be of this world and were not subject to the laws of time that Ovid describes. Plutarch echoed the idea of the eternal as unborn and unperishing, entities to which time brings no change. Timelessness may also be understood as a lack of limitation of existence in time, but not the failure to exist in all time. For example, a timeless truth exists and expresses a true proposition at all times. Finally, an entity characterized by total eternity was by nature immutable and changeless, distinguishing it from things that change and perish, and was for the Romans so extraordinary as to defy comprehensive linguistic definition.

¹⁸² See Weiss 1941.

¹⁸³ Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 6.3.2.

¹⁸⁴ Ov. *Met.* 15.160: (*nihil est toto, quod perstet, in orbe . . . ipsa quoque adsiduo labuntur tempora motu, non secus ac flumen . . . nam quod fuit ante relictum est, fitque, quod haut fuerat . . .*).

Eternity of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius

If Divus Augustus and Divus Julius were theologically similar to the other state gods as revealed through architecture, then like the state gods, at least from the perspective of collective memory embodied in Roman religion, Divus Julius and Divus Augustus were conceived of as timeless, eternal entities. The total eternity of the Roman gods is important to the fictional dialogue that Cicero presents in the *De Natura Deorum* among several protagonists advocating in turn the theological ideas of the Epicureans and Stoics. At a fundamental level Cicero points out that most scholars agreed on the existence of the gods.¹⁸⁵ Another pervasive thread is the association of the gods and their divine nature with the world and specifically with the heavens that are characterized as eternal, changeless and immutable throughout all time.¹⁸⁶ Cicero elaborates on the eternity of the world itself in the *Academica*, “The world never had a beginning, because there can never have been a commencement on new and original lines of so glorious a structure, and no old age arise from the long lapse of years to cause this ordered cosmos ever to perish in dissolution.”¹⁸⁷ For Pliny too the world and the sky whose vaulted roof encircles the universe was a sacred, eternal, and immeasurable deity.¹⁸⁸

In terms of nature and the heavens the Epicureans believed in an infinite past from which there has existed an eternity not measured by the limited divisions of time. Although he criticizes the Epicurean view, the character Cotta in *De Natura Deorum* also takes as a starting point the eternity of the gods as entities that have always existed and always will exist. Second century authors continue and reinforce this line of thought. Plutarch characterizes God as existing, “. . .

¹⁸⁵ Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.2.2. In the dialogue the speakers reference a general notion of deity or divinity of which the gods of accepted belief are a part.

¹⁸⁶ Rogers 1994, 5.

¹⁸⁷ Cic. *Acad.* 2.38: (. . . *neque enim ortum esse umquam mundum quod nulla fuerit novo consilio inito tam praeclari operis inceptio, et ita esse eum undique aptum ut nulla vis tanto queat motus mutationemque moliri*).

¹⁸⁸ Plin. *HN* 2.1.

for no fixed time, but for the everlasting ages which are immoveable, timeless, and undeviating, in which there is no earlier nor later, no future nor past, no older nor younger.”¹⁸⁹

In connection with the heavenly gods eternity stretched into the limitless future and past; thus, the celestial or heavenly nature of the gods was also indicative of their eternal mode. Highlighting the Stoic view on the nature of the sun, moon, and stars, which continue in regular motion and whose movements do not vary for all the ages of eternity, the character Balbus in *De Natura Deorum* emphasizes the regularity of the heavenly bodies as the sole source of preservation for all things. Moreover, Cicero believed that contemplating the heavenly bodies was one way to arrive at knowledge of the gods.¹⁹⁰ Addressing them directly, Ovid pleads with the gods, the celestials (*tu caelistibus*), to take care of Augustus.¹⁹¹ Indeed, the very words *deus* and *divus* had a common root in *deywos*, the old Latin *deivos*, fundamentally connected to the Indo-european word for sky.¹⁹²

The eternity of the gods, however, was not only a subject for philosophers and poets. Fragments of a marble tablet found in Rome on the left bank of the Tiber near the Via di Monte bear a votive inscription recording the dedication of an Augustan altar by a *magister vici* to Jupiter and other gods. Dated by the name of the consul Gaius Caesar Lucius Paullus to between January and June of 30, the altar specifies a dedication to AETERNO DEO I[OVI], the eternal god Jove, as well as Mercury, Juno Regina, Minerva, Sol, Luna, Apollo, Diana, Fortuna, and Mars (**Fig. 2.17**).¹⁹³

¹⁸⁹ Plut. *Mor.* 392C-393A.

¹⁹⁰ Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.65.

¹⁹¹ Ov. *Fasti* 2.63-66.

¹⁹² Wardle 2002, 181. Cf. Lipka who states that the Roman gods were invariably eternal but that the term was too unspecific to have any practical consequence in cultic terms (Lipka 2009, 30).

¹⁹³ Ovid describes how Caesar was transformed after death into a heavenly body (*Met.* 15.745). As such, Caesar entered heaven and had his place in temples on earth (*Met.* 15.818).

There was a widespread recognition of the celestial nature of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus. At funeral games of Julius Caesar, the *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris* which ran from July 20-28 in conjunction with a festival of Venus Genetrix, a comet that appeared and remained visible for seven days afterward was reportedly the deceased ruler ascending to the heavens, setting the stage for the sidereal interpretation of the *divi*.¹⁹⁴ A scene on the Belvedere altar, commemorating the establishment of the cult of the Lares under Augustus, shows a quadriga of winged horses carrying Divus Julius to the heavens, spatially visualizing the celestial nature of Divus Julius (**Fig. 2.18**).¹⁹⁵ After the deification of Caesar, Augustus affixed a star to statues of Julius Caesar in Rome existing at his death and then to the cult statue in the Temple of Divus Julius before its dedication. A denarius issued in 12 BCE depicting Augustus affixing a star to the head of a seminude figure wearing the hip mantle and holding a scepter and victory alighting on a globe may represent such an event.¹⁹⁶ Similarly Augustus attached a gold star, made of a metal with its own divine and astral associations, to a statue of Divus Julius on the Capitoline.¹⁹⁷

Coins depicting the Temple of Divus Julius during its construction prominently displayed the *sidus iulium*, the Julian star, in the temple's pediment (**Fig. 2.2**). Numerous and widely circulated numismatic issues associated Divus Julius with the comet believed to be his soul alighting to the heavens. On coins Divus Julius was also represented by an eight or six-rayed comet with a tail or the comet could accompany his portrait (**Fig. 2.19**).¹⁹⁸ An interest in visual and conceptual clarity of divine status is apparent in Tiberius' ban on the ancestor mask of Julius

¹⁹⁴ Gordon 1958, no. 35, pl. 21b (Museo Nazionale Romana Inv. No. 72743).

¹⁹⁵ Belvedere Altar, Rome, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano inv. 1115, h. 95 cm.

¹⁹⁶ Scott-Ryberg 1955. Hallett has observed the similarity between the hip-mantled figure in this coin image and the Algiers relief grouped with Mars Ultor and the goddess Venus and with a hole drilled for attachment of the star (1005, 127).

¹⁹⁷ *RIC I*² no. 415.

¹⁹⁸ Comet and portrait: *BMCRE I* no. 69; no. 70; no. 71. Eight-rayed comet: *RIC I*² no. 37a.

Caesar from appearing in the funeral processions of his relatives on the rationale that the image could not exist simultaneously in the procession of the gods and of men.¹⁹⁹

Although the star was not as prominent in the visual iconography of Divus Augustus, presumably because the connection between deification and the heavens was so well known fifty-six years after the death of Caesar that it did not need to be reinforced, it was not eliminated altogether. Coins of Tiberius issued from the Lugdunum mint bore a laureate portrait of Tiberius on the obverse and a bare-headed or laureate portrait of Divus Augustus on the reverse with a star above it.²⁰⁰ Coins from the DIVUS AUGUSTUS PATER series under Tiberius issued in Rome make an explicit comparison between the radiate head of DIVUS AUGUSTUS PATER with a thunderbolt and star on the obverse, and an eagle standing on a globe on the reverse, equating the power and celestial nature of Divus Augustus and Jupiter (**Fig. 2.20**).²⁰¹ Later, in 37 in conjunction with the dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus and again in 40 Caligula issued coins with his portrait on the obverse and the radiate head of Divus Augustus between two stars on the reverse (**Fig. 2.21**).²⁰² In addition, in the same year that Caligula dedicated the Temple of Divus Augustus, he was responsible for the transportation to Rome from Egypt of the red granite obelisk, a form with strong solar associations that bore an inscription recording the dedication to Divus Augustus, son of Divus Julius, and Tiberius as son of Divus Augustus.²⁰³

Augustan poets similarly celebrated the celestial nature of the new *divi*. In the *Aeneid* Jupiter himself reveals the Fates to Venus, the divine ancestress of the Julian gens, dictating that

¹⁹⁹ Dio 47.9.2.

²⁰⁰ *RIC I*² no. 23; *BMCRE I* no. 28.

²⁰¹ *BMCRE I* no. 155. Other coins in the series show the thunderbolt and star with legend DIVUS AUGUSTUS PATER on the obverse and on the reverse Livia as a priestess of Divus Augustus or in the guise of Pietas, veiled, seated and holding a patera and a long scepter (*RIC I*² no. 72; *BMCRE I* no. 151).

²⁰² *RIC I*² nos. 1, 2.

²⁰³ *CIL* 6.882: Sacred to the deified Caesar Augustus, son of the deified Julius and to Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of the deified Augustus (Divo Caesari Divi Iulii f. Augusto/ T. Caesari divi Augusti f. Augusto/Sacrum).

Caesar and later Augustus would come to heaven as a god and be worshipped in temples.²⁰⁴

Invoking him as a future god, Vergil forecasts that Augustus will appear as a new star and that the Romans will be granted ‘*imperium sine fine*’, power without end in space or time.²⁰⁵

Similarly, in the *Metamorphosis* Jupiter charges Venus with taking Caesar’s soul and making it a constellation, one comparable to Quirinus.²⁰⁶ Discussing Caesar’s reform of the calendar, Ovid reminds readers that Caesar was destined for a home in heaven, *caelum*.²⁰⁷ Ovid further emphasizes the point by comparing the divinity of Caesar to the fire of Vesta thought to be timelessly eternal; “Over the eternal fire the divinity of Caesar, no less eternal, doth preside.”²⁰⁸ Vesta herself spoke of Caesar’s apotheosis; “Transported to the sky he saw the halls of Jupiter, and in the great Forum he owns a temple dedicated to him.”²⁰⁹

Visual manifestation of the ascension to heaven became an integral part of the imperial funeral after a former praetor swore an oath that he saw the soul of Augustus rise from the funeral pyre, a vision that led to the characterization of Divus Augustus’ honors as celestial, *caelestes*.²¹⁰ For example, Tacitus describes the decree following Augustus’ death and funeral in which the Senate granted to Divus Augustus a temple and heavenly rites.²¹¹ The decree itself was commemorated in Rome, as indicated by a fragment of a Roman Fasti with an entry for the decree.²¹² Indeed, the portrait of Divus Julius was carried with those of the gods rather than those

²⁰⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 15.818.

²⁰⁵ Verg. *G.* 2.13-25; Verg. *Aen.* 1.278-279.

²⁰⁶ Ov. *Met.* 15.843-51.

²⁰⁷ Ov. *Fasti* 3.157-160.

²⁰⁸ Ov. *Fasti* 3.421-422: (*ignibus aeternis aeterni numina praesunt Caesaris*).

²⁰⁹ Ov. *Fasti* 3.703-704: (*ille quidem caelo positus Iovis atria vidit et tenet in magno templa dicata foro*).

²¹⁰ Suet. *Aug.* 99.

²¹¹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.

²¹² Degrassi 1963.

of the ancestors in the configuration of Augustus' funeral procession, demonstrating the new categorization of Divus Julius as one of the gods and affirming the ontological transformation of Divus Julius from man to god.

It might be argued that the birth, life, and death of the historical emperor prevented an understanding of their divine status in terms of total eternity. To the contrary, that the Temple of Divus Julius was built over the spot where his body was cremated suggests that death of the mortal body was not conceptually inconsistent with deification. Deification may have been understood on one level as a continuation of a religious idea that began around 300 BCE, portraying the Olympian gods as coming from the ranks of men. According to Euhemerus, who worked in the court of Cassander of Macedon in the late 4th century and whose work Ennius translated into Latin in the mid first century BCE, the Olympian gods were great humans who achieved apotheosis through meritorious action and supreme achievement such as outstanding conquests and benefactions.²¹³ A tomb of Zeus was identified with a site at Mount Iuktas south of Knossos and several places associated with the birth of Zeus were promoted in Roman times. Moreover, according to Euhemerus, Zeus had his deeds inscribed in gold and mounted on a column at his temple near Mount Paphaios. Brian Bosworth and more recently Alison Cooley have found in the *Res Gestae*, Augustus' account of his deeds told in his own words and inscribed on pillars in front of the Mausoleum of Augustus, parallels with the inscription by Zeus. Based on Euhemerus' model of deification through deeds, Cooley interprets the *Res Gestae* as an argument for Augustus' deification.²¹⁴

²¹³ On Ennius, see Bosworth 1999.

²¹⁴ Bosworth 1999.

Some Romans such as Cicero openly criticized Euhemerism. Bosworth has argued, however, that Cicero was not criticizing apotheosis but the humanizing of the divine.²¹⁵ Cicero did not believe that considering deified humans divine diminished the gods; rather he thought just the opposite, that it brought mortals up to the level of the divine who remained in their lofty positions. By the time of Suetonius it was plausible to recount that Cicero himself told of a dream that he had in which Jupiter lowered the young Augustus to the Capitol from heaven on a golden chain.²¹⁶ Evocations of the celestial nature of Divus Augustus incorporate the idea not only of an ascension to the heavens as a god after death but the idea that the ascension is a return, one that implies that the *divus* existed in the celestial realm before becoming the man on earth.²¹⁷ Seneca similarly described the rulers and preservers as coming from the stars and returning there. Of course, not every Roman understood the nuances of the theological position presented here; however, even without poetic or philosophical commentary on the nature of divinity, for most Romans it is likely that the incorporation of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus into the universalizing sacred history and contemporary religious landscape would have been enough for the new gods to gain an enduring foothold in the Roman collective consciousness.

Sculptural Program of the Temple of Divus Augustus

The iconography of the architectural sculpture further enhanced the implied antiquity of the cult and similarity to other state gods (**Fig. 2.2**). Although the images of Mars and Venus would have been understood on multiple levels, the central pedimental image of Augustus holding a scepter and globe in a position of visual and hierarchical prominence between Mars

²¹⁵ Cooley 2009, 41-2.

²¹⁶ Suet. *Aug.* 94.9.

²¹⁷ Bosworth 1999, 11.

and Venus was not primarily a reference to the immortal ancestors of the mortal Augustus; rather it signified that Divus Augustus was now one of the state gods with a sacred history that was as important, and as conceptually ancient as the established state gods. The apex quadriga that echoed the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus not only symbolized the apotheosis of Augustus as has been suggested by others, more importantly it categorized Divus Augustus with the most important of Roman state gods.²¹⁸

The well-known acroterial images of Romulus and Aeneas functioned to iconographically collapse all of Roman history from Rome's founding and prehistory to Augustus, directly linking the cult of Divus Augustus to Rome's legendary past (**Figs. 2.23 and 2.24**).²¹⁹ This temporal compression is analogous to the phenomenon that Dennis Feeney refers to as 'wormholes' in Vergil, the chronological flattening accomplished by the linking of typological parallels such as Aeneas and Augustus.²²⁰ Demonstrating a similar phenomenon in the early imperial period, the Roman calendar had a clustering of festivals originating in legendary, especially Romulean, Rome, and in recent history with Julius Caesar and the Julio-Claudians, the goal of which was to define the essence of Rome by linking up the present age to the deep origins of Rome's past.²²¹

Romulus represented on foot holding the *spolia opima* in the context of the pediment was particularly potent as it combined associations of Rome's founding, the triumph, and the period predating the Roman kings. Romulus bearing the trophy of Acron on his back was, as Plutarch recounts, the origin and model of all subsequent triumphs.²²² Statues in Rome of Romulus

²¹⁸ Price 1984.

²¹⁹ On the frequent representation of the heroic linking the new and the old, see Cubitt and Warren 2000, 5.

²²⁰ Feeney 2007, 161-4.

²²¹ Wallace-Hadrill 1987, 226.

²²² Plut. *Rom.*

bearing the trophy were all on foot, specifically rejecting the image of the triumph as transformed by the Roman king Tarquin, who elevated the pomp and ceremony of the event. Moreover, the image of Romulus, the founder of Rome who ascended to the heavens as a god, would have evoked associations with the temple to his deified incarnation, the Temple of Quirinus on the Quirinal, normalizing the second temple of a *divus* by implying that the Temple of Divus Augustus and cult were well within the bounds of the *mos maiorum*.²²³ Founded in 293 BCE by Lucius Papirius Cursor, the Temple of Quirinus was destroyed several times and had been reconstructed by Augustus.

The coin image of the Temple of Divus Augustus sheds light on the significance of the patera as an iconographic element in the temple's sculptural program (**Fig. 2.22**). A central figure of Augustus, togate, holding a spear or scepter and patera in the center of the Temple's pediment is a visual echo of the larger figure of Caligula holding a patera while sacrificing over an altar in the foreground of the coin image. On the obverse a seated, draped, female Pietas similarly holds the patera in her outstretched right hand (**Fig. 2.12**). As indicated by Pietas, it is not only sacrificing humans that hold the patera in their outstretched hand, a prototypical sacrificial pose. In addition, on the reverse of a denarius from 16 BCE a laureate Apollo wearing a robe that falls to his ankles stands on a platform sacrificing out of a patera in his right hand, poised over a lighted and garlanded altar. The legend identifies the god as APOLLINI ACTIO, an identification supported by the lyre held in the figure's right hand, and the platform ornamented with prows and anchors on which the gods stands (**Fig. 2.25**).²²⁴ Other roughly

²²³ On myriad connections between Augustus and Romulus, see e.g. Feeney 2007, 160-2.

²²⁴ *RIC* I² no. 366.

contemporary examples of gods and goddesses holding *paterae* include Vesta, Concordia, and Salus feeding a snake from the patera²²⁵

In ancient Greek depictions of sacrifice, particularly in votive reliefs, the deity could also be shown participating in the ceremony, most often standing before an altar holding a patera. The pedimental images of Divus Augustus follow this iconographic tradition. Augustus is not depicted in the pediment performing his duties during life; rather Divus Augustus participates in sacrifices honoring him. Inez Ryberg views the depiction of deities on coins holding patera as a typical numismatic abbreviation for a scene of sacrifice.²²⁶ The coin image depicting Caligula sacrificing and Augustus receiving the sacrifice emphasizes the strong connection between sacrifice and piety to the state gods and family and the importance of sacrifice, discussed further below, to our understanding of the *divi*.

Comparing the use of Augustus' image in the Forum of Augustus with its use in the pediment of the Temple of Divus Augustus reveals the image's literal and metaphorical elevation.²²⁷ Facing the Temple of Mars Ultor was the colossal statue of Augustus in a quadriga, with the title *pater patriae*, the culmination of titles bestowed during his life. Later in the Temple of Divus Augustus the god alighted at the apex of the temple in a quadriga above the architrave that likely bore the dedication to Divus Augustus, the culmination of his life and death. No longer is the position of Augustus as princeps or leading citizen in the Forum of Augustus juxtaposed with the achievements of earlier leaders from his and other families. Instead, in the Temple of Divus Augustus, the god is in the visual realm with Romulus, Aeneas, Mars, and Venus. Finally, while the Forum of Augustus boasted a colossal statue of Augustus in an *alae*

²²⁵ Vesta on the Sorrento Base, see Ryberg 1955, 51. On Concordia, see Ryberg 1955, 86. In addition the Genius of a living person could be represented with a patera and cornucopia, see Ryberg, 135, n. 47; 169. See also Scott 1925.

²²⁶ Scott-Ryberg 1955, 4, 138.

²²⁷ On the sculptural program in the Forum of Augustus, see Favro 1996, 224-35.

outside and to the left of the Temple of Mars Ultor, the sacred focus of the *Templum Novum* is the colossal statue of *Divus Augustus* visible on later coins of Antoninus Pius and perhaps on coins under Caligula. This recontextualization of Augustus' image showcases the deceased emperor as *Divus Augustus*, another accepted role of the emperor.

Performing Eternity

Although they were integral components of the symbolic structures that constituted the *divi*, architectural form and iconography alone did not transform the ontological status of the deceased ruler and perpetuate the new gods in collective memory. The senatorial decree of the Temple of *Divus Augustus* set in motion a chain of ritual events: site selection and dedication by a magistrate, inauguration of a *templum* known as the *locus liberates et effatus*, and consecration and dedication of the *aedes*, the building that housed the cult statue, by the *pontifex maximus*.²²⁸ Furthermore, the Temples of *Divus Julius* and *Divus Augustus* were the center of obligatory, recurring ritual obligations such as sacrifices and festivals in favor of the gods and recorded in the Roman calendar. It was at temple ritual that, “the conceptual systems of temple, image, and sacrifice had their living embodiment.”²²⁹

Inauguration and Dedication

Mary Beard has justifiably questioned the assumption that Roman ritual required *ad infinitum* repetition until replicated exactly and executed perfectly.²³⁰ Nonetheless, forms of ritual action held meaning and proper conduct of ritual required core similarities from instance to

²²⁸ On procedures for temple foundation during the Republican period, see Ziolkowski 1992, 193-223.

²²⁹ Price 1984, 39.

²³⁰ Beard 1985.

instance. R.L. Gordon has argued that attachment to forms in ritual should be understood as action inspired by respect for the customs and conventions recognized by the group rather than mere tokens of sincerity or belief.²³¹ Cicero supports this view when he emphasizes that the importance of the pontiffs setting out religious laws lay in those laws' necessary role in facilitating performance of the rites forever.²³² The centrality of religious practice in Roman culture is indicated by Valerius Maximus, writing during the reign of Tiberius, “. . . our community has ever held that all things must yield to religion.”²³³

Although no direct evidence survives, the sites of the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus must have been consecrated by augury, the practice of consulting and interpreting the divine will in regards to a proposed action by the state. Varro describes the method of drawing a *templum*, an area marked out as sacred by the augurs, for auspices on the Capitol using the *lituus* to draw lines in the air, utter specific words, and delimit the area by stakes, ropes, and stars. If the augurs inaugurated a site according to the *ius divina*, divine law, the integrity of the complex would be defended by law.²³⁴ The result was to categorize the land as *res sacra*.²³⁵ What had been contested space before consecration, at least in the case of the Temple of Divus Julius, received formal sanction after consecration.

In addition to the senatorial decree, which was the senate's explicit recognition of the change in the status of the deceased emperor, inauguration of the *templum* by an augur was a necessary precursor to the temple's construction. Augury, it is here argued, constituted an

²³¹ According to the *ius divinum*, a site was either sacred and therefore consecrated and dedicated according to the public rites, or it was profane (Gordon 1990, 191-2).

²³² Cic. *De Leg.* 2.19.48.

²³³ Val. Max. 1.1.9: (*omnia namque post religionem ponenda semper nostra civitas duxit*).

²³⁴ Ziolkowski 1992, 218

²³⁵ Cancik describes the rich vocabulary developed by Romans to define sacred space (Cancik 1985-1986, 251).

explicit assent of the gods to the recategorization of the deceased emperor.²³⁶ Like the augural rites that Livy reminds us founded the eternal city of Rome, augural rites in the founding of a *templum* implied its eternity and demonstrated that the *templum* was founded by agreement of the gods and consequently was integral to the cosmic and sacred order.²³⁷ Augury gives the support of the heavens and indicates stability and duration into the future.

After construction the final step in the founding of a temple was the dedication, the date of which was known as the *dies natalis*, one of the days on which the, “monuments came alive in the festivals connected with them.”²³⁸ Ovid’s dictum that temples duly dedicated by priestly hands received the epithet *august*, or sacred, stresses the importance of the priestly ritual.²³⁹ While no full account of a temple dedication has survived, ancient sources offer tantalizing clues. In the life of Publicola Plutarch briefly describes the original dedication of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in 509 BCE.²⁴⁰ On the Ides of September, as the people assembled before the most magnificent temple in Rome, the priests proclaimed silence. After performing unstated ceremonial actions, the consul Marcus Horatius Pulvillus placed his hands on the door of the temple and, according to custom, pronounced the usual words of consecration.

One component of the ceremony was the assembly of the people. Some version of the sentiment first espoused by Numa, that people should not work during services so that they could avoid distraction and devote themselves to important religious ceremonies, was clearly preserved

²³⁶ On augury indicating agreement of the gods, see Scott 1925, 102-4; Turcan 1983, 9-10. See also Fears 1981, 778. On the augury of Romulus as a pledge of an eternal Rome by the gods, see Turcan 1983, 2-3.

²³⁷ Livy 4.4.4. Sumi 2011, 218.

²³⁸ Zanker 1988, 114.

²³⁹ Ov. *Fasti* 1.608-610.

²⁴⁰ Plut. *Pub.*

in Plutarch's time.²⁴¹ Crying '*Hoc age*', mind this, was believed to make bystanders more attentive and orderly. The creation of a ritual setting incorporating attentive and orderly bystanders was probably a practical necessity, however, practice also suggests that the presence of spectators was not optional but an integral part of the ceremony. The phrase 'mind this' implies that witnesses were expected not only to refrain from disruption, but also to address their attention to the ritual performance, increasing the likelihood of minding, or remembering it. A story by Suetonius of a man caught with a dagger near Claudius when he was sacrificing gives some notion of how close the crowd could be to ritual officiants.²⁴²

Octavian dedicated the Temple of Divus Julius on 18 August 29 BCE in spectacular fashion as the culminating event of the triple triumph celebrating victories over Dalmatia, Actium, and Egypt.²⁴³ To mark the dedication Octavian had 300 enemies who were captured in the siege of Perugia in 40 BCE executed before an altar set up in honor of Divus Julius. The celebration began on 13 August, the same day as sacrifices to Heracles, a god known as a benefactor of mankind, who similarly won his apotheosis through his deeds on earth.²⁴⁴ Vergil's description of the triple triumph scene on the shield of Aeneas gives some idea of the impression created by the event:

But Caesar, entering the walls of Rome in triple triumph, was dedicating to Italy's gods his immortal votive gift – three hundred mighty shrines throughout the city. The streets were ringing with gladness and games and shouting; in all the temples was a band of matrons, in all were altars, and before the altars slain steers covered the ground.²⁴⁵

²⁴¹ Plut. *Vit. Num.* 14.

²⁴² Suet. *Claud.* 5.36.

²⁴³ Cass. Dio 51, 22, 3.

²⁴⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 15.2.

²⁴⁵ Verg. *Aen.* 8.714-721: (*At Caesar, triplici invecus Romana triumpho moenia, dis Italis votum immortale sacrat, maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem. laetitia ludisque viae plausuque fremebant; omnibus in templis matrum chorus, omnibus arae; ante aras terram caesi stravere invenci*).

Augustus probably performed the dedicatory ceremony in his role as a pontifex with his head veiled, after which he conducted libations using the *simpulum* and offered the first blood sacrifice to the god.²⁴⁶ Augustus himself recounts that following the dedication of the Temple of Divus Julius he financed extravagant gladiatorial games in his own name. That Romans were impressed with the spectacles of fighting among hordes of exotic non-Romans, chariot races, the wild-beast hunts, and the Trojan games is known from Cassius Dio.²⁴⁷ Furthermore, Augustus dedicated the spoils of war in the Temple of Divus Julius and in the Capitoline Temple.²⁴⁸

Similarly, Caligula, and probably Tiberius although he didn't live to see it carried out, carefully timed the dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus. In his extensive commemoration of Divus Augustus Caligula, Michael Grant asserts, must have known that the dedication in 37 coincided with the centenary of Augustus' birth in 63 BCE.²⁴⁹ As the first such temple sacrifice scene, the significance of this coin goes beyond the simple announcement of the temple's dedication. The coin's reissue every year that sestertii were minted under Caligula demonstrates its continued importance in Caligula's visual program.²⁵⁰

With remarkable detail the coin issue of Caligula commemorating the Temple of Divus Augustus highlights the act of the dedicatory ritual and brings attention to the essential connection between architecture and ritual for an understanding of the *divi*. Although the order, pediment, and architectural sculpture of the temple remain highly visible, much of the building is obscured behind Caligula and the sacrificial attendants (**Fig. 2.22**). Garlands adorn the temple

²⁴⁶ *RGDA* 22.1. Bosworth 1999, 8.

²⁴⁷ Cass. Dio 55.22.4-9.

²⁴⁸ Cass. Dio 51.22.2-3.

²⁴⁹ Grant 1950, 6.

²⁵⁰ Grunow 2002.

indicating that it is a festal day. Also present in some of the issues is the *camillus*, the flute player, and a tunicate attendant holding what may be a container of *mola salsa*.²⁵¹ Moreover, Caligula replicates the pose of Divus Augustus positioned immediately above him in the center of the pediment: both are togate, head turned and weight shifted to one side with Caligula's stance leading the focus to the altar and sacrificial animal, and with the right arm extended holding a patera. Firmly anchored on the ground line, Caligula is an earthly successor to Divus Augustus now visually present in the *fastigium*.

That temples were designed to accommodate sacrifice reinforces their importance to cult practice and maintenance of the *pax deorum*. Vitruvius advised that the temple and cult statue should be oriented in such a way that those who pray and sacrifice may look up to the divinity and that the cult statue would seem to rise up and gaze upon them in return.²⁵² Bloody sacrifice to Divus Augustus, a ritual that was by nature indefinitely repeatable, was similar to sacrifices that had been conducted at other temples of state gods for centuries and was an activity perceived to be ancient.²⁵³ Like architectural form, the antiquity of the actions linked Caligula, Divus Augustus, and the Roman Empire with a form of power perceptibly ancient and deriving from the past. Even the assignment of dedicated priesthoods, the Flamen Divi Iulii for Divus Julius, depicted in the center of the South frieze of the Ara Pacis, and the Flamen Augustales for Divus Augustus, was a feature particular to the oldest cults in Rome (**Fig. 2.26**).²⁵⁴ Cassius Dio records

²⁵¹ Scott-Ryberg 1955, 83-4.

²⁵² Vitr. *De arch.* 4.5.1, 4.8.5, 4.9.

²⁵³ On the repeatability of ritual and the distinction between ritual time and profane time, see Connerton 1989, 66. Ritual did not necessarily embody total repetition but the idea or potential for total repetition.

²⁵⁴ Though Tacitus (1.54) notes that the year 14 brought a novelty in religious ceremonies enriched by a new college of Augustal priests (*sodales Augustales*), he also points out that the new ceremonial was patterned on the old Titian brotherhood founded by Titus Tatius to safeguard the Sabine rites. The new college of Augustales was drawn by lots from the noble houses, and included Tiberius, Drusus, Claudius, and Germanicus. On the depiction of the Flamen Divi Iulius, see Rehak 2001.

that Numa Pompilius created the first three Flamens of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus, who along with the Flamen Divi Iulii are depicted together on the southern frieze of the Ara Pacis. Thus, the priests of the *divi* became the most influential of the priesthoods behind those established by Numa.

Scholars argue that the absence of votive offerings indicating the expectation of a specific benefit suggests that Romans did not believe that the *divi* were ‘real’ gods.²⁵⁵ That Cicero was upset because Romans offered prayers to Caesar after his death that were usually offered up to the gods suggests that there is more to the picture. Fishwick documented the Roman practice of paying vows to *divi* but only in association with other Roman state gods. For instance, in 65 L. Titinius Claucus Lucretianus made a vow for the health of the emperor Nero, which he fulfilled through a dedication to the Capitoline Triad, Roma, and Divus Augustus.²⁵⁶ For Fishwick the inclusion of Divus Augustus with the Capitoline Triad indicated the god’s inefficacy. Viewed from another perspective, however, it is reasonable to conjecture that the Capitoline Triad, the supreme gods of the Roman state pantheon, benefited from direct association with the cult of Rome’s newest founder.

The dominant view of the inefficacy of the *divi* simplifies the polythetic nature of Roman religious organization characterized by orthopraxy, the focus upon standardized ritual rather than standardized belief. Moreover, inherent in *pietas* was the Roman ideal of reciprocal relationship, which was flexible enough to allow Romans to maintain relationships with multiple gods at varying levels of personal commitment.²⁵⁷ At a collective level, *pietas* required the Roman state to properly venerate the state gods in order to maintain a prosperous society. As members of the

²⁵⁵ Nock 1930.

²⁵⁶ *CIL* 11. 1331 (ILS 233).

²⁵⁷ Alcock 2002.

Roman state pantheon, Roman worshippers of the *divi* would have expected general benefit through maintenance of the *pax deorum*. Indeed, inherent in the act of sacrifice was an unmistakable give and take in which priests offered gifts to the gods in exchange for benefit, whether specifically the health of the emperor or victory or generally in the form of continued prosperity. Speaking in Ovid's *Fasti*, the god Janus associates an open temple with the opening of the gods' ears.²⁵⁸

Ritual elements of bloody sacrifice also fashioned Divus Julius and Divus Augustus as eternal, celestial gods. Roman practice observed a specific connection of deity and victim, the *hostia propria*. Male deities received male victims and female deities received female victims according to the rules governing the Roman rites. The coin image of Caligula in front of a garlanded Temple of Divus Augustus likely represents Caligula performing libations at the dedication of the temple in the moments immediately before the sacrifice. The victim was a male bovine and likely a *bos mas*, a white, castrated ox, the same victim sacrificed to Jupiter in the annual oaths on the Capitoline by Roman consuls. A mosaic in the barracks of the *vigiles* in Ostia Antica illustrates two stages of an immolation. The central scene, with a victimarius urging the steer to the lighted altar beside which stands a flute player and priest, marks the conclusion of the preliminary supplication and the beginning of the immolation proper (**Fig. 2.27**). To the right a side group shows an attendant dismembering the slaughtered bull to prepare for the burning of the *exta*, the internal organs (**Fig. 2.28**). Upon completion of the supplication by Caligula the attendants would have dismembered the sacrificial animal, reserving the *exta* and blood for Divus Augustus and the meat for ritual banqueting. After cooking the *exta* attendants would have sprinkled it with wine and *mola salsa*, salted flour prepared by the Vestal Virgins, and placed it

²⁵⁸ Ov. *Fasti* 1.

on the burning altar so that the smoke fumes could rise to the sky and be consumed by the celestial god, Divus Augustus.

Recurring Ritual and the Calendar

With the dedication of the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus complete, the *divi* became the focus of annual, ritual obligation delineated in the Roman calendar. Although there are variations in the amount and type of detail for each day in the Roman calendar, the format, which was based on a recurring annual cycle, remained remarkably consistent from the age of Augustus until late antiquity: the numbered days of each month are listed under the name of the month and the categorization and details of each day are enumerated beside the number. Characterization of certain days hinged on whether Romans could conduct public business without violating obligations to the gods. *Fasti* were permissible days, *nefasti* were days on which public business was forbidden usually because of religious obligations.²⁵⁹ As opposed to the *Fasti Triumphales*, recording triumphs granted down to the reign of Augustus, and the *Fasti Consulares*, listing the consuls for each year since the founding of Rome, in the imperial period the *Fasti Magistrales*, *Annales*, or *Historici* designated public religious sacrifices and festivals to the state gods as well as days of celebration associated with the emperor and the imperial family.²⁶⁰ There is a wide variety of recurring annual celebrations recorded in the calendars inscribed during the Julio-Claudian period that reference either Divus Julius or Divus Augustus (**Table 1**).

Religious celebrations in the early Empire explicitly connected to the *divi* commemorate three general types of days. In the first category are celebrations of military victories such as

²⁵⁹ On the structure of Roman calendars, see Laurence and Smith 1995-1996, 135.

²⁶⁰ On the Roman structure of the Roman calendar, see Salzman 1990.

those of Caesar in Spain and Pharsalus and Augustus in Actium and Sicily, as well as the fulfillment of vows for the safe return of Augustus from military pursuits in the provinces. The second category includes games in honor of the *divi* and the *die natalis*, or foundation day, of their temples. The third category, celebrations of events such as births, maturity and reception of the toga *virilis*, and the Senatorial decree of deification, demonstrates a marked interest in recognizing and commemorating changes in states of being. Significantly, the description of the Senatorial decree to deify Augustus for 17 September in the *Fasti Viae dei Serpenti* highlights the celestial nature of the honors accorded to the new god, ‘*honores caelestes divo augusto*’ (Fig. 2.29).²⁶¹

The majority of the surviving calendars are Augustan and Tiberian and only a few include Divus Augustus. In descriptions of events that occurred during Augustus’ lifetime such as the anniversary of Livia and Augustus on 17 January of the *Fasti Verulani* dated after 14, the deceased emperor is referred to as Divus Augustus, his ontological state at the time of the calendar.²⁶² To describe Livia’s marriage to Divus Augustus is, in a sense, to suggest that he had always been Divus Augustus, a fact confirmed after his death. In addition, many of the victory celebrations from calendars dated to the lifetime of Augustus, such as the victory celebration after Actium recorded for 2 September in the *Fasti Amiternini*, describe him as ‘*Caesar divi filius*’, an implicit claim that his status as the son of a god contributed to his victory (Fig. 30).²⁶³

An annual celebration of the *die natalis* of the temples emphasized the importance of place in Roman religion. *Die natalis* calendar entries usually specified the location of the building as in ‘*Divo Iulio ad Forum*’ or ‘*aedes Divi Iulii dedicata*’ for 18 Augustus celebration of

²⁶¹ Degrassi 1963, 215.

²⁶² Degrassi 1963, 17.

²⁶³ Degrassi 1963, 193.

the Temple of Divus Julius.²⁶⁴ These entries were similar in content to, for example, entries in the *Fasti Vallenses* related to other temples such as August 12 ‘*Herculi Magno Custodi in Circo Flaminio*’, August 13 ‘*Dianae in Aventino*’, and Augustus 14 ‘*Portuno ad pontem Aemili*’.²⁶⁵ Because the calendar marks festivals that represent processions and sacrifices in, through, and around the city, Ray Laurence and Christopher Smith view the whole city as a spatial calendar. The increase in the number of temples resulted in the increase in the number of festivals, a system into which celebrations at the temples of *divi* were incorporated.²⁶⁶

A number of scholars have commented on the unique ability of the Roman calendar to express social and cultural identities by focusing on dates of importance to Augustus.²⁶⁷ Augustus sought to reinforce his power by incorporating himself and the imperial family into the expression of time, including the reformulation of the *Fasti Triumphales*, creation of the Horologium, and the insertion of new holidays into the Roman calendar.²⁶⁸ Karl Galinsky, however, wisely cautions that a top-down model suggesting a system imposed by the emperor is a mischaracterization, arguing instead that many Romans shared Augustus’ ideas and found their own ways of expressing them.²⁶⁹ In the *Fasti Praenestini*, for example, the days associated with the imperial family are indicated by the phrase ‘*feriae ex senates consulto*’ specifying that the celebrations are by decree of the Senate.²⁷⁰ Through this designation the Senate would have

²⁶⁴ Degrassi 1963: *Fasti Allifani*, 118; *Fasti Antiates Ministrorum*, 208; *Fasti Amiternini*, 191; *Fasti Fandozziani*, 233.

²⁶⁵ On the *Fasti Vallenses*, see Degrassi 1963.

²⁶⁶ Laurence and Smith 1995-1996, 141. See also, King 2003.

²⁶⁷ See, e.g., Wallace-Hadrill 1987; Wallace-Hadrill 2005; see also Orlin 2007.

²⁶⁸ Laurence and Smith 1995-1996, 141.

²⁶⁹ Galinsky 1996.

²⁷⁰ On the *Fasti Praenestini*, see Wallace-Hadrill 1987.

demonstrated some level of control over the calendar and the granting of honors while simultaneously expressing their approval of the individuals receiving honors.

Incorporation of celebrations of the *divi* into the Roman calendar adds a temporal mode of inscription to the architectural mode discussed above and further implicates and complicates the condition of total eternity here attributed to Divus Julius and Divus Augustus. At a fundamental level the Roman calendar recorded a system of dates extrinsic to the events to which they applied. Ricoeur calls this the ‘time of memory’ because implicit in the recording of the event is the time at some undetermined point before the present when the event happened.²⁷¹ It is a transition, he argues, from living memory to the extrinsic positing of historical knowledge. Significantly, the Roman calendar does not record the year that the commemorated events such as the *die natalis* first occurred, only the day of the year, obscuring the temporal distance of the events from the present as well as the chronological relationship among all of the events commemorated in the calendar. An entry in Ovid’s *Fasti* for the 5th of April signaling the importance of the date makes explicit the link between past and present, “On this day of old the temple of Public Fortune was dedicated on the hill of Quirinus.”²⁷² What year the original event happened is not crucial to understanding the calendar; rather the emphasis is that all events commemorated happened in the past. Of course first-hand knowledge could be employed to determine temporal relationships between the events, but the fact remains, that with limited exceptions the calendars did not specify this information.

LeGoff explains that the past-present opposition, a construction rather than a natural given, is essential to the acquisition of a consciousness of time.²⁷³ In contrast, from the

²⁷¹ Ricoeur 2004, 155.

²⁷² 4.373-376: (. . . *quondam sacrata est colle Quirini hac Fortuna die Publica*).

²⁷³ LeGoff 1996.

information provided by the Roman calendars it is impossible to discern that the cults of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius, and the *dies natalis* of each temple, were established before or after the cults of any other god. Indeed, employing extraneous information would reveal that the cult of Mars Ultor was newer than the cult of Divus Julius, yet that fact would not imply that the god Mars Ultor did not exist before the construction of his temple. Mary Beard brings attention to the lack of chronological information by interpreting the calendar as a pageant of the Roman past encompassing a non-chronological reenactment of Roman history throughout the year.²⁷⁴ The calendar permitted the viewer to analyze and juxtapose events on different days of the year but did not facilitate an understanding of chronology. Thus, in conjunction with temple architecture the calendar subsumed the *divi* within a totality of civic and religious remembrance by reflecting and constructing an ideal past that evolved as the calendar itself evolved through the addition and omission of religious festivals and other celebrations.

Moreover, the calendar was much more than a store recording certain types of knowledge; it provided a guide to ongoing religious veneration, a structure around which the rituals of the *divi* and of the Roman state as a whole ensured the performance of remembrance and religious obligations.²⁷⁵ Time at Rome was a culturally embedded system that relied upon a linear history of military victories, temple dedications, birthdays, adoptions, and senatorial decrees alongside the annual calendar of cyclical time.²⁷⁶ The calendar inscribed, literally and metaphorically, the eternal, timeless *divi* into a cyclical time that already included the other state gods. As a historical monument with a day of dedication, as well as a religious monument, the

²⁷⁴ Beard 1987.

²⁷⁵ Williams 2003, 227-31.

²⁷⁶ Laurence and Smith 1995-1996, 133.

dies natales commemorated the dedication of the temple linking the significance of that moment with the continued existence of the temple and the cult in the future.²⁷⁷

Invoking the eternal gods through ritual makes present an order of things that is fundamentally timeless.²⁷⁸ Recurring ritual brings the present world into line with the mythic past by periodically reenacting it in the here and now.²⁷⁹ The acts of dedication that marked out the religious cycle of the year recalled an ever-present metaphysical order towards which the sacrifice and acknowledgment were directed, recollections both of immediate obligations and a more timeless and ever-present set of values.²⁸⁰ With its theme of periodic annual renewal the Roman calendar could embody total eternity in the same way as the never-ending cycle of the sun and moon.²⁸¹ Moreover, repetition gives rise to what psychologists call semantic recall, the capacity to recall general knowledge, rather than episodic recall, the ability to remember specific events of one's life experience, both concepts discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5. For example, an adult living in Rome under Nero may not recall the details of each of the two dozen or more annual festivals and sacrifices in honor of Divus Augustus that he may have experienced, but he or she would know the general structure of such religious celebrations honoring Divus Augustus as a god of the Roman state pantheon and that they occur annually. Though the present analysis of architectural form, iconography, and ritual breaks down the complex of ideas concentrated in the temple and ritual into component parts, during the performance of a sacrifice to Divus Augustus, for example, meanings were simultaneously

²⁷⁷ Laurence and Smith 1995-1996, 146.

²⁷⁸ Assmann 2006, 14.

²⁷⁹ Gell 1992, 24; Alcock 2002, 146; Zerubavel 2003, 46-7.

²⁸⁰ Barrett 1993, 243.

²⁸¹ Turcan 1983, 23.

condensed into a single experience with redundant messages, knowledge, and understandings reinforcing each other.²⁸²

Evidence for a number of recurring rituals survives. Birthday celebrations for Augustus on 23 September continued after his death and deification with sacrifices of an ox to Jupiter on the Capitol. After the dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus, celebrations for Augustus' birthday that were likely annual are attested in 38 and in 52; the celebration extended to two days and included a second day of sacrifice to Divus Augustus at his temple.²⁸³ Recorded occasions of sacrifices of a *bos mas* by the Arval Brethren to Divus Augustus include the Augustalia, consecration of Livia in 52, various imperial days, and on the occasion of vows.²⁸⁴

When Augustus returned from Syria in 19 BCE after restoring the Parthian standards to Rome, the Senate voted an altar to Fortuna Redux commemorated on coins in Rome and located along the Via Appia near the Porta Capena.²⁸⁵ In addition the senate decreed a festival, the Augustalia, named after Augustus but ostensibly dedicated to Fortuna Redux.²⁸⁶ After Augustus' death and establishment of the Flamen Augustales and Sodales Augustales, the priestly college and association charged with the veneration of Divus Augustus, the Augustalia continued, expanded to 3-12 October, and included the elaborate Ludi Augustales. Patrizia Arena argues that in the *pompa circensis*, the procession that preceded festival games held in the circus, it was standard practice to include statues of the imperial family whether or not they became deified. Under the Julio-Claudians then, the *pompa circensis* would have included Divus Julius, Divus Augustus and Livia, Agrippina the Elder and Drusilla, Antonia and Claudius, and under Nero

²⁸² Sullivan 1986.

²⁸³ Henzen 1874/1967, 51.

²⁸⁴ *RIC I*² no. 322.

²⁸⁵ *RGDA* 11.

²⁸⁶ Henzen 1874/1967, 49, 59, 71-4, 84-6, 102, 5, 21.

probably Claudia and Poppaea.²⁸⁷ According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, boys from Roman families lead the *pompa circensis* followed by other boys on foot, charioteers, athletes, dancers, and finally statues of the gods.²⁸⁸ Significantly, while images of members of the imperial house were paraded in front of the gods, after Caesar's death the image of Divus Julius was grouped with Victoria, Quirinus, Venus, and the other gods.

Temples and Processional Routes

Although it is generally acknowledged that the route of the triumphal procession was not fixed, there is some agreement based in part on patterns of manubial and imperial building that certain nodes along the route, once incorporated, remained consistent.²⁸⁹ In light of new approaches to the triumph arguing that the meanings of the procession feeds off the buildings and landscapes along the route, changes in the triumphal route to accommodate the messages and goals of individual triumphators are not surprising.²⁹⁰ The general shape of the triumph in the early empire began in the Campus Martius, progressed through the Porta Triumphalis, then south through the Forum Holitorium and the Forum Boarium, through the Circus Maximus, around the Palatine, down the Sacred Way traversing the full length of the Forum, up the Clivus Capitolinus, and ending at the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus where the triumphator dedicated the spoils of war and performed a sacrifice (**Fig. 2.31**).

There are two competing theories of the procession's path after the Forum Boarium and in the area nearest to the Temple of Divus Augustus and the Velabrum. The first theory

²⁸⁷ Arena 2009, 83.

²⁸⁸ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.72.

²⁸⁹ See, e.g., Wiseman 2007. Beard contests the notion that there was a prescribed route for the triumphal procession (Beard 2007, 92-105).

²⁹⁰ See e.g. La Rocca 2009; Popkin 2012.

advocates for a shorter route that bypasses the Velabrum, a designation generally understood to refer to the low ground between the Capitol and the Palatine Hills and between the Forum Basin and the Tiber, on the way to the Circus Maximus (**Fig. 2.11**).²⁹¹ In the second theory, the triumphal route progresses from the Porta Carmentalis, turns left down the Vicus Iugarius going either in front of or behind the Basilica Julia, until it made a right on the Vicus Tuscus and on to the Circus Maximus.²⁹²

Speculation in this area is based on a passage from Suetonius, who relates that when Julius Caesar rode through the Velabrum on the day of his Gallic triumph in 46 BCE the axle of his chariot broke throwing him to the ground.²⁹³ According to Dio this incident occurred in front of the Temple of Fortune or Felicitas built by Lucullus and known to be located generally in the saddle between the Capitoline and the Palatine.²⁹⁴ Beard interprets the phrase *praetervehens* not as ‘riding through’ but as ‘riding past’ the Velabrum and concludes that Caesar bypassed the entire area. In contrast, T.P. Wiseman argues that the reference to the ‘Velabrum’ did not refer to the entire area but a particular place, likely in the area of S. Giorgio in Velabro next to the Arcus Argentarium, in which case Caesar’s procession did process down the Vicus Iugarius and Vicus Tuscus.²⁹⁵

Regardless of who is correct about the route at the time of Julius Caesar’s triumph, it is generally acknowledged now, and certainly would have been in the early imperial period, that within the basic scheme laid out above the route could change based on the needs of a particular triumphator. If the Temple of Divus Augustus is located between the Vicus Iugarius and the

²⁹¹ Coarelli 1992, 365-6, 384-5.

²⁹² Beard 2007, 103.

²⁹³ Suet. *Iul* 37.2.

²⁹⁴ On this passage see Beard 2007, 103.

²⁹⁵ Wiseman 2007.

Vicus Tuscus as is generally accepted, it is plausible that the triumphal route influenced the siting of the temple or that the presence of the Temple influenced the processional route in triumphs after 37. At first glance the site of the Temple of Divus Augustus is perplexing. Though the Temple of Divus Julius prominently delineated the southern end of the Forum, the multi-level Basilica Julia would have blocked the view of the Temple of Divus Augustus from the Forum.

Though little is known of the Velabrum during the Augustan period, evidence suggests that it had a commercial character making it an unlikely first choice for a prominent temple: storefronts opened from the lower level of the Basilica Julia on the side facing the Tiber, and the Vicus Tuscus and Vicus Iugarius were the primary routes from the Roman Forum to the Forum Boarium and Forum Holitorium respectively.²⁹⁶ Also located in this area was the Graecostadium, or slave market, later restored by Antoninus Pius and likely identifiable on the marble plan in a fragment that belongs south of the Basilica Julia.²⁹⁷ Seneca suggests that the Graecostadium was at the same location in the mid first century when he laments the dealers in worthless slaves near the Temple of Castor and Pollux.²⁹⁸

Each celebrated triumph renewed and regenerated the symbolic significance of the urban landscape. During the middle Republic, for example, holders of *imperium* vowed and dedicated more than thirty temples along the route and in adjacent areas. Thus, construction of the Temple of Divus Augustus along the triumphal route or a potential spur of the route was well in line with

²⁹⁶ On the Velabrum, see Guidobaldi and Angelelli 1999.

²⁹⁷ Graecostadium is listed in the regionary catalog in the *Notitia* in Regio VIII, between the Vicus Iugarius et Unguentarius and Porticus Margaritarius, and in the *Curiosum* between the Vicus Iugarius and Basilica Julia (Guidobaldi and Angelelli 1999; FUR pl. 21e,]RECOST[;Rodríguez Almeida 1981, pl. 13; SHA *Ant. Pius* 8.2).

²⁹⁸ Sen. *de Cl.* 13.

religious precedent.²⁹⁹ Moreover, the temple would have been directly in the line of view from the steps of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. When considering the Velabrum's proximity to significant nodes on the triumphal route, particularly the temples of the Forum Boarium, Forum Holitorium and the Circus Maximus, inclusion of the Temple of Divus Augustus on the triumphal route would have brought to mind not only Augustus' triple triumph, but also the greatest triumph of all, that of Rome's founder over mortality. As the Roman ruler responsible for inaugurating the institution of the triumph, Romulus' image carrying the *spolia opima* in the acroteria provided a link between imperial triumphs and the procession's auspicious beginnings.

The route of the *pompa circensis* may also have been altered to accommodate the Temples of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius. Conducted at the beginning of circus games held in conjunction with Roman religious festivals, the route of the *pompa circensis* in the Republic started at the Capitolium, progressed down the Clivus Capitolinus to the Roman Forum, up the Sacred Way and along the Vicus Tuscus to the Circus Maximus.³⁰⁰ In the culminating act of the procession, participants deposited statues of the gods in a *pulvinar* at the Circus. By the time of Tiberius the procession was extended to include the Temple of Mars Ultor where participants presumably collected the statues of Divus Augustus and Germanicus. In addition to the Augustalia, documented processions to the circus were included in the Ludi Martiales and celebrations of Augustus birthday. Arena has argued that, after dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus, for festivals specifically associated with the imperial family the Arval Brethren made a sacrifice at the Temple of Divus Augustus, which provided a starting point for the *pompa*

²⁹⁹ On the triumphal procession during the middle Republic, see Hölkeskamp 2006, 485.

³⁰⁰ On the *pompa circensis* in the Republican and early Imperial period, see Arena 2009.

circensis instead of the Capitol.³⁰¹ Such changes in configuration of processional participants and images, processional route, and inclusion of sacrifices at the Temple of Divus Augustus had theological and dynastic significance: the *pompa* and associated sacrifices categorized Divus Augustus as one of the eternal state gods, underscored the importance of the imperial house in the Roman Empire, and created a focus for devotion to the Julio-Claudian dynasty.³⁰²

Suppression of Personal History

As argued above, the architectural form, iconography, and ritual of the Temples of Divus Julius and of Divus Augustus were intended to evoke the distant, unknowable past. Categorization of the *divi* with the state gods led to an understanding of their divinity as timeless, immutable, and eternal encompassing past, present, and future. Also significant was the striking difference in mnemonic strategy of the temples to *divi* from other commemorative monuments such as arches, columns, porticoes, and funerary monuments.³⁰³

Unlike the Temple of Divus Augustus, most of the monuments in the Roman landscape honoring the emperor Augustus commemorated specific virtues of the emperor or events during his lifetime. For example, the Arch of Augustus at the southeast corner of the Roman Forum, also known as the Parthian Arch, was erected in 19 BCE to celebrate Augustus' return from the east and recovery of the standards lost to the Parthians at the battle of Carrhae in 53 BCE.³⁰⁴ Coins depict a central arch surmounted by quadriga and two lateral arches with barbarians

³⁰¹ Arena 2009, 83-91.

³⁰² Coarelli 1995, 372.

³⁰³ "One way of discovering the shape and structure of an idea in memory is to observe what is retained in the process of transmission, what is added, and what is dropped." (Fentress and Wickham 1992, 47)

³⁰⁴ On the Parthian honors of Augustus, see Rich 1998.

offering standards to the *triumphator*. In concept the arch visually reenacts the event, the return of the standards, that it commemorates (**Fig. 2.32**).³⁰⁵

Emphasizing personal qualities integral to the perception of the good ruler, the Senate voted the *clipeus virtutis* to Augustus in 27 BCE in connection with the grant of his new name Augustus and new title of Princeps. The shield supported by a winged victory and located in the Curia, bore an inscription of four virtues: *virtus, iustitia, pietas, and clementia* (**Fig. 2.33**).³⁰⁶ An image of the *clipeus virtutis* appears on the Belvedere Altar commissioned in connection with the establishment of the Lares Augusti, bearing a representation of two laurel trees between which is a pillar and the *clipeus virtutis*. A victory places the shield that bears the inscription, “Senatus Populusque Romanus Imperator Caesari Divi F Augusto Pontiff Maxim Imp Cos Trib Pot” atop the pillar (**Fig. 2.34**).³⁰⁷ Dedicated to Augustus in his new position as Pontifex Maximus, the shield places the focus on the personal virtues of Augustus.

Significantly the *Res Gestae*, Augustus’ monumental autobiographical account of his greatest achievements as he saw them, was affixed to the Mausoleum of Augustus, a funerary monument associated with his death through the inclusion of his and his family members’ bodily remains. The lengthy inscription enumerated Augustan successes in warfare and triumphs, powers rejected and offices accepted, administrative reorganizations, religious honors, benefactions for the city of Rome including buildings, triumphal commemorations, and spectacles, and contributions to the expansion of the Roman Empire.³⁰⁸ Given that the first audience for the *Res Gestae* was the Senate during the reading of Augustus’ will by Tiberius,

³⁰⁵ *RIC I*² no. 132.

³⁰⁶ On the shield voted to Augustus, see Wallace-Hadrill 1981, 300-6.

³⁰⁷ On the Belvedere Altar (Rome, Vatican Museum, inv. 1115), see Scott-Ryberg 1955, 55-8.

³⁰⁸ On the *Res Gestae*, see Scheid 2007; Cooley 2009.

Cooley suggests that it was written to justify his apotheosis and encourage the senate to expedite the process.³⁰⁹ Likewise, Penelope Davies has classed the Mausoleum of Augustus in a group of monuments that she argues refer explicitly to the change of state of the emperor from mortal to immortal. Davies persuasively links the Mausoleum with the *Res Gestae* prominently displayed on two columns flanking the entrance, and its role in securing Augustus' deification, to the legitimation of Tiberius.³¹⁰

The intended dynastic nature of the Mausoleum was clear before the completion of its construction. As one of the first building projects that Augustus began after his victory at Actium, Augustus interred his first heir and nephew Marcellus in the Mausoleum followed by multiple family members including his other heirs and grandsons who predeceased him: Gaius in 2 and Lucius in 4. Dynastic significance in this context though is somewhat different from that implicated in the Temples of Divus Augustus and Divus Julius. The Mausoleum presents a gallery of Julio-Claudian notables known for their great deeds, with Augustus at the pinnacle of the group, conveying the messages that such an illustrious family surely deserved to be elevated above all others and that a suitable ruler of the Roman world could only come from this family.

With the heading "RES GESTAE DIVI AUGUSTI" inscribed in large letters at the beginning of the bronze slabs that made up the inscription, a Roman viewer after the death of Augustus would certainly have had the deification of Augustus in mind, lending further prestige to the Julio-Claudian family that no other Roman family at that time could hope to achieve, a prestige that derived directly from the status of Divus Augustus as fashioned in the god's temple. Moreover, the colossal bronze statue of Augustus that stood high above street level at the apex of the mausoleum and led the viewer's eyes to look up to the heavens would have recalled the

³⁰⁹ Cooley 2009, 41.

³¹⁰ Davies 2000.

temple of the god and the images of Divus Augustus elevated in the center of the pediment and at the apex of the temple.³¹¹ Although the ideas embodied and messages conveyed by the Mausoleum and the Temple of Divus Augustus certainly were interconnected, the temple was the *loca sancta* in Rome for veneration of Divus Augustus and satisfaction of obligations required by the *pax deorum*. The Mausoleum was the site of retrospective funerary ritual and explicitly evoked contemplation of the deeds of Augustus and the other interred Julio-Claudian family members. It is intriguing to consider what would have happened had Tiberius and Caligula lived up to the expectations of their respective rule. If either of them had been deified Claudius may well have included their cults in the Temple of Divus Augustus. However, the lack of a ruler between Augustus and Claudius who was suitable for deification must have profoundly complicated the possibility of state veneration for the dynasty implied by the inclusion of multiple Julio-Claudian emperors within one temple.

In contrast to the assertion made by J.C. Richard that the monuments to house the mortal remains of the emperors were not significantly different than those built to them as *divi*, the Mausoleum of Augustus and the Temple of Divus Augustus were not interchangeable.³¹² Differing mnemonic strategies ensured that there was no confusion. From the Mausoleum of Augustus to the Temple of Divus Augustus there was a shift in mnemonic function from a generally retrospective funerary cult foregrounded by the *Res Gestae*, to the cult of a state god centered on the future well-being of the state and conditioned on present and future veneration.

Gradel has demonstrated that of the seven surviving funeral epitaphs from the mausoleums of Augustus and Hadrian, those for Tiberius, Vespasian, Nerva, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Lucius Verus, and Commodus, the titulature of the deceased emperors included no

³¹¹ von Hesberg 1996.

³¹² Richard 1966.

posthumous title of *divi* even though five of the seven were deified. Gradel attributes this to a procedural technicality reflecting the fact that deceased emperors were not yet deified on the day of their funeral and entombment.³¹³ Gradel's theory suggests that the epitaph was carved and displayed on the day of the funeral, which was not necessarily the case. Even if the epitaphs were erected on the day of the funeral, inscriptions could certainly be revised. In other words, successors to deified emperors chose not to include the title *Divus* on the funerary epitaphs. The more likely reason for the universal exclusion probably derived from the mnemonic function of the mausoleums, which were primarily retrospective, for those in the present looking back on the lifetime of the deceased.

The requirement that remembrance of individuals be preserved for posterity was fundamental to Roman society. The wax *imagines* of deceased family members in the atrium of elite houses combined with *tituli* describing honors of the deceased employed word and image that prompted viewers to emulate virtues of the deceased.³¹⁴ Indeed, Favro has characterized the gallery of portraits in the Forum of Augustus as an atrium for the state.³¹⁵ Of the statues lining the exedra, one side was devoted to the Iulii led by Aeneas and the other to the great men of the Republic led by Romulus.³¹⁶ Each statue was accompanied by a *titulus* and an *elogium* describing lifetime achievements and offices held. Being remembered meant that someone lived a life worthy of remembrance based on their deeds (**Fig. 2.35**).

Like the family *imagines* in the atrium, the ensemble in the Forum of Augustus was an open group, and ancient authors understood that Augustus made arrangements to add bronze

³¹³ For the full text of the seven imperial epitaphs, see Gradel 2008.

³¹⁴ On the *imagines*, see Flower 1996, 185-221.

³¹⁵ Favro 1996, 127.

³¹⁶ Ov. *Fasti* 5.563-6; Suet. *Aug.* 31.5; *SHA Alex. Sev.* 28.6.

statues of those whose future services to the state were equal to the heroes already on display.³¹⁷ As discussed above, in ancient Rome the term *immortalitas*, when applied to mortal humans, meant that they would live on beyond death in people's memory, not that they literally existed forever. The role of history according to Livy was to provide a model through which Romans could understand their present by comparison with the past.³¹⁸ These exempla, remembered though catalogs of aristocratic virtue, were preserved in the immortal memory of those honored for the purposes of comparison, emulation, and inspiration.

In contrast, the Temple of Divus Augustus suppressed any reference to Augustus' individuality, shifting the emphasis from personal to communal significance, and served as a means to remember the historical person only in a limited capacity further addressed in Chapter 5. The Temple of Divus Augustus did not overtly remind people of Augustus' specific deeds, spur them to emulation, or justify his apotheosis; rather it suppressed Augustus' individuality and emphatically declared the existence of the god.³¹⁹ The Temple of Divus Augustus not only did not spur Romans to emulation, it magnified the distance between the emperor and the people, reminding Roman citizens that they would never attain the honor of state veneration in a temple and cult.

The *divi* were tools for Roman self-understanding rather than models for living, with the exception that the good emperors served as exempla for subsequent emperors.³²⁰ Unlike the Forum of Augustus or the Mausoleum of Augustus, in which great men were remembered

³¹⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 31.5; Cass. Dio 55.10.3.

³¹⁸ See Gowing 2005, 22.

³¹⁹ On the functions of imperial funeral monuments to highlight aspects of an emperor's life on which his authority relied and to justify the deceased emperor's apotheosis so as to promote dynastic succession, see Davies 2000.

³²⁰ On some of the ways societies creatively imagine their heroes, men and women whose existence in life or later is endowed by others with a high degree of fame or honor and with a special allocation of imputed meaning and symbolic significance, see Cubitt and Warren 2000.

individually and in their specific role as part of a chosen group, from a mnemonic perspective the focus of the temple is solely on the god whose cult it houses. This is in stark contrast to the Republican remembrance of things past that revolved around the great figures and, “a glorious record of heroes and their deeds, towering figures or awe-inspiring ‘ancestors’ . . . who acted out their particular part in Rome’s predestined mission to wage war on her enemies and goal of universal rule.”³²¹ In the Republic, Hölkeskamp points out, cultural memory crystallized around these figures in the form of personalized stories and memorable deeds that formed the core of Rome’s monumental memory.³²² During the Roman Empire, architecture and ritual of the *divi* eschewed common techniques of immortalizing human beings in the collective memory, instead subsuming the new god in the universalizing, sacred history of the Roman state gods. This new conception does not completely supplant the historical emperor but supplements the mnemonic strategies employed elsewhere, either before or after death, in image, text, monument, and performance.

Dynastic Implications

That dynastic implications are an important facet to understanding deification is undeniable. Although Divus Julius and Divus Augustus may have been evoked for dynastic purposes, it is argued here that the temples were not inherently dynastic monuments, though their dynastic significance would have been stronger at the time of their dedication than under later imperial dynasties. Focusing solely on dynastic significance obscures the need to explore

³²¹ Miles 1995.

³²² Hölkeskamp 2006.

theological considerations, the complex layering of meanings, and a nuanced understanding of the temples as a specific mnemonic strategy.³²³

Consider for example the Temple of Mars Ultor, arguably one of the most enduring symbols of Rome and an extraordinarily powerful sacred site housing the cult of Mars Ultor and numerous governmental activities. Octavian originally vowed the temple to avenge the assassination of Julius Caesar, who like Octavian actively promoted the perception of Mars and Venus as the divine ancestors of the Julian gens and of the Roman people. The role of Mars in the divine lineage of Julius Caesar and Augustus, however, should not minimize the theological importance of the temple and cult. Indeed, its theological and symbolic significance is the reason the god was such a desirable ancestor in the first place. In other words, the temple is not primarily a dynastic monument, presenting an ancestor of the Julian Gens; rather it is a dynamic cult site. Evocation of the god in particular contexts, however, sometimes at the temple and sometimes elsewhere, could and often did highlight the dynastic importance of Mars Ultor. I don't mean to suggest that a dynastic understanding or theological emphasis of the *divi* in particular situations was an either/or proposition, rather that there are contexts in which one understanding was more or less prominent.

Although not the primary theme in the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus, there are abundant contexts in which the roles of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus as divine ancestors were paramount. Augustus' position as *divi filius* would have been difficult to miss under Augustus because of copious coin issues bearing some form of the legend AUGUSTUS DIVI FILIUS. Coins issued within a few years of Caesar's deification explicitly juxtaposed the

³²³ Fears highlights a similar tendency to underestimate or misconceive the significance of the cults of virtues at Rome. As concrete divinities, the cults of virtues manifested themselves in familiar ways, special localization in a temple and temporal specification in a feast day, that rendered all deities on some level similar and familiar (Fears 1981, 828-34).

two leaders. Some presented opposed busts on the obverse with the legend DIVOS IULIUS beside one portrait and DIVI F beside the other (**Fig. 2.36**).³²⁴ An aureus issued in Rome in 17 BCE during the Saecular Games shows a herald on one side holding a round shield with a six-pointed star and the legend AVGVST DI VI F LUD OS. The reverse displays the youthful, laureate head of Julius Caesar beside a comet with four rays and a tail.³²⁵

Helène Whittaker has interpreted the coins depicting the Temple of Divus Julius, the obverse of which bears the head of Octavian with the legend IMP CAESAR DIVI F. III VIR ITER RPC, as emphasizing the close relationship between the Caesar and Augustus.³²⁶ These coins put the relationship between Octavian/Augustus and Divus Julius on display, not only by equating them with each other, but also by excluding the possibility of anyone else claiming such a close connection to Divus Julius. In this context the connection would have contributed to establishing the legitimacy of Octavian's claim by winning over Caesar's supporters who were inclined to support whomever Caesar identified as his successor. Moreover, Augustus displayed the virtue of filial *pietas* to his family members by honoring his divine ancestor, and religious *pietas* by honoring a god of the Roman state pantheon. Discussing the Divus Augustus Pater/Pietas issues of Tiberius in honor of Divus Augustus, Grant has observed that the notion of *pietas* encompassed a broad range of ideas and argued that it would be wrong to imagine that one aspect excluded others.³²⁷

Other AUGUSTUS DIVI FILIUS coins focused on the actions of Octavian/Augustus rather than his relationship with Julius Caesar. In these coins victory was a dominant motif. A

³²⁴ *RIC I*² no. 620.

³²⁵ *BMCRE I* no. 69; 13, no. 70, pl. 2.20.

³²⁶ Whittaker 1996.

³²⁷ Grant 1950, 36. See also, Hölkeskamp 2006.

denarius of 32-39 BCE from an Italian mint showed a portrait of Augustus on the obverse with a victory alighting on a globe and the legend CAESAR DIVI F on the reverse. Issued in anticipation of the triple triumph in 29 BCE, a coin that not only declares Octavian's status but also conveys the message that his victory was a result of the favor of the gods, a favor indicated by his status as the son of a god (**Fig. 2.37**).³²⁸ Analyzing the evolving concept of the divine election of the emperor as a political concept in Rome, Fears distinguishes between the idea of being chosen by the gods to conquer in battle and the dynastic character of divine protection and favor, however, Divi Filius coins bearing images of victory adeptly synthesize these two ideas.³²⁹

For the immediate successors of Julius Caesar and Augustus employing the image of Divus Julius or Divus Augustus in order to suggest the future deification of the reigning emperor would have been bound up with a dynastic message because of family relationships. According to Gagè the integration of Divus Julius into a triad with Mars and Venus in the Temple of Mars Ultor anticipated Augustus' own deification, a plausible interpretation by the time of the dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor in 2 BCE after several decades of Augustan rule (**Fig. 2.9**).³³⁰

Favro, and more recently Sumi, have aptly characterized the architectural complex of the Temple of Divus Julius together with the commemorative arches added later on either side by Augustus, as a dynastic ensemble that served as a terminus for a major axis of the Roman Forum.³³¹ Built in 19 BCE to celebrate the return of the Parthian standards by Augustus, the Parthian arch likely spanned the right of way between the Temple of Divus Julius and the

³²⁸ *RIC I*² no. 254b. On the role of the emperor's status as heir to a god helping to secure divine support and status for the successor, see Hekster 2009, 101.

³²⁹ Fears 1977, 321-3.

³³⁰ Gagè 1930, 193.

³³¹ Favro 1996; Sumi 2011, 205, 21.

Temple of Castor and Pollux (**Fig. 2.38**). A monumental inscription nine feet long and two feet high recorded the dedication, “The Roman Senate and people to Imperator Caesar, son of the deified Iulius, consul for the fifth time, consul designate for the sixth time, imperator for the seventh time, the Republic having been saved.”³³² Fifteen years before the Temple of Mars Ultor, the Parthian Arch combined with the temple of Divus Julius also raised the issue of Augustus’ deification. Although the explicit purpose of the arch was to commemorate the return of the Parthian standards, saving the Republic is also clearly presented as an accomplishment. With the notion of deification as a consequence of great deeds in circulation at the time, viewers must have considered the arch together with the temple of Augustus’ deified father as a suggestion of Augustus’ future deification. The temple further alludes to Augustus’ triumph over his enemies through the ships’ beaks adorning the Rostra Julia, the winged victories in the figural frieze of the Temple of Divus Julius, and *spoglia* from Egyptian victories housed in the temple.

Tiberius’ eulogy of Augustus, performed from the rostra of the Temple of Divus Julius similarly promoted the idea of his own deification. Tiberius vividly revealed himself as bearer of the divine torch passed from Divus Julius, represented in the temple towering behind him, and Augustus, whose deeds Tiberius recounted for the expectant crowd. Placement of the statue of Divus Augustus reclining on a gold *lectisternium* in the Temple of Mars Ultor put Divus Augustus in the purview of his divine ancestors. Extending the divine chain yet another link from Mars and Venus to Divus Julius and then to Divus Augustus increased the likelihood that one of their descendants, namely Tiberius, would possess the virtues and engage in meritorious action justifying his own deification.

³³² CIL 6.873: *Senatus Populusque Romanus/Imp(eratori) Caesari Divi Iuli F(ilio) Co(n)s(uli) Quinct(um) Co(n)s(uli) Design(ato) Sext(um) Imp(eratori) Sept(imum) Re Publica Conservata* (Nedergaard 1993. 82).

Perhaps the best example of the *divi* invoked primarily and unquestionably with dynastic implications, one not instigated by the imperial house, is a dedication to the Julio-Claudian emperors and members of the imperial family found at the base of the Palatine during excavations in the area of the Meta Sudans.³³³ The dedication consists of a long, paratactic statue podium, initially dedicated under Tiberius and to which additional statues were added at least through Nero's reign (**Fig. 2.39**).

Inscriptions on large marble slabs affixed to the front of the approximately one meter high base identified the patrons as the *aenatores*, *tubicines*, *liticines*, and *cornicines* of Rome, the corporate group of hornblowers, trumpeters, clarion, and cornet players that served at public religious functions. Now in the Baths of Diocletian, the inscriptions identified the images with the extended imperial titlature. Dedicated in 12 BCE, the statue of Augustus is identified as "Imp(eratori) Caesari Divi f(ilio)/Augusto" and additional titles. In 7 the *collegium* added a separate base for Tiberius, "Ti(berio) Claudio Ti(beri) filio/Neroni." While the base of Tiberius remained separate, in 42 the base of Augustus was augmented to include Claudius, "Ti(berio) Claudio Drusi f(ilio)/Caisari Augusto Germanico." Finally, in 55-56 at the start of Nero's reign the college made two final additions: a statue of Nero between Augustus and Claudius and one for Agrippina beside Claudius. Nero was "Divi Claudii f(ilio)," the son of Divus Claudius, "Germanici Caisaris n(epoti)," grandson of Germanicus, "Ti(beri) Caisaris Aug(usti) pro n(epoti)," the great grandson of Tiberius, and "Divi Augusti ab n(epoti)," the great great grandson of Divus Augustus.³³⁴ Enumeration of divine lineage is also common in individual dedications to emperors and imperial family members found elsewhere in Rome. On a statue base found on the Capitoline and dated to between 14 and 15, the identifying inscription in honor

³³³ For the excavation results, see Panella 1996, 201-16.

³³⁴ For the full text of the inscriptions, see Panella 1996, 201-2.

of Drusus the younger delineates his status as son of Tiberius, grandson of Divus Augustus and great grandson of Divus Julius.³³⁵

Nero's mother Agrippina, the only woman honored in the Velian complex, was labeled the daughter of Germanicus and wife of Divus Claudius, "Divi Cla[udi uxori]."³³⁶ Though commissioned by a corporate group, the monument seems to reflect imperial policy. Close analysis of the inscribed slabs has revealed that at some point between Agrippina's death and the fire in 64, after which the monument was leveled, Agrippina was removed from her position on the monument beside her husband Claudius and balancing out the presence of her grandfather Augustus on the far end of the podium. For Nero, the inclusion of Tiberius and Germanicus in his lineage were necessary in order to maintain the direct line of descent from Divus Augustus, himself a *divi filius*, to the present dedication. Originally built in the saddle between the Palatine and Caelian Hills, during the reign of Nero the monument was conspicuously located at a nexus of monuments consisting of the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus near the Roman Forum and the later Temple of Divus Claudius under construction on the Caelian, further highlighting Nero's divine ancestry as presented in the inscription to the dedication.

Agrippa's Pantheon, dedicated in 27 BCE, presents a more complicated situation. Coarelli has characterized Agrippa's Pantheon as a sanctuary to the gens Julia.³³⁷ Within the Pantheon the statue of Divus Julius joined a number of other gods of the Roman state including Mars, Venus and several that are unknown.³³⁸ Statues of Marcus Agrippa and Augustus graced niches flanking the entrance to the inner chamber. Agrippa's first choice was to include a statue

³³⁵ Gordon 1958, 66-7, no. 59, pl. 29b.

³³⁶ Kragelund 2007, 27-9.

³³⁷ Coarelli and Luisanna 1980.

³³⁸ Summarizing recent research on the Agrippan Pantheon, see Ziolkowski 1999.

of Augustus with the gods, an option Augustus famously declined. His refusal of the honor is not surprising. Twenty-seven BCE was also the year that Augustus returned nominal power to the Roman Senate and in which the Senate granted Octavian the new titles of Augustus and Princeps. In connection with his new titles Augustus refused the name Romulus perhaps because of its strong connection with kingship and monarchy.

With the benefit of hindsight it seems obvious that the Pantheon implicitly suggested Augustus' future divinity, however, based on his decline of other honors combined with the infancy of Julius Caesar's cult, at the time of its construction it is unlikely that Augustus would have encouraged or sanctioned such an interpretation.³³⁹ More likely the Pantheon further demonstrated the incorporation of Divus Julius into the eternal state pantheon and demonstrated the *pietas* of Augustus and Agrippa to the collective group of state gods. As the idea of deification based on great deeds gained additional currency, as the Empire prospered and expanded under Augustan rule, and as Augustus completed the Mausoleum and Horologium complex in the Campus Martius in dialogue with Agrippa's Pantheon, the temple to all the gods must have later provoked in viewers the likely possibility that Augustus would join Divus Julius and the other stars housed within temple *cella*.

Conclusion

Conceptions of the divinely ordained leader were not new under Augustus, yet it is clear that the idea evolved significantly to the point that the leaders themselves became divine after death.³⁴⁰ As the Roman Empire was conceived under Augustus and his immediate successors the

³³⁹ Noting that in 25 B.C.E., two years after the 'restoration' of the Republic, implying semi-divine honors would have been out of the question, Ziolkowski argues that the Agrippan Pantheon was not a dynastic shrine, see 2007.

³⁴⁰ Distinguishing between concepts of divine protection, divine election, and god-given victory, Fears focuses on the specific question of divine election in official ideology (Fears 1977). As Fears acknowledges that in the popular

ruler had the support, approval, and protection of the gods, as well as the potential to become one of the group of divinities on which the Fortune of the Roman world depended. From Romulus' invocation of the gods when he founded the city it is evident that, although he called specifically on only a few gods, implicitly the Roman people depended on all gods with whom they had established a reciprocal relationship. Ovid recounts the words of Romulus:

The king spoke thus: "O Jupiter, and Father Mars, and Mother Vesta, stand by me as I found the city! O take heed, all ye gods whom piety bids summon! Under your auspices may this my fabric rise! May this imperial country long endure and its dominion! May east and west be subject to it! So he prayed. Jupiter vouchsafed omens by thunder on the left and lightning flashing in the leftward sky."³⁴¹

The city founded by Romulus, Ovid observes, was "destined to set its victorious foot upon the whole earth."³⁴² For Ovid the greatness and imperial mission of Rome was tied to the will of the state gods, those that would favor the Roman people in exchange for maintenance of the *pax deorum*. Moreover, the gods ordained that Rome be subject to great Caesar, and Ovid prays that there will be several of that name. Even under Augustus, the poets recognized the beginning of an enduring tradition, one that would include present leaders and subsequent rulers who would step into the shoes of Caesar.

While the intended aim of the first cults of *divi*, Divus Julius and Divus Augustus included legitimization of the successor's power, the effect was to create something with the potential to resonate long after the successor's reign. Divus Julius and Divus Augustus were the epiphany of empire without end, a manifestation of Rome's limitless potential. Venerating the

mind there may not have been such distinctions, neither will this project dwell on them, preferring instead the all-encompassing idea of divine favor which could take many forms.

³⁴¹ Ov. *Fasti* 4.827-833: (. . . *vox fuit haec regis: "conenti, Iuppiter, urbem et genitor Mavors Vestaque mater, ades; quosque pium est adhibere deos, advertite cuncti. Auspicibus vobis hoc mihi surgat opus. Longa sit huic aetas domitaeque potential terrae, sitque sub hac orens occiduusque dies. ille precabatur, tonitru dedit omina laevo Iuppiter, et laevo fulmina missa polo).*

³⁴² Ov. *Fasti* 4.857-862: (*urbs orbitur . . . victorem terries impositura pedem).*

individual deceased leaders as eternal gods of the Roman state pantheon aligned with glorification of the state, yet presented a tension between venerating the individual and the glory of Rome. The Roman understanding of the *divi* reveals the Roman's self-conception during a critical phase in its history that witnessed the development of the Roman Empire. With the funeral of Divus Augustus soon after the emperor's death, the eulogy and procession served to contextualize the dead emperor's life, while the Temples to Divus Julius and Divus Augustus suppressed personal history in the service of recontextualizing the *divi* within the eternal world of Roman state religion and an '*imperium sine fine*.'

Table 1

Date and Event	Sample Entry	Calendar
January 17 – wedding anniversary of Augustus and Livia	<i>Feriae ex senates c(onsulto) quod eo die Augusta nupsit divo Aug[us]t(o)</i>	<i>Fasti Verulani</i> (DeGrassi 160)
July 12 – Birthday of Julius Caesar		<i>Fasti Antiates Ministrorum</i> (DeGrassi 208) <i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 189)
July 20 – victory games in honor of Divus Julius given by Augustus	<i>Lud(i) Victor(iae) Caes(aris) divi Iul(i) commit(tuntur)</i>	<i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 191)
August 1 – for saving Augustus from danger	<i>ex s(enatus) c(onsulto), q(uod) e(o) d(ie) Imp. Caesar Divi f. rem public(am) tristissim(o) periculo liberat</i>	<i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 191)
August 2 – Victory of Caesar in Spain		<i>Fasti Antiates Ministrorum</i> (DeGrassi 208)
August 9 – Victory of Caesar at Pharsalus		<i>Fasti Antiates Ministrorum</i> (DeGrassi 208)
Augustus 18 – die natalis of the Temple of Divus Julius	<i>Divo Iulio ad Forum 'Aedis divi Iul(ii) ded(icata)</i>	<i>Fasti Allifani</i> (DeGrassi 181) <i>Fasti Antiates Ministrorum</i> (DeGrassi 208) <i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 191) <i>Fasti Fandozziani</i> (DeGrassi 233)
September 2 – Victory of Augustus at Actium	<i>ex s(enatus) c(onsulto), quod eo die Imp Caes(ar) Divi f. Augustus apud Actium vicit</i>	<i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 193)
September 3 – Victory of Augustus in Sicily	<i>die Caes(ar) Divi f. vicit in Sicilia</i>	<i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 193)
September 17 – Date of Senatorial decree to consecrate Augustus	<i>ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) q(uod) e(o) d(ie) divo Augusto honores caeles-tes a senatu decreti Aug(usto) hon(ores) cael(estes) d[ecreti] ex s(enatus) c(onsulto), [quo]d eo die honores caelestes divo Augusto</i>	<i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 195) <i>Fasti Antiates Ministrorum</i> (DeGrassi 208) <i>Fasti Viae dei Serpenti</i> (DeGrassi 215)
September 23 – Birthday of Augustus		<i>Fasti Pighiani</i> (DeGrassi 219)
October 3 – Games of the Augustales		<i>Fasti Antiates Ministrorum</i> (DeGrassi 208)

October 5 – Games to Divus Augustus and Fortuna Redux		<i>Fasti Amiternini</i> (DeGrassi 195)
October 12 – for Augustus crossing the seas to return from the provinces		<i>Fasti Viae dei Serpenti</i> (DeGrassi 215)
October 19 – Augustus assumed the toga virilis	<i>Divus Aug(ustus) tog(am) [v]irilem sum(psit)</i>	<i>Fasti Antiates</i> (DeGrassi 209)

CHAPTER 3

JULIO-CLAUDIAN DIVI, DIVUS CLAUDIUS, AND CIVIL WAR: NEGOTIATION AND NOVELTY (54-69)

Introduction: Uncertain Power and Divine Intervention

Although the process of imperial succession from Augustus to Tiberius was complicated, Augustus was wisely cognizant of the need to provide for a clear line of succession and avoid the strife caused by the civil wars that preceded his own rise to power. In order to secure a two-step line of succession Augustus adopted Tiberius on the condition that Tiberius adopt Germanicus Julius Caesar, the son of Nero Claudius Drusus, Livia's other son and also an adopted heir of Augustus. The untimely death of Germanicus thwarted Augustus' intentions. During the reign of Tiberius there may have been a perception that the nascent cult of Divus Augustus was still insecure: Tiberius expressed concern that if a successor were chosen from outside the imperial family, the memory of Augustus and name of the Caesars might be turned to derision and contempt.³⁴³ Nonetheless, Tiberius found suitable successors and left his estates jointly to Caligula, the ever-popular Germanicus' son and Tiberius' grandson by adoption, and to Tiberius Julius Caesar Nero Gemellus, Tiberius' natural grandson and Caligula's cousin.³⁴⁴ On 28 March 37 Caligula entered Rome amid great fanfare and was acclaimed by the Senate and people. With the death of Gemellus, executed shortly after Tiberius' death for allegedly plotting against Caligula, Caligula became sole emperor.

After a number of unsuccessful conspiracies against Caligula precipitated by his unpopularity with the Senate, certain members of the Praetorian Guard led by Cassius Chaerea

³⁴³ Tac. *Ann.* 6.46: (*sin extra domum successor quaereretur, ne memoria Augusti, ne nomen Caesarum in ludibria et contumelias verterent, metuebat*).

³⁴⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.72; 4.57.

and assisted by members of the Senate and equestrian order, assassinated Caligula on 24 January 41 during the Ludi Palatini in honor of Divus Augustus.³⁴⁵ While Suetonius gives a somewhat abbreviated account of Caligula's assassination and Claudius' accession, he includes a curious detail: while voting in favor of restoring the Republic the Senate also discussed destroying the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus in order to abolish their memory, and implicitly the memory of the Roman Empire, a conception presumably viewed as inherently inconsistent with a Republican restoration.³⁴⁶ The radical nature of the Senate's proposal to destroy the temples to *divi* is suggested by the rarity with which memory sanctions manifested in the demolition of buildings and other architectural monuments.³⁴⁷ Moreover, the proposal to destroy the temples shows how highly charged they were as religious and political symbols. The debate, however, was about much more than the temples, it was also about the memory of the deified emperors and form of the Roman government that they must have represented.

It is significant that, at least as recorded by Suetonius, there was no proposal to destroy portraits, arches, or any other monuments commemorating Julius Caesar or Augustus. In the heat of the moment while the Senate debated restoration of the Republic they believed the surest route to strike at the heart of imperial memory was to destroy the temples. Other monuments may have been understood as commemorating specific virtues or deeds of Julius Caesar or Augustus, isolated incidents deemed less threatening to the restoration of the Republic than the emperor conceived as an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon requiring obligatory ongoing veneration. Destruction of the temples would have been a desperate act, the proposal of which indicates a desire to turn back the clock, a sentiment echoed in Josephus' description of Chaerea

³⁴⁵ Jos. *AJ* 19.1.3; 19.1.11.

³⁴⁶ On Suetonius' account see above, pp. 1-2; Hammond 1956, 65.

³⁴⁷ See Davies 2000.

demanding a new watchword from the Senate who gave him ‘Liberty’, looking back to years earlier when democracy was laid aside.³⁴⁸

To the accounts of Caligula’s assassination and Claudius’ accession in Suetonius and Dio may be added additional details from version of events present by Josephus in the *Antiquities of the Jews* embedding the events of January 41 within a narrative extolling the career of King Agrippa.³⁴⁹ Although Josephus drew on a senatorial and a pro-Claudian source molding the material to suit his own purposes, he was writing for a Roman audience and so it is possible to discern what he perceived to be significant and relatable to his audience.³⁵⁰ Striking is the emphasis in Josephus on the Roman debate over the form of government and the uncertainty that the debate caused among the soldiers and the Senate. Josephus foregrounds these issues by specifying that the games on the day Caligula died were in honor of that Caesar who changed the government and transferred it to himself and that the deed itself happened right after Caligula offered sacrifice to Divus Augustus.³⁵¹

In the confusion immediately following the assassination rumors were rampant among the spectators in the theater until a public crier named Euaristus Arruntius publicly announced the assassination. German soldiers in the theater threatened the spectators but refrained from harming them because the soldiers were afraid they might be punished if the supreme authority of the Princeps reverted back to the Senate.³⁵² For the German soldiers the possibility of a Republican restoration must have seemed very real. Members of the Senate encouraged everyone

³⁴⁸ Jos. *AJ* 19.2.3.

³⁴⁹ On Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 19.1-273, see Wiseman 1991.

³⁵⁰ On the sources for Book 19, see Goud 1996.

³⁵¹ On the Caesar who changed the government, see Jos. *AJ* 19.1.11. On the timing of the assassination, see Jos. *AJ* 19.1.13.

³⁵² Jos. *AJ* 19.1.18.

to go home as though they were already in charge. Two meetings ensued: one in the praetorian camp and one in the Senate house. According to Josephus, the soldiers decided that a republican form of government was incapable of administering the vast extent of Roman affairs and declared Claudius the emperor on the basis of his noble ancestry and great learning believing that only he would be able to prevent a civil war as had occurred in the time of Pompey.³⁵³ It is true that Claudius did not present a clear case for succession through the channels employed to date: adoption by an earlier emperor, sharing honors with an earlier emperor, identification as chief heir, status as a Caesar, or member of the Julian family.³⁵⁴ Yet, uncertainty over Claudius' succession was not really about Claudius per se but about the form of government.

Remarkable too is Josephus' insistence by many of the players in Caligula's assassination and its aftermath of their divinely ordained cause. Josephus is writing from the perspective of a Jewish Roman citizen, however, and he attributes a certain mindset to his Roman actors that must have been plausible and convincing to a late first century Roman audience. For example, when Chaerea heard someone cry out as he approached Caligula he believed it was divine encouragement urging him to complete his task.³⁵⁵ The idea that the gods cleared out a bad emperor to make way for someone better also appears in the story of the soldier who tells a cowering Claudius to take over the throne after the gods, in their concern for the habitable world, removed Caligula from it. Only in retrospect, however, is it possible to see where the gods' favor lay. In the senatorial debate following the assassination Gnaeus Sentius Saturninus prophetically stated that the endurance of liberty, one safeguarded by the Senate in a Republican Rome, would be by a grant of the gods. Of course, he couldn't know that within a day Claudius would secure

³⁵³ Jos. *AJ* 19.2.1. Other considerations included the fact that Claudius was the brother of Germanicus, much-loved by the soldiers, and that the Senate also made many mistakes when they were in charge during the Republic.

³⁵⁴ Osgood 2011, 11-5.

³⁵⁵ Jos. *AJ* 19.3.2.

the imperial office. In listing the many offenses of the emperors, Saturninus cites Caligula as the worst concluding, in contrast to the opinion of the Praetorian Guard, that the republican government was the Senate's best chance at maintaining control and restoring order.³⁵⁶

That similar debates over the form of government occurred among senators and among soldiers three decades after Augustus' death supports the view that the early empire was a time of adaptation to a new political order, one in which senatorial opposition to imperial power was precipitated at least in part by the hereditary succession of unworthy candidates creating a tension between a desire for stability provided by dynastic heirs and the possibility that those heirs were unworthy successors.³⁵⁷ The development of an imperial office that stood outside of worldly concerns in the eternal realm of the gods balanced the hereditary succession of the Principate so anathema to the Senate and easy to question in the absence of a constitutional definition of succession. Necessary to this development was the addition of Divus Claudius, the first emperor after Divus Augustus deemed worthy of deification. Subsequently, with the strife brought on by the civil wars of 68-69 that marked the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, the *divi* powerfully evoked the continuity and eternity of the Empire.

Julio-Claudian *Divi* and the Temple of Divus Augustus

In the period between the death of Augustus and the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty Augustus and several other members of the imperial family received divine honors. After Livia's death Tiberius resisted the Senate's desire to deify her, employed minimal honors for her funeral, and refused to execute her will.³⁵⁸ Claudius, however, successfully encouraged the Senate to

³⁵⁶ Jos. *AJ* 19.2.2.

³⁵⁷ McAlindon 1956.

³⁵⁸ Cass. Dio 58.2.1-3, 6; Tac. *Ann.* 5.1.

deify Livia in 42.³⁵⁹ As possible reasons for the Senate's ratification of Livia's deification Fred Kleiner suggests that she saved the lives of a number of senators, reared several senators' children, and helped citizens pay their daughters dowries.³⁶⁰ Before death she had received the honorific title *mater patriae*, mother of the fatherland, in parallel to the title *pater patriae* granted to both Julius Caesar and Augustus and indicating the high regard in which she was held. An arch voted to Livia by the Senate after her death in lieu of deification but never built provides further support for her popularity.³⁶¹ After her deification Claudius appointed the Vestals, priestesses whose primary responsibility was maintaining the sacred, eternal hearth of Rome, to make sacrifices to Diva Augusta and maintain her cult.³⁶²

A dupondius issued from the Roman mint in 42 commemorating Livia's deification shows the radiate head of Divus Augustus on the obverse. Accompanied by the legend DIVA AUGUSTA on the reverse, Diva Livia is depicted seated on an ornamental throne wearing a wreath of wheat stalks and holding wheat stalks and a long torch in her hands (**Fig. 3.1**).³⁶³ The coin may have represented Livia's cult statue consecrated in the Temple of Divus Augustus as suggested by later coins issued under Antoninus Pius commemorating a restoration of the temple.³⁶⁴ In the Antonine coins seated cult statues of Diva Livia and Divus Augustus appear between the center two columns (**Fig. 7.31, 7.32**). Epigraphic evidence further attests to the inclusion of Diva Livia in official worship in the Temple of Divus Augustus referring to the

³⁵⁹ Suet. *Claud.* 11.2; Cass. Dio 60.5.2.

³⁶⁰ Kleiner 1990, 509.

³⁶¹ Kleiner 1990.

³⁶² Cass. Dio, 60.5.2.

³⁶³ *RIC I*² no. 101; *BMCRE I* no. 224.

³⁶⁴ See Osgood 2011, 55-6.

‘aeditus templum Divi Aug. [et] Divi Augustae.’³⁶⁵ In addition, during a ceremony on 17 January 44 with some of the most prominent men of Rome present, the Arval Brethren dedicated a cow to Diva Augusta and a bull to Divus Augustus.³⁶⁶

While acknowledging that only the cult statues of Augustus and Livia are visible on any of the coins, Fishwick has suggested that the reference by Cassius Dio to the Temple of Divus Augustus as an *aedes Caesarum* implies that *simulacra*, cult statues, of later *divi* were added to those of Divus Augustus and Diva Livia. From an inscription dated to 153 Fishwick concludes that later *divi* housed in the temple each received an individual *aedicula*.³⁶⁷ With one possible temporary exception, however, the evidence supports the Temple of Divus Augustus as a center of veneration only for Divus Augustus and Diva Livia. It is plausible that a cult statue of Claudius may have found its temporary home in the Temple of Divus Augustus between the time of Claudius’ deification and construction and dedication of the temple.

Although Nero allegedly failed to complete the Temple of Divus Claudius and Suetonius reports that he neglected and then cancelled the divine honors accorded to Claudius, the evidence discussed below suggests that Claudius’ cult remained vital under Nero.³⁶⁸ Where did cult veneration take place until the new temple complex was operational? Under Tiberius a gold image of Divus Augustus found its home in the Temple of Mars Ultor until completion of the Temple of Divus Augustus. If a statue of Divus Claudius also required a location for veneration pending completion of his temple then the Temple of Divus Augustus, his divine ancestor and the first deified emperor, would have been a natural choice. A senatorial decree recorded in the

³⁶⁵ *CIL* 6.4222.

³⁶⁶ Those present included L. Vitellius, Claudius’ prospective son-in-law L. Silanus and Silanus’ brother Marcus, and another prospective son-in-law, Pompeius Magnus (Osgood 2011, 56).

³⁶⁷ Fishwick 1992.

³⁶⁸ Suet. *Claud.* 45. On evidence for cult of Divus Claudius under Nero, see pp. 117.

Tabula Hebana required that a *sella curulis* of Germanicus be placed in the temple of Mars Ultor after his death in 19 until the Temple of Divus Augustus was completed and that the statue be carried from the Temple of Mars Ultor to the circus during the Ludi Augustales.³⁶⁹ Germanicus was not deified and so not venerated in accordance with the Roman state cult, however, inclusion of his statue in the temple as a posthumous honor may have suggested the name Aedes Caesarum for the Temple of Divus Augustus to later authors.

Could other consecrated members of the Julio-Claudian imperial family have received cult within the Temple of Divus Augustus? Drusilla is one possibility. After her death in 38 at Caligula's instigation the Senate deified his sister Drusilla who was the first woman to become a *diva*.³⁷⁰ A Senator who witnessed Drusilla's ascent to heaven was generously rewarded with 1,000,000 sesterces. Neither Cassius Dio nor Suetonius mention the specific honors for Drusilla, if any, though they did for the deified emperors, which may indicate that the Senate assented to the deification but did not grant the full cohort of heavenly honors. Concluding from the material evidence that the consecration of Diva Drusilla was well-received in the provinces, Susan Wood has demonstrated that the reputations of Caligula's sisters suffered 'collateral damage' in the ancient sources.³⁷¹ For example, inscriptions from Caere attest that a dedication to Diva Drusilla, from which the statue has survived, was included in a Julio-Claudian statue group in the theater of Caere (**Fig. 3.2**).³⁷² In the unlikely event that Caligula placed an image of Diva Drusilla in the Temple of Divus Augustus, as he did in the Temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum of Julius Caesar, it may have been removed after the assassination of Caligula or it may have survived

³⁶⁹ Fishwick 1992, 233-4.

³⁷⁰ Suet. *Calig.* 24.2; Cass.Dio 59.11.1-5; Sen. *Apoc.* 1.

³⁷¹ Wood 1995.

³⁷² On *CIL* 9.3598 see, Wood 1995, 477-8, n. 74. On the statue of Diva Drusilla from the theater of Caere, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano, inv. 9952, see Wood 1995, 470.

until the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty based on the association of Diva Drusilla with her sister Agrippina the Younger, the mother of Nero and wife of Claudius.³⁷³

It is significant that Caligula chose not to issue coins specifically commemorating Drusilla's deification. With good reason, Wood conjectures that although Drusilla enjoyed a prominence unknown to earlier imperial women, functioning as a symbolic genetrix of the Julian line within Caligula's dynastic imagery during life and after death, he may have recognized that her status as a *diva* should not be equal to that of Divus Augustus.³⁷⁴ Consistent with this approach are provincial issues commemorating Diva Drusilla in which she remains, depicted along with her sisters Agrippina and Livilla and her mother Agrippina the Elder, closely integrated into the structure of the imperial family without a seemingly independent divine presence (**Fig. 3.3**).³⁷⁵ Without a temple in the Roman landscape and recurring obligation of future remembrance entailed by cult ritual the significance of her deification and its resulting manifestations in the visual realm remained primarily dynastic.³⁷⁶ Indeed, any commemoration of her cult in Rome likely ended shortly after the death of Caligula.

Unlike Drusilla there is some evidence for cult veneration in Rome of Nero's second wife Diva Poppaea who died in 65. Tacitus barely mentions her deification preferring instead to recall the unusual circumstances of her elaborate state funeral: her embalmed body stuffed with spices combined with the overpowering use of incense.³⁷⁷ In Rome a fragment of the *Fasti* for the

³⁷³ Cass. Dio 59.11.2-3.

³⁷⁴ Though Wood notes a number of provincial cities in which Diva Drusilla's portrait had a role in the public image of the imperial family, including Apamea in Bithynia (Wood 1995, 458-63). See also, Arena 2009, 81-2.

³⁷⁵ See Wood 1995, 463.

³⁷⁶ Literary sources mention plans to build a shrine accompanied by twenty priests and priestesses but where or if it was ever built is unknown (Grether 1939, 92).

³⁷⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 16.6.

Sodales Augustales Claudiales for 64/66 includes ‘Divae Poppaeae augustae’.³⁷⁸ The context of the inscription mentioning ‘vaccam honori vaccam aeterni’ and ‘novo divo aug(usto) B(ovem M(arem))’ in the preceding lines suggests that Diva Poppaea was included in a list of dead and living sacrificial beneficiaries. Dio attests to a temple to Diva Poppaea inaugurated by Nero in 68 several months before the end of his reign and built either in Campania or Rome.³⁷⁹ Though the location is uncertain, based on a detailed analysis of the sources describing the many connections of Nero and Poppaea to Pompeii, Stabiae, and Oplontis, P. Kragelund has recently concluded that the shrine was more likely established in Campania.³⁸⁰ Like Drusilla, no evidence for the veneration of Poppaea after Nero’s death survives.

Two years before Poppaea’s death in 63 the Senate decreed an *aedes*, a *pulvinar*, and priestesses in honor of Claudia Augusta, Nero and Poppaea’s only daughter who died of illness three months after her birth.³⁸¹ In his eulogy of Poppaea Nero refers to her as the mother of a deified infant whose cult should be celebrated in the same place as the infant. F. Chausson has cited certain modifications in the area of the Domus Aurea that could have been a cult place for Diva Claudia and possibly Diva Poppaea, but whether a cult structure to either of these divinities was ever built in Rome remains uncertain.³⁸²

If priests inaugurated cult sites for Drusilla, Poppaea, or Claudia the Senate and subsequent emperors could only desacralize these places through a ceremony known as *exauguratio*, a recategorization of the land as *profanum* rather than *res sacrae*.³⁸³ Without an

³⁷⁸ *CIL* 6.32345. Gordon 1958, no. 117.

³⁷⁹ Cass. Dio 63.26.1

³⁸⁰ Kragelund 2010.

³⁸¹ Tac. *Ann.* 15.23. See also Grether 1939, 103-7.

³⁸² Chausson 2001, 347.

³⁸³ Livy 5.54-57.

exauguratio presumably the state would have remained responsible for cult structures and rites in accordance with the *pax deorum*. Even if a shrine had fallen into neglect, Pliny suggests that in theory nothing else could be done with a plot of land if was still consecrated to another god.³⁸⁴

As an inherently revisionist act an *exauguratio* would have vividly demonstrated that the individual deities were no longer a part of Rome's religious memory and any references to them in the Roman calendar would have been removed as well. Ritual desecralization of cult sites may have been one tool in the arsenal of memory sanctions employed against emperors such as Caligula and Nero.

Deification of Claudius: Addressing Contemporary Bias

Claudius was deified in 54 because, as Barbara Levick notes, "Nero's own position demanded it."³⁸⁵ Fishwick claims that already by this time the process had evolved so that the Senatorial decree took place before the funeral rather than after the funeral implying increasing influence by the Senate in the decision whether or not to deify dead emperors.³⁸⁶ Accounts of Claudius' deification recording that the Senate enrolled Claudius among the gods, voted heavenly (*caelestes*) honors in his favor similar to the honors for Augustus, and granted Claudius a funeral as lavish and in all formal respects like Augustus indicate that ancient authors considered Divus Augustus the prototype for imperial deification and that the honors and funeral of Augustus were well-known enough that writers could simply refer to them as a sort of formulaic shorthand for imperial deification.³⁸⁷ Like Tiberius after the death of Augustus, Nero

³⁸⁴ In an inquiry to Trajan about building a bath complex in Prusa, Pliny requests that Trajan clarify whether a part of the land had ever been consecrated for a shrine to Claudius (Pliny *Epist.* 10.71).

³⁸⁵ Levick 1990, 187.

³⁸⁶ Fishwick 2002, 346.

³⁸⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 12.69.4; Suet. *Claud.* 45 (in numerum deorum relates); Suet. *Nero* 9.

delivered a eulogy for Claudius in the Forum. Assenting to construction of a temple on the Caelian for Divus Claudius, the Senate also granted the privilege of two lictors to Agrippina and appointed her as a priestess of Divus Claudius, a *flaminium Claudiale*.³⁸⁸

Despite the formal decree of deification and accompanying honors, contemporary derision for the cult of Divus Claudius that may be exaggerated colors modern scholarship. For instance, Levick claims that contemporary writers ignored the deification by referring to the Emperor Claudius without his title of Divus.³⁸⁹ Even for Divus Augustus, however, writers did not always use the title Divus. It is true that sources referred to Claudius as Divus rarely under Nero but this may indicate uncertainty regarding the cult because of stalled construction of the temple or uncertainty over Vespasian's treatment of Divus Claudius rather than overt disregard for Claudius' divine status.

Claiming that the site of the Temple of Divus Claudius would have been solely the prerogative of the Senate whose goal was to ridicule Claudius, Fishwick attributes the location of the Temple of Divus Claudius on the Caelian to contemporary bias against Divus Claudius. The Senate, he concludes, chose the site because of its associations with dubious factions of the Etruscans and its proximity to a meat market and brothel, both of which supposedly would have appealed to Claudius.³⁹⁰ Based on the optimal sites of the Temples of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus, however, it is unlikely that the Senate had sole discretion in locating new temples, especially temples to *divi* so closely connected to the imperial family. Moreover, Nero was the adopted son of Divus Claudius and reigning emperor and the Senate would not have wanted to alienate the new emperor by overtly insulting his divine father. While it might be argued that the

³⁸⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 13.2-3.

³⁸⁹ Levick 1990, 191-2.

³⁹⁰ Fishwick 2002.

temple was sidelined from more centrally located areas near the Forum and Palatine, it would have been difficult to find room for the enormous temple terrace closer to the Forum at the start of Nero's reign and before the fire of 64 cleared large areas of the city. More likely the gigantic scale of the temple complex as envisioned by Agrippina, visible from the Palatine and summit of the Sacred Way, may indicate that Agrippina was attempting to exceed the grandeur and scale of the temples to Claudius' predecessors.

Modern attitudes are also influenced by Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* published shortly after Claudius' deification, ridiculing Divus Claudius by claiming that the gods in heaven had not ratified his apotheosis. The *Apocolocyntosis* has been taken as evidence that Romans perceived deification as a grand joke, however, Seneca had good reason to despise the Emperor Claudius and may have had ulterior motives in impugning the emperor's memory.³⁹¹ In contrast, Price has persuasively interpreted the *Apocolocyntosis* as one faction's argument that deification was inappropriate for Claudius in particular rather than a commentary on deification as a general practice.³⁹² By calling into doubt the credibility of the man who witnessed Caligula's sister Drusilla translated to heaven Seneca similarly questions the validity of her deification.³⁹³

It is important to remember that by 54 the only deified emperor was Augustus, so Senatorial doubt over whether Claudius lived up to the standard set by Augustus is not surprising. Like other institutions such as the Roman triumph that glorified the emperor, deification of a dead emperor provided a context within which the posthumous judgment could be discussed and challenged.³⁹⁴ Seneca's jesting at Claudius' expense should not be taken as

³⁹¹ See also, Turcan 1998.

³⁹² Price 1987, 87-8.

³⁹³ Sen. *Apoc.* 1.

³⁹⁴ Beard 2007, 7.

negating the theological and political significance of deification, rather it is a cautionary tale that despite the mnemonic strategies employed in the architecture and cult of deification, the memory of each deceased emperor was a complex product of interaction not only between competing views in the collective realm but also of the individual's internalization of collective memory. Seneca was certainly not the only Roman to view religious and political ritual in favor of the emperor with skepticism. Tacitus openly criticizes what he believes to be the growing sycophancy of the Roman elite in the late first century: "Meanwhile at Rome, consuls, senate, knights, ran headlong into slavery. The greater a man was, the greater the insincerity and the haste, with expression carefully composed so as to show neither happiness at the death of one emperor nor too much grief at the succession of the next, they combined tears with joy, mourning with flattery."³⁹⁵

Similarly, Beard highlights the ambivalent nature of the triumph, an honor entailing high risk and one that could lead to success or signal failure.³⁹⁶ For instance, in later accounts of Pompey's life authors employed the triumph as evidence that the Fortune that once favored Pompey later abandoned him. There was, however, a key difference between the triumph, a one-time event that would later be recalled in the context of Roman history or an individual life, and a deified emperor who was the subject of continued, recurring veneration requiring Roman society to repeatedly reaffirm the importance and relevance of a *divus* such as Claudius. Once an emperor ascended to the heavens as a god, Fortune could no longer abandon him. Thus, although deification provided an arena for debate over the relative merits of an emperor's life, once deified and honored with a temple and cult, the new god was, with few exceptions, embedded in

³⁹⁵ Tac. *Ann.* 1.7.1.

³⁹⁶ In later accounts of Pompey's life authors employed the triumph as evidence that the Fortune that once favored him eventually abandoned him (Beard 2007, 34-70, 253).

Roman collective memory as a god independent of contemporary debates. Olivier Hekster cites the *Apocolocyntosis* as evidence that there was some middle ground between deification and damnation.³⁹⁷ While some deified emperors may have been more prominent in the collective memory than others whether through popularity of honors or prominence of the temple, the difference is in degree not in kind.

The *Apocolocyntosis* is a daring satire that would have been impossible without the context of official and unofficial debates provoked by decisions regarding the emperor's memory. Deification provided a catalyst for discussion about the desirable and undesirable qualities and deeds of the emperor, suggesting that deification was by no means certain even if the dead emperor's successor was in the same dynasty. In particular, Seneca highlighted Claudius' personal failings such as his cruelty and inarticulateness. From Seneca's remark that the proceedings on earth for deification were too well known to need recounting, it is apparent that debates over deification were familiar to Seneca's readers and were much more than empty gestures.³⁹⁸ Perhaps most interesting is the emphasis in the *Apocolocyntosis* on the divine senate. While some have seen an analogy between the divine senate and the earthly senate passing posthumous judgment on the deceased emperor, the satirical scene of divine debate may also reflect the Roman understanding of the divine sanction implicit in deification.

Temple of Divus Claudius and Cult Under Nero

Agrippina instigated the site selection of the Temple of Divus Claudius on the Caelian Hill, reported to have been sacred to the Gens Claudia (**Fig. 3.4**).³⁹⁹ In addition, she was

³⁹⁷ DeJong and Hekster 2008.

³⁹⁸ Sen. *Apoc.* 5.1.

³⁹⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 4.64.

responsible for initial work beginning in 59 on the enormous 180 by 220 m terrace that would eventually support the temple on one of the highest sites in Rome at 50 m above sea level.⁴⁰⁰ Various remains of the complex have been attributed to Agrippina including a monumental staircase on the west side of the terraced platform and vaulted parallel corridors in the rusticated masonry typical of Claudian architecture near the Church of San Giovanni e Paolo (**Fig. 3.5**).⁴⁰¹ Construction may have lapsed after the death of Agrippina in 59 until work began on the Domus Aurea in the Colosseum valley and on the Esquiline and Caelian Hills.⁴⁰² Further documented work in the area under Nero focused on the east side of the platform and the monumental nymphaeum, the remains of which are still visible along the Via Claudia. Spanning the entire length of one side of the platform, the nymphaeum consisted of an elaborate backdrop of scalloped and rectangular niches fronted by a screen of columns (**Fig. 3.6**).⁴⁰³ In connection with the nymphaeum and additional water works that flanked the ramp on the west side, Nero also completed the construction of a branch of the Aqua Claudia that terminated on the south side of the temple platform.⁴⁰⁴ Yet more accommodations for water works have been discovered on the north side across from the Colosseum in the form of a cistern that supported a flight of stairs up to the temple terrace.⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰⁰ Suet. *Claud.* 9.7. On the Temple of Divus Claudius, see Buzzetti 1993.

⁴⁰¹ Buzzetti 1993, 277-8.

⁴⁰² Colini 1944, 151-4.

⁴⁰³ Cox 2006, 37-40.

⁴⁰⁴ Cf. Darwall-Smith, who questions whether the structure on the east side of the temple podium was a nymphaeum. He claims that the façade was not waterproof and that it shows signs of having been built over a previous façade with a network of corridors and small rooms (Darwall-Smith 1996, 50). In his treatise on aqueducts Frontinus mentions that the temple was near the terminating arch of the Aqua Claudia (*Aq.* 20, 76).

⁴⁰⁵ Cox 2006, 42.

Seven fragments of the Forma Urbis comprise the primary evidence for the form and structure of the temple and surrounding complex (**Fig. 3.7**).⁴⁰⁶ According to the marble plan the temple stood in the center slightly set to the southeast toward the nymphaeum wall of the massive terrace. The dimensions were approximately 25 by 40 m. Although the Forma Urbis shows a prostyle, pentastyle temple with a pronaos three bays deep and protruding antae, more likely the temple was hexastyle.⁴⁰⁷ A five-step approach led up to the pronaos. Long narrow rectangular spaces indicated on the temple terrace probably contained plantings. The Claudian porticus, mentioned by Martial and which C. Buzzetti has suggested housed the Sodales Augustales Claudiales, is not indicated on the Forma Urbis fragments but it likely would have enclosed the temple platform on three or four sides, at the very least flanking the monumental entranceway surmounting a ramp on the west side.⁴⁰⁸

There is no guarantee that the details of the Forma Urbis, created under Septimius Severus between 203 and 211, accurately reflect the plan and size of the temple complex either in the early third century or at the time of its construction approximately 130 years earlier. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the Temple of Divus Claudius was destroyed by fire or any other means and that it was later rebuilt. Thus, although the marble plan was not intended to be a precise rendering of the city, it probably conveys the general form and proportions of the temple complex.

⁴⁰⁶ Buzzetti 1993, 277-8.

⁴⁰⁷ As in architectural representations on coins and sculptural reliefs accuracy in the Forma Urbis was not paramount. In the *Anglypha Traiani*, for example, the Temple of Castor was depicted with five columns across the façade rather than the eight that it actually had (see Torelli 1999).

⁴⁰⁸ Mart. *Epig.* 1.9-10. Rodríguez Almeida 1981, frag. 4b, pp. 26-7, pl. 2; 5a, pp. 26-7, 65-9, pl. 2; 5b, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5c, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5dg, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5e, pp. 26-7, pl. 2; 5f, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5h, pp. 26-7, pl. 2. For an inscription citing the Augustales Claudiales, see *CIL* 6.1984-1988. See also, Talamo 2007, 105-6.

The inclusion of the garden complex surrounding the temple indicated by long thin parallel lines on the Forma Urbis fragments is consistent with the surrounding areas under Nero. Recent virtual reconstructions of the Temple of Divus Claudius and the terrace underscore the visual assimilation of garden platform and surrounding gardens (**Fig. 3.8**).⁴⁰⁹ Eventually subsumed within the grounds of Nero's Domus Aurea, views from the temple platform south and east would have encompassed groves of trees, pastures with flocks, vineyards, and an artificial lake, a setting that Suetonius described as *rus in urbe*, countryside in the city.⁴¹⁰ While the Temple of Divus Claudius itself seems to conform to the two precedents of the Temple of Divus Julius and Temple of Divus Augustus, retaining the essential elements of temple form and providing an appropriate built environment for an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon, the temple's configuration within a porticoed garden setting is innovative and may have been intended to echo family commemoration on country estates.⁴¹¹

The nymphaeum along the west side of the temple platform was, as von Hesberg points out, the largest and most lavish display in Rome to date (**Fig. 3.9**).⁴¹² Built into the wall of the temple terrace and likely included in the inaugurated *templum*, the nymphaeum may have been intended on one level to glorify Divus Claudius. A monumental ramp surrounded by waterworks led up to the temple terrace on the east side of the platform. The nymphaeum provided a compliment to planned elements of the Domus Aurea as well as the comparable water feature on the opposite side of the terrace. In addition, as Varner argues, as part of a complex that constitutes the termination of Claudius' monumental aqueduct project, the nymphaeum is in some

⁴⁰⁹ Viscogliosi 2011.

⁴¹⁰ Suet. *Ner.* 31.

⁴¹¹ See Bodel 1997.

⁴¹² von Hesberg 2011, 110. See also Carandini, Bruno and Fraioli 2011, 151.

ways a culmination of the Aqua Claudia paying homage to Claudius.⁴¹³ In this context, the nymphaeum should be understood as ornamentation of the temple complex and a display of *pietas* by Nero.

The statement by Suetonius nearly fifty years after Nero's death that Nero destroyed the Temple of Divus Claudius has loomed large in accounts of Nero's reign, often taken at face value because the act seems characteristic of ancient authors' characterization of bad emperors such as Nero.⁴¹⁴ If Nero had obliterated the temple, as Suetonius' use of the term *destructum* suggests, the act displayed a profound lack of filial piety to his adoptive father, a disregard for the *pax deorum*, a lack of religious piety to a god of the Roman state pantheon, and a love of luxury demonstrated by the desecration of a sacred place with a lavish and elaborate nymphaeum intended to adorn his Domus Aurea.⁴¹⁵ In 1937 Martin Charlesworth first questioned whether Nero annulled the cult of Divus Claudius characterizing it as 'sheer folly' if he had, and later Turcan played down the reconstruction of the temple by Vespasian.⁴¹⁶ Robin Darwall-Smith is also reluctant to conclude that Nero destroyed the temple. He conjectures that the superstructure of the Temple of Divus Claudius may have been damaged in the fire of 64 and that Nero's construction efforts in the area focused on the Domus Aurea rather than immediately rebuilding the temple.⁴¹⁷ Henner von Hesberg recently concurs, noting that because the Temple of Divus Claudius was an integral component of the Domus Aurea, one highly visible across the

⁴¹³ Varner forthcoming.

⁴¹⁴ See also, e.g., Josephus' account that Caligula plundered Greek temples giving orders that all engravings, statues, and donations be brought to Rome to adorn his own house and gardens (*AJ* 19).

⁴¹⁵ This discussion of the Neronian Temple of Divus Claudius is indebted to discussions with Eric Varner, who brought recent developments and crucial evidence to my attention, such as the Agrippina Orans in the Centrale Montemartini in Rome.

⁴¹⁶ Charlesworth 1937; Turcan 1998. See also, Buzzetti 1993, 277-8.

⁴¹⁷ Darwall-Smith 1996, 48-52. See also, Cox 2006, 43-5.

landscaped grounds from the Esquiline wing, Nero would not have left the temple terrace empty or even worse, in ruins.⁴¹⁸

Nero's approach to religion is rarely mentioned by ancient historians, however, as statements by Suetonius and Dio confirm, ancient authors consciously depicted Nero as an emperor who openly demonstrated his contempt for religion by overtly violating his obligations to the gods through sacrilegious treatment of divine images located within sacred sanctuaries.⁴¹⁹ The comments of Suetonius on Nero's destruction of the Temple of Divus Claudius should be understood as part of this literary tradition. In the final words of his biography of Nero, Suetonius summarizes the extent of Nero's *pietas*, "He utterly despised all cults, with the sole exception of that of the Syrian Goddess, and even acquired such a contempt for her that he made water on her image . . ." ⁴²⁰ Cassius Dio recounts that, "As for . . . the votive offerings that he [Nero] stole from the very temples in Rome, no one could ever enumerate them all."⁴²¹ These accounts would have their readers believe that Nero melted down the very household gods of Rome.⁴²²

Despite the ancient sources that ridiculed Claudius and described Nero with all the tropes of a bad ruler, especially his lack of filial and religious *pietas*, there is evidence to suggest that Nero in many ways adhered to the religious traditions handed down to him. Suetonius admits that immediately after Claudius' death, in a "display of filial piety, he gave Claudius a

⁴¹⁸ von Hesberg 2011, 110.

⁴¹⁹ Nero is not the only emperor remembered in this way by ancient historians, Tiberius supposedly "lacked any deep regard for the gods or other religious feelings" (Suet. *Tib.* 3.69), while Caligula was a man "who despised the gods" (Suet. *Calig.* 4.51).

⁴²⁰ Suet. *Ner.* 6.56: (*Religionum usque quaque contemptor, praeter unius Deae Syriae, hanc mox ita spreuit ut urina contaminaret . . .*).

⁴²¹ Cass. Dio 62.11.4: (*και τα αναθηματα οσα και εξ αυτων των εν τη Ρωμη ναων εσυλησεν, ουδε εξαριθμησειεν αυτις*); see also Tac. *Ann.* 15.45.

⁴²² Suet. *Ner.* 6.32.

magnificent funeral, spoke his eulogy, and deified him.”⁴²³ Tacitus admits that the eulogy appeared genuine, describing that when, “[Nero] pronounced Claudius’ panegyric, [...] there was enthusiasm both in himself and in his audience.”⁴²⁴ In addition, Suetonius describes games instituted by Nero in honor of the ‘Eternity of the Empire’ and seemingly connected to the cult of the deified emperors, though exactly how is uncertain.⁴²⁵ Nero’s use of the radiate crown, Fears observes, coincided with the fifty-year anniversary of Augustus’ deification and may have been intended to draw attention to all three of his deified ancestors: Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, and Divus Claudius (**Fig. 3.10**).⁴²⁶

Contrary to the impression of the written sources, Nero’s approach to construction, maintenance and use of sacred space was quite conventional. Nero’s rather traditional approach to sacred space in Rome was modeled on his imperial predecessors, most importantly Augustus. Nero did not allow the sacred sites of Rome to fall into neglect. Pliny recounts that when the Venus Anadyomene of Apelles that Augustus dedicated in the Temple of Divus Julius became irreparably damaged, Nero commissioned an artist named Dorotheus to paint a copy to replace it.⁴²⁷

Nero was responsible for the restoration of a number of temples and shrines after the fire in 64: Temple of Vesta, Temple of Fortuna Sejani on the grounds of the Domus Aurea, shrines located in the Circus Maximus, and probably the Regia. In accordance with tradition Nero also constructed new shrines. After Nero’s delivery from death at the hands of the Pisonian

⁴²³ Suet. Ner. 6.9: (*Orsus hinc a pietatis ostentiatione Claudium apparatissimo funere elatum laudavit et consecravit*)

⁴²⁴ Tac. Ann. 13.3: (*Die funeris laudationem eius princeps exorsus est, dum antiquitatem generis, consulatus ac triumphos maiorum enumerabat, intentus ipse et ceteri*).

⁴²⁵ Suet. Ner. 11.

⁴²⁶ Fears 1977, 236.

⁴²⁷ Pliny NH 35.36.

conspirators Nero built a Temple to Salus and vowed and built a Temple to Fecunditas after the birth of his daughter with Poppaea. Nero's delay in finishing the Temple of Divus Claudius was also in line with precedent. Augustus dedicated the Temple of Divus Julius thirteen years after Julius Caesar's death and Caligula dedicated the Temple of Divus Augustus twenty-three years after Augustus' death. Nero's supposed failure to complete and dedicate the temple within his fourteen-year reign, especially in light of the other projects in the area including the Domus Aurea and completion of the Aqua Claudia, did not violate any norms of *pietas* established by his predecessors.

Furthermore, evidence for the commemoration and veneration of Divus Claudius in various contexts under Nero supports the establishment of Claudius' cult. Promptly after Claudius' death Nero commemorated Divus Claudius in 54-55 in a series of denarii and gold coins from the Lugdunum mint. On the obverse the legend DIVUS CLAUDIUS AUGUSTUS surrounds an image of the god. A stunningly detailed representation of a *tensa*, a chariot that bore the images or attributes of the gods in the Circensian games, pulled by four horses adorned the obverse. Appearing in the form of a temple, the *tensa* bore a pediment surmounted by figures of Victories and horses and embellished with a *lituus* between two *pateras*. Other features included a figure on the front panel of the *tensa* holding a scepter or spear and a Victory advancing above the *tensa* (**Fig. 3.11**).⁴²⁸ That an image of Divus Claudius was included with other images of the gods in the *pompa circensis* seems all but certain from another denarius of Nero in with the titles of Agrippina on the reverse surrounding a representation of statues of the

⁴²⁸ Aureus: *RIC* I² no. 4; *BMCRE* I no. 4. Denarius: *RIC* I² no. 5; *BMCRE* I no. 6.

two deified emperors, Divus Augustus and Divus Claudius, drawn in a public procession by four elephants (**Fig. 3.12**).⁴²⁹

Activity of the Sodales Augustales, renamed the Sodales Augustales Claudiales after the deification of Divus Claudius to include priests to the new god, is attested during the Neronian period by a fragment of the Acta Aruales recording the sacrifice of cows and oxen at the Temple of Divus Augustus.⁴³⁰ In addition, records from 59/60 record sacrifices by the Arvals for the health of Nero, son of Divus Claudius, grandson of Germanicus, great grandson of Tiberius, and great, great grandson of Divus Augustus (**Fig. 3.13**).⁴³¹

From the cult of Divus Augustus in the years after Augustus' death it is apparent that the absence of a completed temple was not a bar to veneration. Pending the completion of the Temple of Divus Augustus the god's cult continued while his golden image was housed in the Temple of Mars Ultor. However, an over life size greywacke statue of Agrippina as a priestess, the Agrippina Orans, recovered during excavations on the Caelian in the late nineteenth century may provide additional evidence that progress on the Temple of Divus Claudius under Nero was sufficient for the complex to be operational. Exquisitely carved from a single piece of expensive and exotic stone, the standing statue depicts Agrippina wearing a thin chiton, mantel over her head, and heavy cloak draped around her body (**Fig. 3.14**).⁴³² As currently restored, the statue's arms are outstretched in the act of sacrifice, a typical pose of priestess statues.⁴³³ E. Talamo has

⁴²⁹ *RIC I*² no. 6.

⁴³⁰ Gordon 1958, no. 117. Darwall-Smith 1996, 48-9. On the priesthoods of Divus Claudius, see Gradel 2007.

⁴³¹ Gordon 1958, 107-8, no. 111, pl. 48b. See also Tac. *Ann.* 13.2.13.

⁴³² Body: Musei Capitolini, Central Montemartini inv. 1882. Head: restored with a copy of the head in Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, inv. 753. H: 210 cm. For a description of the statue, see Moltesen 2007, 123-7.

⁴³³ On the restoration and statue type, see Moltesen 2007, 129-32.

persuasively argued that the Agrippina originally adorned the Temple of Divus Claudius complex rather than one of the eastern cult sanctuaries on the Caelian.⁴³⁴

Gradel notes the importance of Agrippina's appointment as flaminica of Divus Claudius to her prestige in relation to the other renowned flaminica, Livia.⁴³⁵ If Talamo is correct, Agrippina's image in the role of priestess near the Temple of Divus Claudius would have fulfilled the same function as her own ritual appearance: keeping her and her priesthood constantly in the public eye and mind. In addition, the erection of a valuable and prestigious sculpture of the *flaminica* in the complex indicates that substantial work had been completed before Agrippina's death in March of 59, not only on the enormous terrace and landscaped grounds of the *templum* but also on the buildings. It is improbable that such a valuable statue would have been moved from the workshop in which it was created to the temple platform on the Caelian if the complex was not being used and if no one would see it. If the statue did adorn the Temple of Divus Claudius or its complex, its presence corroborates the evidence of inscriptions attesting to cult veneration. Furthermore, if the cult was unimportant and Agrippina was not acting in her capacity as *flaminica*, then there would have been no reason to present her in the guise of a priestess, much less in such an expensive and outstanding representation as the Agrippina Orans.

The cult of Divus Claudius probably would not have functioned under Nero if he had sent such a strong message as 'destroying' the god's temple. The absence of Divus Claudius from the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani* granting powers to Vespasian by the Senate and people after his accession may reflect uncertainty in the face of a new dynasty rather than the elimination of the

⁴³⁴ Talamo 2007.

⁴³⁵ Gradel further explains that although no secure evidence survives for a flaminica's role, it is likely that she assisted the flamen of the Divus at the celebration of sacrificial ceremony, see Gradel 2007.

cult of Divus Claudius in the city of Rome.⁴³⁶ That Nero paused construction of the temple for a time with the intention of finishing it as suggested in recent scholarship is a much more likely scenario. An inscription describing Vespasian's role in construction of the temple as '*restitutor aedium sacrarium*' further supports this view.⁴³⁷ *Restitutor*, one who restores or rebuilds, was a term with multiple potential nuances in meaning ranging from restoration to a former state to improvement, revival, or reinstatement, all of which imply a relationship with a building that already exists. If Nero completely destroyed the temple, it is unlikely that Vespasian would have implicitly referenced work on a destroyed monument, rather he would not have felt the need to defer to a work by Nero, by then a denigrated predecessor, and Vespasian would have taken credit for the entire building, a credit later suggested by the ancient authors. A portion of the Temple of Divus Claudius probably remained in place while the priests and priestesses of Divus Claudius performed ritual elsewhere, or the Temple of Divus Claudius was sufficiently completed to conduct cult veneration. Either way Vespasian could not plausibly claim in the inscription to have built the temple anew.

The *Divi* and the Civil Wars of 68-69: Bridging the Divide

By the time Nero committed suicide in 68 the official transfer of the emperor's power had occurred only four times with each to a family member of the first emperor Augustus leaving the process for transfer of power to a non-family member uncertain. John Drinkwater argues that as late as the death of Nero the Principate still had to establish itself as "the office of the emperor."⁴³⁸ After Nero's demise and his perceived failure as an emperor the conspiracy to

⁴³⁶ On the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani*, see Brunt 1977.

⁴³⁷ *CIL* 6.938, dated 78 C.E.

⁴³⁸ Drinkwater 2007, 67.

assassinate Nero in 65 would still have been fresh in people's minds, a disastrous precedent for fostering political stability.⁴³⁹ The conspiracy, instigated by Gaius Calpurnius Piso and purportedly involving other members of the Roman elite such as Seneca and Petronius, echoed the Republican overtones underlying the attempt to destroy the Principate initiated by Roman Senators after the death of Caligula in 41. It seems the gods, along with members of the senatorial elite, manifested a corresponding discontent with Nero. Tacitus believed that the drastic increase in divine portents under Nero indicated mounting anger of the Roman gods.⁴⁴⁰ From this perspective the civil wars of 68-69 were a punishment by the gods, a divinely sent madness caused in part by the immoral behavior of the men, primarily Nero, at the head of their state.⁴⁴¹

In the uncertainty after Nero's death it became clear that while an emperor like Augustus could save the Roman state by rescuing it from a violent civil war and restoring peace, the demise of an emperor could do the opposite, plunging the empire into chaos. Tacitus describes the scene when the Praetorian Guard dramatically burst into the Forum as Galba and Piso attempted to consolidate their support, "Neither the site of the Capitol nor the sanctity of the temples which towered above them, nor the thought of the emperors past and to come, could deter them from committing a crime which any successor to the imperial power must punish."⁴⁴² It is surely significant that the murder of Titus Vinius by the Praetorian Guard

⁴³⁹ Though negative views of Nero must have been dominant following his suicide, that Otho raised the possibility of celebrating Nero's memory with the hope of winning over the Roman people indicates that at least some still looked upon his rule favorably (Tac. *Hist.* 1.98). Vitellius erected altars on the Campus Martius and sacrificed to the shades of Nero (Tac. *Hist.* 2.95). On devastations and calamities as manifestations of breaches in the *pax deorum*, see Fears 1981, 836.

⁴⁴⁰ Liebeschuetz 1979, 159-63.

⁴⁴¹ Gordon 1958, no. 111, pp. 07-08, pl. 48b.

⁴⁴² Tac. *Hist.* 1.90: (*Nec illos Capitolii aspectus et imminentium templorum religio et priores et future principes terruere quo minus facerent scelus suiis ultor est quisquis successit*).

happened in front of the Temple of Divus Julius underscoring the disregard for rulers of the past and future represented by Divus Julius within the god's temple. The Empire was in a precarious position.

Although the Julio-Claudian dynasty had ended, the next four emperors, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and finally Vespasian, all appealed to the memory of the *divi*. At a fundamental level it seems the litmus test for determining which way the political wind was blowing was treatment of one's imperial predecessors. Tacitus emphasizes the significance of imperial images when he characterizes the destruction of Vitellius' images under Vespasian as the decisive moment when the soldiers realized the transfer of power.⁴⁴³ While the brevity of imperial power in 68-69 prevented large-scale building activity, a surprising number of coin issues survive from this period. Coins from the Spanish and Gallic mints making up the majority of issues during the civil wars are difficult to attribute to a particular emperor, however, based on their frequency it appears that coins provided a particularly appealing mechanism to disseminate ideas and messages especially by emperors who barely set foot in Rome.

Mattingly views the emphasis given to Divus Augustus in 68-69 as, "a deliberate reminder of the finely balanced constitutionalism which Augustus, liminary ruler though he essentially was, had slowly and patiently evolved during the early imperial period, and which Nero's autocracy had ruthlessly diminished."⁴⁴⁴ Rufus Fears perceives a parallel campaign, one aimed at reestablishing the framework of the imperial system, in issues from 68-69 celebrating virtues like Concordia, Libertas, Salus, Pax, Fides, Securitas, Victoria, and Virtus, to name a few.⁴⁴⁵ It is certainly logical that any claimant to be emperor would have looked back to the first

⁴⁴³ Tac. *Hist.* 2.7-8.

⁴⁴⁴ *BMCRE* 1 no. 197.

⁴⁴⁵ Fears 1981, 896-9.

and arguably most successfully emperor, but how did the emperors of 68-69 invoke the memory of the emperors that came before them and why?

Coins of Galba demonstrate a renewed interest in the divine origin of the Empire. With the legend *DIVUS IULIUS* and the well-known image of the eight-rayed comet on the reverse and the laureate head of Augustus with the legend *CAESAR AUGUSTUS* on the obverse the initial issues under Galba were a reminder of Caesar's apotheosis and celestial nature.⁴⁴⁶ At about the same time, as a testament to the divine lineage of Augustus, many issues (re)presented Augustus on the obverse as *AUG(ustus) DIVI F(ilius)* (**Fig. 3.15**). Reverse representations of the Augustus *divi filius* series included the butting bull with forefoot raised, Diana running holding a bow in hand and drawing an arrow from her quiver, a decorated quadriga with the legend *EX SC*, and a crescent with seven stars in an arch and legend *AUG DIVI F*.⁴⁴⁷

Although the specific meaning behind the iconographic references cannot be certain the butting bull may refer to the sacrificial victim, and the quadriga to the divinely ordained triumphal victory of the son of a god and more specifically to the actual quadriga perched at the apex of the Temple of Divus Augustus. The crescent moon and stars have general astral associations commonly connected to divinity. Along with the sun and stars the moon was one of the celestial entities believed to best embody the idea of total eternity, specifically the circuit of the moon and its parallel in the sun that were believed to have always existed. The corresponding issue depicting Diana lends additional credence to the suggestion that these coins evoked the eternity of the *divi*. Diana was the focus of a complex constellation of associations in Rome whose primary cult temple was located on the Aventine. In the context of the *divi* her role as a

⁴⁴⁶ *RIC I*² no. 92r3; *BMCRE I* no. 49.

⁴⁴⁷ Butting bull: *RIC I*² no. 100r4; *BMCRE I* no. 51. With Diana: *RIC I*² no. 98r5. Quadriga on reverse: *RIC I*² no. 93r4. Crescent and stars: *RIC I*² no. 95r5.

goddess of light and the moon may have been paramount. In addition, her presence elicited an association with a patron deity of Augustus, her divine brother Apollo whose domain included light and the sun. Coins of AUGUSTUS DIVI F with the oak wreath on the reverse encircling OB CIVES SERVAT implicated Augustus' status as the son of a god in his role as savior and benefactor.⁴⁴⁸ Limited Divus Julius coins combined with extensive Divus Augustus Filius and Divus Augustus imagery suggests that by this time the significance of Divus Julius was primarily in his role as divine progenitor.

Conceptually completing the series are several coins from late 68 or early 69, about fifty-four years after Augustus' death, explicitly linking the radiate Divus Augustus with Pax and Victory.⁴⁴⁹ On the reverse of one coin Pax stands draped and holding a caduceus in one hand and cornears and poppies in the other. Another coin depicts victory on the reverse also draped and holding an inscribed shield (**Fig. 3.16**).⁴⁵⁰ At face value the message looks back to ideas that Augustus promoted at the beginning of his reign, namely that the peace and prosperity of the empire was assured through military victory, an appropriate message from any of the contenders for power during the civil wars of 68-69. At a more fundamental level this coin series not only represented the divine lineage of Augustus and his victory, but also the divine lineage of the Empire itself. An extensive issue by Galba commemorating Diva Livia further reinforced the divine lineage of the Empire by emphasizing that the first emperor and empress were divine (**Fig. 3.17**).⁴⁵¹ In other words, by the time of the civil wars, or perhaps sooner, that the son of a god

⁴⁴⁸ *RIC I*² no. 102r4; *BMCRE I* no. 52.

⁴⁴⁹ Pax: *RIC I*² no. 115r5; *BMCRE I* no. 58. While the aurei and denarii bearing Divus Augustus are distinguished by post-reform weights, by irregularities of legend, type, or portrait treatment, the location of mintage is unclear (Mattingly 1966a, 199-200).

⁴⁵⁰ *RIC I*² no. 116r2; *BMCRE I* no. 59.

⁴⁵¹ *RIC I*² no. 13.

and god of the Roman state pantheon founded the Roman Empire was an index of the divinely ordained and hence inevitable nature of the Roman Empire.

Charles Peirce proposed an elaborate theory of signs, objects or images interpreted as referring to or standing for something other themselves. Put simply Peirce's tripartite theory classifies signs based on the relational mode between the sign and the object to which it refers. In the symbolic mode the sign does not resemble the signified and is fundamentally arbitrary. In the iconic mode the signifier in some way resembles or imitates the signified. Finally, in the indexical mode, most pertinent here, the relationship between the sign and the signifier is not arbitrary but is in some way directly connected usually either physically or causally to the signified.⁴⁵² Although the precise formulation of the theory by Peirce has been questioned the basic premise of varying relationships between signs and signifieds remains and is a useful way to think about the representational relationship between the *divi* and the Empire.

Divus Augustus, and each of the later *divi*, was not in Peirce's sense a symbol or icon of the divinely ordained and eternal nature of the Empire, he was an index of it. Rome's deified rulers were one measure or indication, among others, of the gods' desire for the emperor's universal rule. Worship of a deified predecessor in Rome was among a number of methods by which emperors officially propagated their superhuman status, and that Fears argues, was essential for survival of the state:

The power and continuance of any government is ultimately based on a myth or supernatural character. In a monarchy, a government in which one man serves as the focus of loyalties of all elements in the commonwealth, a superhuman aura must surround this single figure, elevating him above all others . . . The king is thus a charismatic figure, ensuring the continuity of the temporal community.⁴⁵³

⁴⁵² On Peirce's theory, see Atkin 2005; Short 2007.

⁴⁵³ Liebeschuetz 1979, 155-9; see also Gordon 1990, 191.

After a series of elevations of individuals in the position as head of state, originating in concept with Divus Julius, beginning officially with the first emperor Divus Augustus, and continuing with Divus Claudius, the position itself takes on the supernatural aura of the individuals who filled it. The position becomes something more than the accumulation of its representatives. It is this circumstance that allows the position of the emperor, and the form of government lead by the emperor, to continue despite dynastic ruptures and individual instances of emperors such as Caligula and Nero who in retrospect were determined to have lacked the aura of divine sanction.

An anecdote by Tacitus supports the contention that even by the civil wars individual emperors stood for something more. After Otho overthrew Galba, Tacitus describes how the first and fifth legions were so mutinous that they stoned and tore down Galba's images. Tacitus is careful to specify that the soldiers did not want to be misunderstood as having given up reverence for the Empire and so they called on the names of the Senate and Roman people.⁴⁵⁴ There was a significant fear by the soldiers that attacking the images of the emperor would be construed as attacking the state itself, clearly an unforgivable act.

The dissemination of images of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus in Rome such as those on coins issued during the civil wars would have brought to mind primarily the eternal gods as formulated in their temples, and only secondarily ideas or knowledge about the rule of Julius Caesar and the reign of the emperor Augustus. In other words, their importance derived from the totality of their lives, rather than any one specific event or virtue. Divine representations on coins could operate on several levels. Images of deities and abstractions such as Hercules or Pietas were a way of establishing a connection with the god in any form and with mythological narratives or qualities that the god embodied. Other images such as those of the cult statue of the

⁴⁵⁴ Tac. *Hist.* 1.55.

Ephesian Artemis or the goddess Vesta would have, in addition, evoked particular places with more specific cult associations. Coin images of *divi* should be classed in the latter group as specifically recalling the gods' cult temples in the heart of Rome. The power of images of *divi* derives from their close connection with the imperial office combined with the memory of the gods reinforced daily through the mnemonic presence of the temples in the urban landscape and annually through recurring ritual. Emphasizing the *divi* during the crisis of the civil war conveyed a meaning that Rome itself was eternal and would survive.

Conclusion

J. Rufus Fears discovered that although Augustus characterized his rule as the result of divine foreordination it was not an ideology employed by the later Julio-Claudian emperors. This ideological stance became popular again, however, under the stress of the civil wars.⁴⁵⁵ As though predicting the chaos to come. Lucan in the *Pharsalia* denied that the gods protect human destiny.⁴⁵⁶ In times of trouble and anguish about the future such as civil war Romans searched for sacral confirmation and a hope for cyclical renewal.⁴⁵⁷ During civil wars, Paul Ricoeur has similarly observed, citizens raise their demands for justifications of power. Rulers during the civil war of 68-69 evoked the *divi* to mitigate the feeling of uncertainty in the minds of many Romans through the crisis. As an index or measure of the gods' approval of the Roman imperial mission, the cults of *divi* provided the Romans with some assurance of their continuation. Furthermore, if the contenders for power could claim to rule as the deified emperors ruled, they in effect claimed divine sanction for themselves and their destiny to one day be deified. Imperial

⁴⁵⁵ Fears 1977, 189.

⁴⁵⁶ Luc. *Phars.* 7.454.

⁴⁵⁷ Fears 1977, 312-24.

eternity no longer depended on dynastic continuity rather it depended on a successor worthy in comparison to their deified predecessors.

CHAPTER 4

FLAVIAN DIVI: AFFIRMATION, EXPERIMENTATION AND MNEMONIC DISJUNCTION (69-98)

Introduction

In 69 at the beginning of Vespasian's reign deification was far from secure or routine. This chapter presents the view that Vespasian's affirmation of the cult of Claudius, through the rededication of the Temple of Divus Claudius, was a turning point in the tradition of deification. It provided an essential link for the continuity of the Empire after the dynastic rupture caused by Nero's downfall and the civil wars of 68-69, and established a vital connection between Vespasian and the Julio-Claudians.

In addition, numismatic evidence under the Flavians suggests a more explicit development of the association among *aeternitas*, the *divi*, and the emperor, one continued in the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus with its emphasis on sacred aspects of the cults. A more firmly entrenched tradition of deification, together with explicitly delineated imperial powers in the *Lex Vespasiani* may have played into Domitian's architectural and cultic experiments in regard to the cults of *divi*, namely the Arch of Titus, Porticus Divorum, and Temple of the Gens Flavia.⁴⁵⁸ Underscoring the status of Divus Augustus as divine founder of the Roman Empire among other noteworthy emperors and imperial family members, the restoration coin series of Titus positioned Divus Augustus as a fundamental component of the imperial past, a concept that would further evolve under Trajan.

⁴⁵⁸ Under the Julio-Claudians the head of the Roman government was not a single office, but a range of powers, prerogatives, and functions, accepted from the Senate and the Roman people. The *Lex Vespasiani* defined the major powers including the imperium, tribunician power, and office of the pontifex maximus, belonging to the emperor (Hammond 1956, 64-6).

Temple of Divus Claudius and the Flavians: Alignment with the Past

Suetonius suggests a source for Vespasian's devotion to Claudius when explaining that Vespasian served directly under Claudius, earning triumphal decorations and holding priesthoods as well as a consulship.⁴⁵⁹ Yet military, religious, and civic service under Claudius do not fully explain the reinstatement of the supposedly defunct cult of Divus Claudius, the third and final *divus* of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Listing the new works undertaken by Vespasian, Suetonius included the Temple of Divus Claudius on the Caelium, utterly destroyed by Nero, along with the Templum Pacis.⁴⁶⁰ Though Suetonius likely exaggerates Vespasian's involvement, his account gives valuable evidence for Vespasian's completion of the temple, which cannot be confirmed through archaeological evidence because none of the temple's superstructure survives and no remains of the great podium are securely datable to the reign of Vespasian.⁴⁶¹ Against Suetonius, Chapter 3 claimed that work on the Temple of Divus Claudius stalled under Nero leaving Vespasian to complete and dedicate the temple. Suetonius should be read with suspicion, considering that his claim that Vespasian piously rebuilt what Nero had irreverently destroyed is in line with tropes of the good and bad emperors employed by many Roman sources.

Unlike many of the temples to *divi* that were associated with an immediate successor at the time of dedication, the Temple of Divus Claudius came to be physically surrounded by and associated with the Flavian rebuilding of Rome. By Domitian's time contemporary writers contrasted the Flavian building program, reflecting piety and service to the people, with that of Nero, the epitome of luxury and decadence. For example, Martial describes the structures that

⁴⁵⁹ Suet. *Vesp.* 4.

⁴⁶⁰ Suet. *Vesp.* 9.

⁴⁶¹ Buzzetti 1993.

replaced portions of the Domus Aurea: the Colossus rayed with stars and dedicated to Sol, the Flavian Amphitheatre, the Baths of Titus, and the Claudian colonnade, likely referring to the porticoes atop the podium of the Temple of Divus Claudius.⁴⁶² Martial observed that together the Flavian structures occupied the space where a single house, the Domus Aurea, had stood.⁴⁶³ The Flavians, he continued, literally and metaphorically restored the city of Rome to herself through their building projects.

Within the chronology of the Flavian building program Vespasian's appropriation of the Temple of Divus Claudius must have been concurrent with his rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Vespasian repaired damage from a fire on the Capitoline that burnt down much of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on 19 December 69 while Flavian forces fought for control of the city.⁴⁶⁴ Before construction of the new Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus commenced, during a ceremony including fillets and garlands, soldiers carrying boughs of good omen, and Vestals, the Praetor Helvidius Priscus purified the area with a *suovetaurilia* and prayed to the gods who protect the Empire to look favorably on the rebuilding of the temple.⁴⁶⁵ By prioritizing the completion and dedication of the Temple of Divus Claudius, Vespasian affirmed the official status of Divus Claudius as a god of the Roman state pantheon, potentially unresolved at the end of Nero's reign, and one included within the group of gods who protect the Roman Empire in prayers such as that of Helvidius Priscus. The devotion of resources by Vespasian to the contemporaneous rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and

⁴⁶² Though no trace of the portico survives in the Forma Urbis fragments porticoes likely surrounded the large garden area encircling the Temple of Divus Claudius.

⁴⁶³ Mart. *Epig.* 2.

⁴⁶⁴ Tac. *Hist.* 3.71-72.

⁴⁶⁵ Tac. *Hist.* 4.8.

completion of the Temple of Divus Claudius signaled that each cult was essential to maintaining the *pax deorum* and prosperity of the Roman Empire.

Vespasian was not the only Flavian with former ties to the Julio-Claudians. Under Vespasian, Titus granted various honors to Claudius' son Britannicus, including a gold statue of him on the Palatine and an ivory equestrian statue to be carried in the *pompa circensis*. Though Titus had personal connections to Britannicus, and his actions may indicate personal loyalty, more likely he intended to parallel his father's veneration of Divus Claudius, demonstrating that the Flavians could perform the duties expected of the true successors of Divus Claudius that Nero allegedly failed to fulfill. By touting his connection to the Temple of Divus Claudius, a Flavian freedman's funerary inscription alludes to the high esteem of Divus Claudius as venerated in the god's temple under the Flavians.⁴⁶⁶

Vespasian's claim to have built the Temple of Divus Claudius should be understood in light of Flavian efforts to associate themselves with the Julio-Claudians. If the temple was already partially completed, Vespasian's public and visible association with Divus Claudius was not a foregone conclusion but a deliberate choice. As argued by Haeckl, Vespasian may have been motivated in part by a desire to demonstrate his *pietas* toward the Julio-Claudian dynasty.⁴⁶⁷ More importantly, however, by restoring the Temple of Divus Claudius he established a link between his rule and that of Claudius omitting Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. At the time of Vespasian's accession, the end of a violent and tumultuous year of civil wars, his foremost concern was legitimizing his own rule, a necessary precondition to the founding of a new dynasty.

⁴⁶⁶ *CIL* 6.10251a: *Constituor collegi numinis dominorum quod est sup (sic) templo divi Claudi ()*.

⁴⁶⁷ Haeckl 1996, 16.

The attitude of the senatorial elite toward dynastic rule after the precedent set by the Julio-Claudian dynasty was ambivalent. By providing a dynastic heir through blood or adoption Augustus and the Julio-Claudians ruled for almost a century without civil war, yet rulers like Caligula and Nero supplied by dynastic succession were highly unsatisfactory to the senatorial elite. The death of Nero and breakdown of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, however, resulted in a year of civil war that was even worse than a bad ruler. After Vespasian ended the civil war in 69 and immediately after his accession, he underscored his allegiance to the imperial legacy established by the deified Julio-Claudians rather than presenting his dynastic heirs as he did later in his reign. In doing so, Vespasian may have been attempting to alleviate the Senate's understandable apprehension at the founding of a new dynasty. As the imperial system evolved, tension persisted between the Senate's impotence in selecting a ruler and fear of the chaos that resulted from uncertainties in the succession of power.⁴⁶⁸ In other words, though the Senate cared more for good rulers and less for dynasties, they acknowledged the importance of the dynasty, especially in the eyes of the military, for the smooth transition of power. Vespasian wisely first stressed continuity with the most *divus*, then later focused on the new dynasty. Brian Jones argues that Titus would have faced similar prejudices of the Senate at his accession: disillusion with the hereditary principle together with the belief that the 'best man' should rule.⁴⁶⁹

Darwall-Smith notes that Vespasian had to look back to a Julio-Claudian imperial precedent other than Nero; Vespasian, however, could have invoked *Divus Augustus* and certainly more prominent deified Julio-Claudian emperor and founder of the dynasty.⁴⁷⁰ Vespasian's reclamation of the Temple of *Divus Claudius* was unavoidable if he wanted the

⁴⁶⁸ Hammond 1956.

⁴⁶⁹ Jones 1984, 116-7.

⁴⁷⁰ Darwall-Smith 1996, 52-3.

practice of deification, a religious institution increasingly integral to the understanding of the Empire, to survive. If Vespasian had not affirmed the cult of Divus Claudius, after Divus Augustus the Empire would have continued 55 years through Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius without cult veneration of a new divus enduring past the immediate successor.

At the dawn of Vespasian's reign the phenomenon of imperial deification was at a crucial turning point: would it be an anomaly reserved only for Augustus and his adoptive father or would it be a defining aspect of the Empire? If by translating Julius Caesar and Augustus into one of their own, the gods expressed their endorsement and support of the Roman Empire, what was the message if no additional rulers were deemed worthy of sustained state cult? As a successful general and later a consul in the decade after Caligula's death, Vespasian would have recalled the Senate's attack on the memory of Divus Julius and Divus Augustus through a call for the destruction of their temples. By completing and dedicating the Temple of Divus Claudius, Vespasian established the viability of deification, rather than a dynastic continuity with Claudius, suggesting a recognition that the status of the Empire as divinely ordained must be maintained and continually renewed. Moreover, the contemporaneous work on the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the Temple of Divus Claudius conveyed that restoration and rededication of both were necessary to fully recover from the civil war.

Aeternitas and the Flavian Divi

It is surely no coincidence that, while affirming the religious phenomenon of deification through the rededication of the Temple of Divus Claudius and responding to doubts about the viability of the Empire, the Flavians were the first to make explicit the eternity of the divi

formulated previously under the Julio-Claudians through temple architecture and cult ritual of Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, and Divus Claudius.⁴⁷¹ Titus issued a wide variety of types celebrating the deification of Divus Vespasian who died on 23 June 79. Among those types was an As combining the legend AETERNIT(as) AUG S-C and a standing Aeternitas holding a scepter and cornucopia on the reverse, with DIVUS AUGUSTUS VESPASIANUS on the obverse, vividly demonstrating that the eternity of the Augustus, by now an imperial title designating the reigning emperor, was the conceptual counterpart of the Divus (**Fig. 4.1**).⁴⁷² As Rufus Fears has explained, Aeternitas combined with the suffix Augusti describes the sphere of the divinity, thereby declaring an intimate and profound association between the two forces.⁴⁷³

Through two distinct types bearing an Aeternitas legend, coin issues under the Flavians unequivocally convey the astral and celestial conception of Aeternitas and further reinforce that Aeternitas is a quality of the imperial office. Vespasian was the first emperor to issue coins in Rome with the obverse legend AETERNITAS, the goddess depicted as a standing female figure holding the heads of Sol and Luna, expressing the idea of total eternity through the timeless and undeviating cycles of the celestial bodies (**Fig. 4.2**).⁴⁷⁴ A coin issued under Vespasian in the name of Titus as Caesar bore duplicate celestial imagery in connection with Aeternitas.⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷¹ On use of Aeternitas on coins of the Flavians, see Cumont 1896, 438.

⁴⁷² *RIC* II no. 380.

⁴⁷³ Fears 1981, 886.

⁴⁷⁴ *RIC* II nos. 838, 839; *BMCRE* I nos. 272-274. Obv: IMP CAESAR VESPASIANUS AUG, head laureate. Rev: AETER-NITAS, goddess standing before lighted altar with heads of Sol and Luna. On the concept of total eternity, see Chapter 2, pp. 27-30.

⁴⁷⁵ *RIC* II no. 856. Obv: T CAESAR IMP VESPASIANUS, laureate head. Rev: Aeternitas standing before lighted altar with heads of Sol and Luna. *RIC* II no. 866, same but with legend AETER-NITAS accompanying image of the goddess.

Following in the footsteps of the Julio-Claudian poets, Valerius Flaccus, who likely completed his epic poem *Argonautica* some time after 79 and the deification of his patron Vespasian, highlighted the celestial conception of Divus Vespasian. His plea with the gods to guide his poetic endeavor tells of the “straits first navigated by the mighty sons of gods” and is addressed to two gods, Phoebus Apollo and Divus Vespasian for whom his son “shall ordain sacred rites and shall raise temples to his house.”⁴⁷⁶ For Valerius Flaccus, Vespasian has himself become a star guiding sailors more effectively even than the constellations Cynosura and Helike.

Aeternitas Augusti issues of Titus depicting Aeternitas standing with her right foot resting on a globe and holding a cornucopia and scepter, the same reverse imagery as contemporary Divus Vespasian coins, categorically communicated the eternal nature of the Augustus, associating the quality with the power of the emperor through the scepter and with protection and prosperity of the Roman Empire through the cornucopia (**Fig. 4.3**).⁴⁷⁷ Eternity of the Roman Empire was similarly evoked by images of Victory transferring the Palladium, itself a symbol of Rome’s eternity, to Vespasian who, as part of a tradition that stretched before and after him, is marked as the guardian of Rome’s eternity (**Fig. 4.4**).⁴⁷⁸ An idea of Rome rising again, found in the ROMA RESURGENS coin of Vespasian, complements the emphasis on Rome’s eternity by tacitly acknowledging Rome’s continuation despite debilitating circumstances. Depicted on the obverse is Vespasian in the presence of the goddess Roma and

⁴⁷⁶ Val. Flac. *Arg.* 1.1-3; 1.13-20: (*Prima deum magnis canimus freta pervia natis fatidicamque ratem, Scythici quae Phasidis oras ausa sequi mediosque inter iuga concita cursus rumpere, flammifero tandem consedit Olympo . . . ille tibi cultusque deum delubraque genti institute, cum iam, genitor, lucebis ab omni parte poli*).

⁴⁷⁷ *RIC* II nos. 218-220; *BMCRE* I nos. 207-208. Obv: IMP T CAES VESP AUG PM TRP COS VIII, laureate head. Rev: AETERNIT AUG S-C or AETERNIT AUGUST S-C, Aeternitas standing with left foot on globe, holding scepter and cornucopia, among other issues touting other aspects of the emperor such as *salus*, *securitas*, *aequitas*, *concord*, and *fides*.

⁴⁷⁸ Victory and Vespasian: *RIC* II no. 131; *BMCRE* I no. 586.

raising up a kneeling figure of Roma, the city; the image claiming a pivotal role for Vespasian in the recovery of the city and the Roman Empire after the chaos of 68-69.⁴⁷⁹ Representing the first appearance of the ROMA RESURGENS legend, the novel message is consistent with, yet particularizes, the emphasis on the eternity of the city and Empire, the continuation of which would be impossible without the emperor.

That the Aeternitas coins under Titus and Domitian were deliberately issued in conjunction with construction of buildings dedicated to the cults of the *divi* seems likely: under Titus with the commencement of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and under Domitian marking the dedication of the Temple of the Gens Flavia.⁴⁸⁰ Thus, the coins under Vespasian and Titus express the divine nature of the *divi* and provide an unmistakable connection between their eternal nature embodied in their temples and the eternity of the imperial office, and by extension, the Roman Empire.

Once the Empire survived the succession of Claudius and the civil war of 68-69, successive emperors balanced messages inserting themselves into an established imperial tradition against their desire to highlight their unique contributions and dynastic connections. While it might be argued that the Aeternitas Augusti issues of Titus conveyed a quality of Titus only rather than of the imperial office, other visual evidence suggests that particular traits and qualities of the emperor could be highly personalized or depersonalized. On coins of Vespasian, for example, issues bearing the image of Victoria Augusti presented the aspect of the goddess Victory particular to the imperial office, an aspect that Vespasian highlighted in connection with

⁴⁷⁹ *RIC* II no. 195; *BMCRE* I no. 565.

⁴⁸⁰ Mattingly 1966b, xci.

his Judaeian victory (**Fig. 4.5**).⁴⁸¹ On other coins of Vespasian the reverse legend specifies VICTORIA IMP VESPASIANI, referring by name within the legend to Vespasian (**Fig. 4.6**).⁴⁸² Interestingly, the legend bearing the more general Augusti, also meaning august or sacred, is far more common. By Vespasian's reign Augustus was not only the praenomen of Rome's first emperor, it had become a part of the imperial titulature, though Pliny asserts that the very name Augustus is a reminder of the man to whom it was first decreed.⁴⁸³ Augustus was first used as a title for someone not of the Julio-Claudian dynasty in the posthumous commemoration of Galba.

The generalization of Victoria Augusti suggests that by the time of Vespasian, founder of Rome's second dynasty, it was recognized that certain qualities were in the domain of the imperial office, qualities that a particular emperor could credibly, or incredibly, associate himself with or claim to possess. Viewers would have understood the intended connection of the more general legend to Vespasian in light of his image and name on the obverse of the coins; however, depersonalized obverse legends alluding to general qualities may have been purposefully ambiguous to emphasize not only crucial aspects of the reigning emperor, but also characteristics of all those occupying the imperial office who by virtue of their status as emperors were the reigning emperor's predecessors.

A dedication in 70 to Pax Aeterna known from an inscription seems to combine the ideas inherent in the two personifications of Aeternitas and the generalized Pax Augusti, the aspect of the goddess Pax associated with the emperor.⁴⁸⁴ When considered together these concepts convey that eternal peace is attainable only through the Augustus, the emperor, a position at the

⁴⁸¹ For reverse of VICTORIA AUGUSTI S-C with Victory inscribing a shield set on a palm tree above a seated Judea, see, e.g. *RIC* II no. 221.

⁴⁸² *RIC* II no. 1340.

⁴⁸³ Pliny *Pan.* 88.10.

⁴⁸⁴ *CIL* 6.199; 6.200.

helm of the Roman world that remains vital through individuals, some superior to others. In this way Vespasian established himself as an imperial successor to Augustus, one related not by blood but by the common mission to reestablish peace and prosperity after a violent, destructive civil war. Depictions of Pax with an olive branch, cornucopia, and the caduceus of Felicitas, offering thanksgiving over an altar vividly demonstrate the debt of the goddess in favor of the Augustus, Vespasian.⁴⁸⁵

Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus: Emphasis on the Sacred

There is a longstanding debate about whether the Senate deified Vespasian in September 79, after his death on 23 June 79 near his estate in Cutiliae, or sometime later but before either 30 May 80 when Titus and Domitian are identified as ‘Divi F’ on a fragment of the acts of the Arval Brethren, or June 80, a month marked by the earliest coins bearing the legend DIVUS VESPASIAN on the obverse.⁴⁸⁶ An inscription from the Aqua Marcia over the Via Tiburtina identifying Titus as ‘Divi F’ provides the sole evidence for the deification in 79.⁴⁸⁷ No consecration decree survives and Titus and Domitian continued to use the titles *Augusti filius* until the middle of 80, when the first coins bear the title DIVI FILIUS.⁴⁸⁸ Also uncertain is the date of the temple, though it was likely begun under Titus and completed in the early years of

⁴⁸⁵ *RIC* II no. 1142.

⁴⁸⁶ Fragment of Acts of the Arvals: *CIL* 6.2059. Darwall-Smith 1996. For coins dated to 80 and 81 and identifying Divus Vespasian on the obverse, see e.g. *RIC* II no. 59 (reverse with victory standing placing shield on trophy at foot of which is a captive); *RIC* II no. 60 (reverse with quadriga and richly ornamented car); *RIC* II no. 62 (reverse with shield resting against cippus with an urn and laurels); *RIC* II no. 63 (reverse with shield supported by capricorns below a globe); *RIC* II no. 64 (reverse with victory advancing right holding wreath and palm); *RIC* II no. 65 (reverse with Pax); and *RIC* II no. 66 (reverse with she-wolf and twins).

⁴⁸⁷ *CIL* 6.1246. Buttrey argues for a date in 80, suggesting perhaps that the Aqua Marcia inscription was not completed until 80 and at that time the stone cutter added the imperial titlature to include the title ‘divi f’ (Buttrey 1976, 455).

⁴⁸⁸ *Cf.* Scott (1975) who argues for 79 based on the coin evidence.

Domitian's reign based on attribution of the temple to him in the later sources and stylistic and formal qualities of the architectural ornament.⁴⁸⁹

Though no deification decree for Titus survives, coin issues of Domitian from 80-81 bearing a portrait and the legend DIVUS TITUS AUGUSTUS on the obverse commemorate Titus' deification along with the appointment of his daughter Julia Titi as Augusta of the cult of Divus Titus (**Fig. 4.7**).⁴⁹⁰ The claim that Titus was deified after 1 October 81 stems from the records of the Arval Brethren referring to Julia as 'T Imp. F' rather than 'Divi Titi F'.⁴⁹¹ While the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus was an opportunity first for Titus and then for Domitian to emphasize their succession to a divine dynastic predecessor, and monumentally pronounce their *pietas* with respect to their deified father, it was also a continuation of an established architectural and cultic religious tradition, the sacred nature of which was emphasized in the temple's architectural sculpture; a vivid reminder that the Temple housed eternal gods of the Roman state pantheon.

Architecture

Three *in situ* Corinthian columns of white Italian marble supporting a section of the original architrave give some idea of the grandeur of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus as restored by Septimius Severus and Caracalla in the early third century (**Fig. 4.8**).⁴⁹² Because portions of the temple have been continuously visible since antiquity, its conservation and excavation history is long with extensive documentation in etchings and drawings dating

⁴⁸⁹ The terminus ante quem of August is determined by a dated inscription of the Arval Brethren from June of AD 87 referring to the Temple of Divus Vespasian, see De Angeli 1992, 137.

⁴⁹⁰ See e.g. Domitian *RIC* II no. 216 Rev: IULIA AUGUSTA DIVI TITI F, draped bust.

⁴⁹¹ *CIL* 6.2060.

⁴⁹² The columns are 1.57 m in diameter and 13.2 m high. The plinth is 0.175 m. The lower diameter of the column shafts are 1.48 m. The double ionic bases are 0.7 m high (De Angeli 1992, 81-4).

back to the 16th century.⁴⁹³ Significant milestones include liberation of the columns in 1912, clearing of the stairs and podium in 1817, and the transfer to the Tabularium of the entablature fragment that remains on display.⁴⁹⁴

Unique in certain elements of its plan, the hexastyle, prostyle Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus retained the essentially recognizable aspects of Roman temple form with its 4.2 m high podium, front stairway entry, columnar façade, pronaos, and enclosed cella (**Fig. 4.9**).⁴⁹⁵ De Angeli offered a new reconstruction of the pseudodipteral temple with dimensions 21 m wide and 27.75 m long. Located on the north side of the Clivus Capitolinus, the temple was across the way from the Temple of Saturn and flanked by the Portico of the Dei Consenti on the left and the Temple of Concordia on the right (**Fig. 4.10**). That the façade intercolumniation of the 6 by 2 pronaos is slightly larger than the lateral intercolumniation suggests that the architect opted to retain the optimal façade proportions despite the cramped dimensions of the site (**Fig. 4.11**). Other accommodations that may have been required by the narrow confines of the temple, restricted by the Clivus Capitolinus in the front and the Tabularium renovated by Claudius in the back, are the continuation of the front stairs between the first row of columns in the pronaos and a cella wider than it is deep.

With its 19 m width exceeding its 18 m length, the unusually oriented cella housed an enormous statue podium adjacent to the rear wall of the temple, 6.85 m long, 5.75 m deep, and

⁴⁹³ For a detailed history of the excavations and documentation from the early 1500s, see De Angeli 1992, 10-23.

⁴⁹⁴ 1999. The podium is constructed of cement and pozzolana rossastra and includes large pieces of giallo-chiaro colored tuf. The perimeter walls of the podium are in blocks of travertine 0.9 m high and 4 m long. Pivots and pour channels used to secure moldings and the marble revetment to the podium are still visible. The stylobate consists of two blocks of luna marble (De Angeli 1992, 63-8).

⁴⁹⁵ For the facade intercolumniation of 3.65 m, and lateral intercolumniation of 3.25 m, see De Angeli 1992, 125.

1.35 m high for cult statues of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.⁴⁹⁶ The dimensions of the statue podium, along with late antique references to a ‘Temple of Vespasian and Titus’, suggest that the temple contained two cult statues in the single cella.⁴⁹⁷ An aedicula housing the cult statues is indicated by a foundation to the left of the podium composed of travertine and with holes for attaching the plinth of a column approximately 0.7 m in diameter. Fragments of figured capitals bearing Victories and trophies discovered in the vicinity are believed to have adorned the cult statue aedicula. The back wall of the aedicula, the impression of which is still visible in the back wall of the Tabularium, rises to a height of 4.6 m. The dimensions of the aedicula provided ample vertical and horizontal space for colossal cult statues of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.⁴⁹⁸ The 1.35 m high cult statue podium, and other interior surfaces, were revetted in pavonazetta, a light colored marble with heavy black or grey veins. Each of the six lateral podiums supported a lower interior colonnade order with columns 0.4 m in diameter.⁴⁹⁹

The temple podium and travertine cella walls were adorned with marble revetments.⁵⁰⁰ In the pronaos fluted Corinthian columns three deep rose to support a masterfully carved three-step architrave.⁵⁰¹ Elements of the architectural ornament dating to Domitian’s reign distinguish the Corinthian capitals: the ionic cyma of the abacus, V-shaped calice of the flower of the abacus, three stylized foliage shoots at the base, and the crowns characterized by deep vertical grooves

⁴⁹⁶ The Temple of Concordia immediately to the north of the Temple of Vespasian and Titus also faces the Clivus Capitolinus and has a cella wider than it is long, 45 m by 24 m (De Angeli 1992, 81).

⁴⁹⁷ The statue base was revetted in a brick wall to which would have been attached marble slabs, however, a second brick wall, probably an intervention intended to make the podium bigger, also indicates a change of plan and addition of a second cult statue (Scott 1975, 79-80). On Titus sharing in honors in the temple, see Jones 1984, 156.

⁴⁹⁸ De Angeli 1992, 63-74.

⁴⁹⁹ De Angeli 1992, 128-9.

⁵⁰⁰ Fragments of the podium marble revetment found between the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus and the Portico of the Dei Consenti have survived, see e.g. De Angeli 1992, cat. 25.

⁵⁰¹ Shaft: 10.25 m. Total: 14.19 m.

(**Fig. 4.12**).⁵⁰² Modillions bearing two volutes with acanthus leaves are also typical of the Flavian era. Occupying the façade intercolumniations was a carved soffit 1.4 by 1.1 m. Four acanthus branches, each terminating in three tendrils, spring from the central rosette in an X pattern similar to a schematized representation of a lightning bolt. An elaborate sculptural frieze of sacred implements and priestly attributes embellished the lateral long sides of the temple.

Sculptural Program

On display in the substructures of the modern Tabularium is a block of the entablature, including the architrave, frieze, and cornice, which spanned only the lateral sides of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus (**Fig. 4.13**). Noteworthy for its deeply carved, complex, decorative quality, the entablature embodies features characteristic of Flavian architecture such as the ‘spectacles’, or Rabirian rings, that adorn the fillets between the dentils, sculptural articulation of the three-step fasciae, and vegetal embellishment of the Flavian cymatia.⁵⁰³ Most striking, however, is the meticulously detailed frieze. Each section of the frieze, confined to the width of one block of the architrave, was punctuated by bucrania festooned in a decorative fillet known as an infula. Based on the *in situ* section in the Forum (**Fig. 4.12**) and the surviving reconstructed section of the frieze in the Tabularium, De Angeli has argued that there were two possible sequences of the same seven objects between the bucrania that alternated along the frieze.⁵⁰⁴ The sequence of objects in the *in situ* section is, moving from left to right after the first bucrania: an urceus, or sacred vessel, in an oblique position; a cultur, the knife used to slit the

⁵⁰² The similarity of Corinthian capitals under Domitian in different monuments has led De Angeli to conjecture a specialized urban workshop emphasizing expert production of different architectural elements, De Angeli 1992, 150-1. On architectural ornament of the temple, see De Angeli 1992, 149-157.

⁵⁰³ On the complexity of Flavian architectural ornamentation as compared to the more austere forms under Trajan, see Packer 2001, 187.

⁵⁰⁴ De Angeli 1992, 94-107.

victim's throat and slaughter the animal; an aspergillum for sprinkling liquids; a secures along the ground line, the small hatchet used to strike the death blow to the victim; above the secures a patera for libations; next to the patera a malleus, long and straight with a circular head for stunning the animal in anticipation of the sacrifice; and finally, a galerus apicato, the pointed leather flamen's cap.

Existing interpretations of the frieze find the earliest precedents in relief and coin representations of the simpulum, lituus, tripod, and patera, symbols of the four major priestly colleges: respectively the college of the pontifex of which the flamens of Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus, and in the imperial period, the *divi*, were a part; the augurs who read the signs of the gods, in particular Jupiter; the XVviri sacris faciundis who oversaw the Sibylline Books; and the VIIviri epulones in charge of public feasts.⁵⁰⁵ For example, on the coins of Augustus the motif of these four instruments, which reappears in the coins of Nero as Caesar under Claudius, commemorates membership by the emperor in the four priestly colleges and indicates the emperor's profound religiosity and *pietas* to the state gods (**Fig. 4.14**).⁵⁰⁶

Prominent representations of clusters of sacred implements indicating membership in the four priestly colleges continue under the Flavian emperors.⁵⁰⁷ More recently, Siebert highlights the assemblages of ritual implements as a particularly Roman device and emphasizes its role in the development of a repertoire of imperial self-representation.⁵⁰⁸ While Siebert recognizes such groupings as more than symbolic decoration, she too concludes that their primary function is to

⁵⁰⁵ De Angeli 1992, 140-1.

⁵⁰⁶ Augustus: *RIC* I² no. 410; *BMCRE* I no. 119. Rev. AUGUSTUS CAESAR, bare head. Obv: C ANTISTIUS REGINUS, simpulum and lituus above tripod and patera. Nero as Caesar: *RIC* I² no. 77 (Claudius); *BMCRE* I no. 87. Obv: NERO CLAUD CAES DRUSUS GERM PRINC IUVENT with draped bust of Nero. Rev: SACERD COOPT IN OMN CONL SUPRA NUM EX SC, simpulum on tripod and lituus on patera.

⁵⁰⁷ See e.g., Vespasian *RIC* II no. 43, with the reverse legend AUGUR TRI POT accompanied by image of simpulum, aspergillum, jug, and lituus.

⁵⁰⁸ Siebert 1999, 147-201.

assert the social status of the priesthood while conveying the message of piety on the part of some individual or group toward the gods, the *res publica*, or family.⁵⁰⁹

De Angeli suggests that in addition to promoting the priestly role and *pietas* of the living emperor, Titus when the temple construction began and later Domitian, the frieze of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus may allude to the sacrificial act and to high religious dignity of the four priestly colleges.⁵¹⁰ With the telltale *lituus*, tripod, and *simpulum* missing from the ensemble adorning the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, however, it appears that the frieze excludes overt references to the augurs, the *XVviri faciundis*, and the *VIIviri epulones* in order to emphasize the importance of the *flamens*. Operating on multiple levels, there is more to this frieze than general religious connotations such as *pietas* or priestly status. A close reading suggests that each element of the frieze functions primarily as a synecdoche of a key action or participant in the rite of bloody sacrifice that together recall and anticipate the recurring rites performed by the *flamen*, a sought after position of high social esteem, who wore the *galerus apicato* depicted on the frieze.⁵¹¹

Made of leather, fastened under the chin and embellished with an apex or pointed top, the *galerus apicato* was a distinguishing feature of the *Flamen Miores* that marked his status and without which he could not properly perform his religious duties. So sacred was the cap and so strongly associated with its wearer, in the second century Aulus Gellius observed that although in the past a *flamen* might not take off the cap indoors, by his time it was considered essential only when a *flamen* left his home.⁵¹² If the cap fell off the priest while he was at the altar he was

⁵⁰⁹ Siebert 1999, 157-75.

⁵¹⁰ De Angeli 1992, 142.

⁵¹¹ On the high status of the *flamines*, see Vanggaard 1988.

⁵¹² Aul. Gell. 10.15.

removed from the priesthood.⁵¹³ An olive branch called a birga formed the actual apex that was secured to the cap with a woolen band or fillet known as the filium or apiculum made from the fleece of a sacrificial victim (**Fig. 4.15**).⁵¹⁴ Though the apex does not survive on the frieze, the filium that rises up from the crown of the cap remains visible.

Priests who could wear this type of cap were the Flamen Dialis of Jupiter, the Flamen Martialis of Mars, the Flamen Quirinalis of Quirinus, and the flamen appointed for each *divus* including, at construction of the temple, Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, Divus Claudius, Divus Vespasian, and Divus Titus. Though the precise configuration of priesthoods established under the Flavians in honor of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus is unclear because of varied terminology in ancient written sources and inscriptions, Pliny mentions incense, altars, pulvinaria and a flamen voted for Divus Titus, and in the provinces, Pliny was a priest of Divus Titus.⁵¹⁵ To the Flaviales created after Vespasian's deification and the Flaviales Titiales after Titus, may be added the Seviri Flaviales, Sodales Titiales, and XVviri Titiales, all attested under Domitian.⁵¹⁶

The galerus apicato indicates that the frieze of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus should be understood in the context of rites performed by a Flamen Maiores. An intricate lightning bolt below a foliate detail interspersed with seven stars adorning the front of the cap further narrows the possibilities to the Flamen Dialis and the Flamen of the *divi*, perhaps an intentional ambiguity (**Fig. 4.15**). Though astral connotations of the *divi* were well established, the seven stars may have been a development of the Flavian era. A coin issued between 88 and 96 commemorating the deification of Domitian's infant son depicts the baby boy on a globe

⁵¹³ Val. Max. 1.1.4.

⁵¹⁴ On the flamen's headgear, see Vanggaard 1988, 40-5. On variations in artistic depictions of the apex, see Esdaile 1911.

⁵¹⁵ *CIL* 5.5667: fl[amen] divi T[iti] Augusti (priest of the Deified Titus Augustus).

⁵¹⁶ *ILS* 1010. See also, Scott 1975, 45-8.

surrounded by seven stars.⁵¹⁷ Though it is tempting to see in these seven stars Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, Divus Claudius, Divus Vespasian, Divus Titus, Diva Domitilla and Domitian's deified son, the evidence supporting a common understanding of a defined group does not justify such an interpretation. It is possible that the group of stars represented a constellation of *divi* such as the group housed in the Temple of the Gens Flavia.

Other elements in the frieze combine to spotlight the connection between the temple and the animal sacrifice conducted at its altar. As Zanker has observed, "The close association of ritual with its architectural setting created the indispensable prerequisite for the *aurea templa* to achieve their full effect."⁵¹⁸ The bucrania, with the elongated proportions of the skulls filling the height of the frieze, are an echo of the sacrificial bull led to slaughter, an example of which is represented on the scene in front of the Temple of Mars Ultor in the relief believed to be from the Ara Pietatis (**Fig. 4.16**).⁵¹⁹ The infula adorning the bucrania, that similarly decorated the sacrificial victim on festal days, suggests a procession.

The flamen used the aspergillum to sprinkle lustral water, the patera for pouring libations before the sacrifice or over the sacrificial meat (*exta*) cooking over the altar after the sacrifice, and the urceus for pouring wine into the patera and holding wine for the feast to follow. Although usually referred to as priestly implements, in fact several of the tools depicted in the frieze are integral to the sacrifice but are not used by the priest. The bearer of the culter, who might carry the implement on a large tray called a *lanx* or in his hands, was called the *cultrarii*. An attendant, the *popa*, carried the *malleus* to strike and stun the larger animals, and yet another

⁵¹⁷ *RIC* II no. 209A.

⁵¹⁸ Zanker 1988, 115.

⁵¹⁹ Before the Augustan period usually the animal's entire head was depicted. Zanker (1988, 117) suggests that the new representations of the ox skull in the Roman Imperial period were intended to intensify the religious effect of bucrania.

attendant might carry the secures. The sheer presence of the malleus, secures, and culter recalls the sacrifice of large victims. As in other visual representations of sacrificial rites that only depict the flamen with an apex in the sacrificial processions or among the attendants in moments preceding the kill, the frieze may have brought to mind the pregnant moment culminating in the sacrifice.⁵²⁰ A scene on one of the Boscoreale cups depicts just such a moment: poised in front of a garlanded temple, a sacrifice concluding the triumphal procession of Tiberius dramatically shows the popa drawing back his weapon to deliver the blow while two attendants struggle to maintain control of the bowing sacrificial victim (**Fig. 4.17**).⁵²¹

On one level, the frieze operates in a way similar to the coin image of Caligula sacrificing in front of the Temple of Divus Augustus in that the emphasis is on the sacrificial act and hence the divinity of the deity housed in the temple. Because the Temple of Divus Augustus was only the second temple to a *divus*, graphic representation of Caligula performing the ceremony in front of the temple would have set an important precedent underscoring the importance of recurring sacrifice and the inextricable link between temple and offerings to the god within. The Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, however, was the fourth temple to a *divus* and Romans alive under Domitian would not have known a time when there was not a temple to a deified ruler in Rome. Sacrifices to *divi* at their temples were no longer unusual; a Roman viewing the frieze would have understood the flamen to be the reigning emperor, Domitian.

In light of the frieze's location on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus it is safe to conclude that most viewers would have associated it with the sacrifice to the *divi* Vespasian and Titus that took place in front of the temple bearing the frieze. However, there may be a purposeful ambiguity. It could call to mind animal sacrifice by a flamen at any of the

⁵²⁰ Grunow 2002, 76.

⁵²¹ On increasingly dramatic representations of sacrifice in the early Empire, see Zanker 1988, 114.

temples of the gods for which the flamens were responsible, but particularly the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. With the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus strategically placed on the Clivus Capitolinus along the steep approach to the Capitoline, the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus rose up behind the Temple of Divus Vespasian underscoring the Flavian reconstruction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and impressing on viewers the close connection between the *divi* and Jupiter like parallel sacrifices on successive days at the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and Temple of Divus Augustus in the first century.

Repeating sequences of objects on the frieze echo in stone the recurring sacrifices at the temple. The lack of schematization frequently evident in other groupings of sacred implements in favor of highly particularized details in the frieze suggest specific representative sacrifices. Moreover, elements of the composition imply movement and potential action. The bucrania is not perfectly symmetrical, nor is each bucrania in the series identical, implying individual sacrificial events (**Fig. 4.13**). The sections of fillet hanging down on either side of the skulls differ in number and the loops of the fillet hanging from the horns fall at different angles, appearing to sway as though responding to forward motion.

Similarly, the urceus is not static but tipped to the side, as though someone was in the act of using it and the liquid was on the verge of spilling from the spout. Each urceus bears relief decoration in two registers (**Fig. 4.18**). On the Tabularium example a man with a lance opposes two felines (either panthers or lions) in the top register, and the lower register contains an antithetical rhinoceros and a bovine. Sculpted in the shape of a satyr wearing a mantle the handle of the urceus joins to the neck of the vessel. A row of nude male figures holding lances adorns the upper register, while a winged horse alights in the bottom register. Also arranged obliquely to the ground line, the culter with lion protome implies an unseen hand about to wield it on the

sacrificial victim. The wavy bovine tail of the aspergillus seems to quiver with movement as though being shaken. Of the instruments only the secures rests on the ground line, but it is physically connected to the malleus; the two are also associated functionally as the instruments that are used to stun and kill the sacrificial animal. While resting the implements on the ground line would have been compositionally unacceptable in a frieze, the artist could have filled the vertical space of the frieze by rendering the implements statically as though hanging on a wall.

Varied in decorative and symbolic detail, the *in situ* patera with a medusa head on the omphalos surrounded by a foliate ring, and the restored patera in the Tabularium fragment with head of Zeus Ammon and surrounding leaf pattern, may be modeled on actual or typical examples in metal. Zeus Ammon and the Gorgon are also connected to imperial cult and are symbols of imperial power (**Fig. 4.19**).⁵²²

Without a coin series commemorating the construction or dedication of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, surviving sculptural remains, or a detailed literary description, it is impossible to know the full sculptural program of which the frieze of cultic implements was surely just one component. To the figural representations in the frieze we may add only one other fragment from the Capitoline Museum: part of a column capital consisting of a corner of the abacus with a woman's head underneath, her hair parted in the middle, drawn up in two nodes of curls atop her head, and bound with a fillet (**Fig. 4.20**).⁵²³ Comparison to the Hartwig-Kelsey fragments justifies a dating of the capital fragment in the Flavian era, and the fragment's find spot suggests its association with the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus. In the area to the left of the female head is the recognizable texture from the plumage of a wing securing the

⁵²² De Angeli 1992, 147.

⁵²³ Musei Capitolini, Inv. 2532, 29 cm h., 33 cm l. The fragment is part of the angle of the abacus under which is the head of a woman, broken at the neck, to the left of the head is a wing which permits identification as a victory, De Angeli 1992, cat. 28, p. 123.

identification of the female figure as a Victory. De Angeli has attributed the capital to the aedicular framing of the cult statue and so conjectures a lost pendant capital.⁵²⁴ Other examples of interior figural capitals in temples of the Republican and early imperial period include a capital with tripod and serpent from the Temple of Apollo Sosianus, a capital with Pegasus in the Temple of Mars Ultor, and a capital from the Temple of Concord with paired rams.

The victory motif on the temple's interior, De Angeli argues, evoked the *virtus* of the deceased emperor, attested by his apotheosis, and corresponded to the *pietas* of the new emperor indicated by the frieze of sacred implements on the exterior.⁵²⁵ While the *virtus* of the deceased emperor would likely have been one understanding of the multivalent image of victory, and one even more fitting in a funerary monument, one should also bear in mind interpretations connected more directly to the status of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus as gods, that is the victory over mortality of the *divi* who have been transformed in the temple and ritual into eternal gods of the Roman state Pantheon.

Architrave Inscription

Without any surviving evidence for the inscriptions on the Temples of Divus Augustus, Divus Julius, or Divus Claudius, the inscription from the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus is the earliest to survive. Originally copied in the seventh century, the inscription at the time of the temple's dedication has been restored by De Angeli: DIVO VESPASIANO

AUGUSTO SPQR (to the Divine Vespasian Augustus from the Senate and People of Rome).⁵²⁶

Between 200 and 205 Septimius Severus and Caracalla restored the temple adding another line to

⁵²⁴ De Angeli 1992, 123.

⁵²⁵ De Angeli 1992.

⁵²⁶ De Angeli 1992, 18-9. The inscription is known from the *Codex Einsiedlensis*, 326 fol. 72b, see Ferroni 1993, 185-8, figs. 29.

the inscription: IMPP CAESS SEVERUS ET ANTONINUS PII FELIC AUGG RESTITUER (the Emperors Septimius Severus and Caracalla restored it).⁵²⁷ While the inscription only identifies Divus Vespasian, the Chronographer of 354 and other ancient sources clearly indicate that the Temple of Divus Vespasian was also a site of veneration for Divus Titus.⁵²⁸ Although it is unusual for temples to house the cults of more than one god it is possible as the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, housing the cults of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, and the Temple of Castor and Pollux attest.

Recognizing how public inscriptions organize different perceptions concerning the passing of time for different groups of readers, John Barrett sees two kinds of epigraphic chronologies: one type commemorated interpersonal relations among individuals and marked acts of patronage and supplication, while the other chronological form was the remembrance of a more generalized ideal, often religious in nature.⁵²⁹ Barrett advocates considering inscriptions as the media through which a memory is made possible and transmitted, rather than solely as evidence for the event that it records. It is within Barrett's latter category, remembrance of a more generalized ideal, that the inscription on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus should be understood.

Most significant is what is missing from the inscription. The carefully considered temple inscription does not name a specific dedicator beyond the timeless SPQR, reference lifetime offices held by the dedicatee, or contain any dating formula.⁵³⁰ Republican temple inscriptions usually included the name of the dedicatee, who sought to gain recognition and prestige through

⁵²⁷ *CIL* 6.938.

⁵²⁸ Chron. 146: templum Vespasiani et Titi. *Notitia* sites in Region VIII: Curiosum.

⁵²⁹ Barrett 1993.

⁵³⁰ On care taken in determining content of inscriptions in stone, see, e.g., Hope 2000.

his status as benefactor, a trend that continues into the imperial period, though the dedicatee was often an imperial figure. In contrast to the brief inscription on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, Pliny recounts that the more typical long inscriptions prompted Senators to complain that the inscriptions on arches and temples were too long for their architraves.⁵³¹ One example of a lengthy inscription, which contained a wealth of information, is the one adorning the Tiberian reconstruction of the Temple of Castor and Pollux in the Roman Forum. Géza Alföldy has recently restored the twenty-seven meter long inscription to include multiple titles and offices of Tiberius and Drusus and the notation that the temple was rebuilt from spoils of war after its destruction by fire.⁵³²

Mark Pobjoy sees the desire “to fix an individual’s place within history, society, and the cosmos” as background to the epigraphic impulse.⁵³³ The vast increase in inscribed texts in the early Empire, Pobjoy conjectures, may be explained as a change in Roman society, a desire to fix oneself within the new history of the Empire. Dating mechanisms in dedicatory inscriptions locate the origination of the monument in time. The conspicuous lack of any specific historical or dating reference in the architrave inscription of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus that would have fixed the temple in time encouraged the perception for later viewers that it had always been there and likewise that the god had always existed.⁵³⁴

In addition, there is no explicit epigraphic reference to the Flavian Gens or to Domitian as the successor of Divus Vespasian or Divus Titus or even his status as patron of the temple, though at the time of its dedication this would have been a well-known connection. The

⁵³¹ Pliny *Pan.* 54, 3: (*et quasi prolatis imperii finibus nunc ingentes arcus excessurosque templorum fastigium titulos*).

⁵³² On *CIL* 6.40339, see Champlin 2011, 82-5 (citing Alföldy 1992).

⁵³³ Pobjoy 2000, 77.

⁵³⁴ Ricoeur 2004, 153.

inscription ‘SPQR’ located patronage of the temple firmly within the public realm outside of the imperial family, an enduring record attesting to the role of the Senate and people in the instigation, concretization, and monumentalization of the new cults. The dedicatory inscription unmistakably indicated that *pietas* toward a deceased and deified emperor was not only in the domain of the new god’s successor, in this case Domitian, but also was a quality to be demonstrated by the Senate and people. Accurately inscribing the name of a building’s founder was so important that a late antique law required that the original founder of a building must continue to be commemorated during later phases of the same building, though subsequent benefactors could also have their names inscribed alongside the founder for rebuilding or redecorating the structure.⁵³⁵

Topography

The first three temples to deified emperors were built on sites with multiple advantages, including a connection with the birth, death, or sanctity of the deceased emperor.⁵³⁶ In contrast, the site of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus seems to have no such significance to Vespasian or his successors. Commentators have observed that the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus formed a pendant on the north side of the Roman Forum to the similarly situated Temple of Divus Julius on the south side of the Forum, a correlation that Statius alludes to in his poem celebrating the colossal equestrian statue of Domitian located in the Roman Forum.⁵³⁷

Summarizing this idea, Michael Thomas has called the two temples a “topographical bookend of

⁵³⁵ Dig. 50.10.7. See, Cooley 2000, 7.

⁵³⁶ Temple of Divus Julius, on the spot of his cremation; Temple of Divus Augustus on the spot of his childhood home; Temple of Divus Claudius at a location sacred to the Gens Claudia.

⁵³⁷ See, e.g., De Angeli 1992, 136.

dynastic deification.”⁵³⁸ While the modern, fragmented state of the Roman Forum combined with a bird’s eye view of building footprints provided by modern plans strongly indicates an ancient correlation between the Arch of Titus, Temple of Divus Julius, and the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, on the ground such a connection would not have been so obvious (**Fig. 4.21**). Virtual reconstructions from the steps of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus have shown that the Temple of Saturn significantly impeded the view from the steps south and across the Roman Forum.⁵³⁹ While some topographical connection to the Temple of Divus Julius is justified, perhaps it has been overstated.

Scholars have similarly noted topographical links between the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus and other Flavian monuments. Thomas has further employed ideas about sightlines among monuments also proposed by Favro, Torelli, and Davies to relocate the Equus Domitiani from its hypothetical location in the center of the Roman Forum to the area of the Column of Phocas.⁵⁴⁰ This location, he argues, satisfies all requirements of ancient descriptions of the monuments and takes advantage of Domitian’s penchant for sightlines by providing a view from the Equus Domitiani down the corridor between the Curia and the Basilica Aemilia to the Forum Transitorium and temple of Domitian’s patron goddess, Minerva. A site in the north end of the Roman Forum for the Equus Domitiani has the added benefit of closer proximity to the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, which rose up behind

⁵³⁸ On the topographical relationship between the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus and the Temple of Divus Julius, see e.g. De Angeli 1992, cat 9.

⁵³⁹ See the virtual reconstruction of the Digital Roman Forum project: http://dlib.etc.ucla.edu/projects/Forum/reconstructions/VespianusDivusTemplum_1.

⁵⁴⁰ Thomas 2004, 24-6. See also Torelli 1987; Favro 1996; Davies 2000.

Domitian's equestrian victory monument, framing a view of the statue and likewise framing the perception of the emperor himself as a worthy successor to his deified father and brother.⁵⁴¹

Connecting the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus on the slope of the Capitoline, the Domus Flavia on the Palatine, and the Temple of the Gens Flavia on the Quirinal, Haeckl views the three structures as a, "topographic golden triangle whose legs connected the sacred Flavian trinity" of Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian.⁵⁴² A focus solely on topographical connections through sightlines and axial relationships, while essential, overshadows the topographical significance of the enigmatic Portico of the Dei Consenti immediately adjacent to the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus and with which it was contemporary (**Fig. 4.10**). On the north side of Clivus Capitolinus, the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus occupied the former route of egress to the Tabularium and the area of the Capitol commonly referred to as *inter duos lucos*, the area between the groves known as a place of asylum.⁵⁴³ It also stands where, Livy recounts, the Portico of the Dei Consenti was built in 174 BCE and extended from the Temple of Saturn to the senate's chambers.⁵⁴⁴

The Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus not only displaced the Portico of the Dei Consenti, but also required considerable interventions in the Tabularium at the level of the temple's podium and cella.⁵⁴⁵ The land on which the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus was built was artificially lowered about two and a half feet at the time of the construction, as evident from travertine remains in the tufa podium of the Temple of Concordia. The lowering of the original Augustan level of the pavement in the area of the temple and fabrication of the

⁵⁴¹ Torelli 1987; Favro 1996, 217-51; Davies 2000, 136-7; Thomas 2004, 33-4.

⁵⁴² Haeckl 1996, 17.

⁵⁴³ Thomas 2004, 28-43.

⁵⁴⁴ Livy 41.27.7.

⁵⁴⁵ De Angeli 1992.

cement foundation and large platform extending under the contemporary Portico of the Dei Consenti attests to the Flavians' systematic approach to the area.⁵⁴⁶ Construction techniques further suggest that there was some connection between the two buildings: excavators noted that the brick construction of the individual chambers of the Portico was similar to that of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.⁵⁴⁷

The Dei Consentes were a group of twelve major Roman deities, six male and six female, identified by Ennius as Juno, Vesta, Minerva, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Neptune, Vulcan, and Apollo, gilded images of which stood in the Roman Forum in the time of Varro.⁵⁴⁸ In response to Hannibal's threatened attack on the city and on the advice of the Sybilline Books Rome celebrated a *lectisternium* in 217 B.C.E. in honor of the twelve gods, placing busts or statues of a male and female pair on each of six pulvinaria to receive an offering.⁵⁴⁹ Already displaced by the Temple of Concordia, which dominated the northeast end of the Forum after its construction in 121 B.C.E., the Portico of the Dei Consenti was further relegated up the Clivus Capitolinus by construction of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.

The Portico of the Dei Consenti is formed by two wings of a colonnade that join at an obtuse angle to conform to the trapezoidal shape of the space it occupies (**Fig. 4.22**).⁵⁵⁰ Cipollino columns with trophy adorned capitals form a screen behind which stood seven or eight small rectangular rooms. A paved courtyard fills out the space between the portico and the Clivus

⁵⁴⁶ De Angeli 1992, 138.

⁵⁴⁷ Nieddu 1993.

⁵⁴⁸ Enn. frag. 45. Var. *Agr.* 1.1.4.

⁵⁴⁹ Livy (23.10.9) lists the pairs as Jupiter-Juno, Neptune-Minerva, Mars-Venus, Apollo-Diana, Vulcan-Vesta, Mercury-Ceres.

⁵⁵⁰ Nieddu 1993.

Capitolinus. A lower level made up of seven small chambers faces the podium of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and would have been accessible from a passageway between the two structures.⁵⁵¹ An inscription dated to 367 attests to a restoration of the simulacra of the Dei Consentes by the ‘praefectus urbi Vettius Praetextatus’.⁵⁵² Specifically, the inscription claims that Praetextatus restored the images in their ancient form. The simulacra probably stood either in the intercolumniations of the portico or in the paved courtyard, although the narrow intercolumniations are an unattractive option because statues in each of the twelve openings would have made access to the chambers behind difficult.

While the ritual and ceremony in the Portico of the Dei Consenti is uncertain, the maintenance and repeated reconstruction of a building to house the simulacra of the Dei Consentes on valuable real estate along the Clivus Capitolinus attest to their importance in Roman religion. Siting the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus adjacent to the Portico of the Dei Consenti with the lower rooms of the Portico opening directly onto the podium of the temple, using similar construction techniques, and even similar decorative finishes in the use of colored stone (cipollino in the Portico of the Dei Consenti and pavonazetto in the interior of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus) suggest a purposeful association. Paratactic arrangement of the Dei Consentes in individual chambers may have suggested that the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus was, in a sense, an adjacent chamber housing additional simulacra of the *divi*. Thus, the proximity of the two buildings and similarities in style configured Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus as additional gods supplementing the timeless and eternal group housed in the Portico of the Dei Consenti.

⁵⁵¹ De Angeli 1992, 68-70.

⁵⁵² *CIL* 6.102: deorum cONSENTIUM SACROSANCTA SIMVLACRA CVM OMNI LOci | totius adornatioNE CVLTV IN formam antiquam restituto | vETTIVS PRAETEXTATVS · V · C · PRAefectus uRBI reposuit | CVRANTE LONGEIO v · c · cONSVLARI.

The Flavians may have located the temple to their *divi* to imply their sacred and eternal nature, but sources also indicate that Rome's oldest gods could benefit from prestige associated with proximity to temples of the *divi*. Cult site and topographical context were an important component in the Arval Brethren's composition of their official records. The first epigraphic mention of the Temple of Divus Vespasian comes in 87, with the recording of a sacrifice to the Dea Diae in the pronaos of the Temple of Concordia 'near the Temple of Divus Vespasiani'.⁵⁵³ While the topographical specification near the Temple of Divus Vespasian seems superfluous because the Temple of Concordia in the Roman Forum would have been well known, it may indicate why the Arval Brethren chose the Temple of Concordia as the site of their ceremony in 87. Although particular cult acts were required to take place in the grove of the Dea Dia, cult sites in the city of Rome were subject to change.⁵⁵⁴ Choosing the Temple of Concordia and recording its location next to the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus may have been a subtle statement of allegiance to the Flavian dynasty under Domitian who had completed construction on the temple.⁵⁵⁵ Statius may have been similarly motivated only two years later. Describing the context of the great equestrian statue of Domitian, Statius notes that it is surrounded by the Basilica Aemilia, Basilica Julia, and to the back the Temples of Concordia and that of Domitian's father, Divus Vespasian.⁵⁵⁶

⁵⁵³ *CIL* 6.2065: (in pronaos aedis Concordiae, quae est prope templum divi Vespasiani).

⁵⁵⁴ Beard 1985.

⁵⁵⁵ Flower 1996, 225, notes that the crisis at the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty that led to the Flavians was also a crisis for the Arval Brethren whose elaborate cultivation of the *divi* and of the family festivals of the Julio-Claudians was affected by the advent of a new dynasty.

⁵⁵⁶ *Stat. Silv.*, 1.1.31.

Restoration Coin Series of Titus and Divus Augustus

In his brief two-year reign, Titus established a novel numismatic tradition rooted in the restoration of earlier emperors' coins, a tradition that would influence important coin issues of later emperors, most notably Trajan. In 2001 Holger Komnick published the definitive volume to date on the Roman restoration series including a catalog, typology, and the first systematic analysis of coin prototypes, on which any discussion of Roman restoration coin series, including this one, must be heavily indebted.⁵⁵⁷ Examining the changing ways in which the *divi* were, or were not, incorporated into the restoration series of Titus and Trajan, further reveals how the reigning emperors negotiated their relationship with the memory of the deified emperors.⁵⁵⁸

Titus was the first emperor to use the term *restituere* in coin legends, explicitly identifying the coins as restored objects through a legend on the reverse listing various titles of the emperor culminating in the designation RES, REST, RESTIT, RESTITU, or RESTITUIT, all different versions of the verb *restituere*.⁵⁵⁹ As Theodore Buttrey persuasively argues, coins with the REST marking accompanying the name of the moneyer are separate phenomena from coins bearing obverses or reverses that simply imitate pre-Flavian coins, a common practice under Vespasian.⁵⁶⁰ Restoration coins of Titus, on the other hand, were almost always embossed on types with obverse and reverse combinations already used by previous emperors. For example, in 22-23, approximately six years after the death and deification of Augustus, Tiberius issued a sestertius with the legend DIVUS AUGUSTUS PATER and a radiate Divus Augustus seated before an altar and holding a laurel branch and scepter on the obverse, and on the reverse S.C

⁵⁵⁷ Komnick 2001.

⁵⁵⁸ On the restoration coin series of Trajan see Chapter 5.

⁵⁵⁹ For a list of obverse legends on the restoration coins of Titus, see Komnick 2001, 31.

⁵⁶⁰ Buttrey 1972, 95.

encircled by the legend TI CAESAR DIVI AUG F AUGUST P M TR POT XXIII (**Fig. 4.23**).⁵⁶¹ Duplicating both the obverse and reverse iconography of the Tiberian coins, perhaps even using the same coin dies, Titus issued a sestertius dated to 80, in all respects identical to the Divus Augustus Pater coin of Tiberius described immediately above except for the reverse legend which read IMP T CAES DIVI VESP F AUG P M TR P P P COS VIII around the large S.C in the middle with REST above (**Fig. 4.24**).⁵⁶² Other iconography associated with Divus Augustus Pater on the coins of Tiberius and later restored under Titus are Divus Augustus radiate and seated on a curule chair with laurel branch and scepter, the head of Divus Augustus on the obverse and victory flying left on the reverse, the obverse legend PROVIDENT and a large altar with double paneled door, and the eagle with wings spread and either standing facing front or on a globe.⁵⁶³

Before Titus some form of *restituere* had been used on coins but not as an explicit characteristic of the moneyer or the coin itself, rather as a modifier of a geographic or other personification. For instance, a Tiberian issue that may allude to the reconstruction of Asia Minor after its destruction by an earthquake in 17, pairs an obverse image of a seated Tiberius clad in a toga and laurel wreath holding a patera and scepter with the reverse legend CIVITATIBUS ASIAE RESTITUTIS.⁵⁶⁴ Similarly, a sestertius of Galba presents a claim of LIBERTAS RESTITUTA in the reverse legend.

To explain the ‘restored’ status of the coins of Titus Mattingly reasons that the emperor’s lack of close personal connection with the dead subjects of his commemorative coins led him to

⁵⁶¹ Tiberius, *RIC I*² no. 49; *BMCRE I* no. 74.

⁵⁶² Titus, *RIC II* no. 184; *BMCRE I* no. 184.

⁵⁶³ Divus Augustus radiate and seated on a curule chair: *RIC II* no. 187; *BMCRE I* nos. 263-64. Reverse of victory: *RIC II* no. 446. Obverse legend PROVIDENT: *RIC II* no. 454. Eagle standing facing front: *RIC II* no. 206; *BMCRE I* no. 278. Eagle on globe: *RIC II* no. 198; *BMCRE I* no. 275.

⁵⁶⁴ Tiberius, *RIC I*² no. 48.

‘restore’ their memories in this form rather than striking coins with their names and portraits but without the ‘restored’ designation.⁵⁶⁵ There is, however, no reason to assume that there was a standard of decorum that prohibited Titus from issuing coins commemorating the Julio-Claudians with simply their names and portraits. The fact that Vespasian was free to complete and dedicate, or at least claim that he completed, the Temple of Divus Claudius and that Titus himself instituted honors for Britannicus discourages such a claim.

Noting that the REST mark was unnecessary, Komnick points to coins of Augustus that copied Republican reverses without explicitly indicating their status as duplications.⁵⁶⁶ The special significance of the REST marking lies in part, Komnick asserts, in the unique status it gives to the person minting the coin as the originator of the copy.⁵⁶⁷ Though *restituere* may have a broad range of meanings and connotations, Titus’ faithful duplication of preexisting numismatic prototypes reveals that in the context of Titus’ restoration series the emperor is presenting himself as a restorer to a former state. Repetition or copying gains meaning in relation to the original, if there is one, in part by detaching the original from its original context. In this case, repetition of the original Julio-Claudian coin issues may be intended to convey imitation, but it was a conscious appropriation of the original coins adding an additional dimension of meaning.

When considering the restoration series of Titus as repetitive imagery that could effectively indicate a sense of historical awareness on the part of Titus, and one that had the capacity to reinforce a connection to tradition and individual exemplars, scholars have nevertheless mischaracterized, to some extent, the significance of Divus Augustus in the

⁵⁶⁵ Mattingly 1920, 181.

⁵⁶⁶ Komnick 2001.

⁵⁶⁷ Komnick 2001, 5.

restoration series of Titus.⁵⁶⁸ Mattingly aptly argues that the restored coins were deliberate, rather than sporadic occasional issues, intended to “revive in the popular mind the earlier princes.”⁵⁶⁹ He attributes the revival of certain types to the character of the age rooted in the conservatism of a people who loved tradition and a government seeking to link itself to an honored past.⁵⁷⁰ Specifically, the selection of some commemorated individuals for inclusion in the series (Divus Augustus, Livia, Tiberius, Drusus, Nero Drusus, Germanicus, Agrippina I, Claudius, and Galba) and exclusion of others (Caligula, Nero, Otho, Vitellius), represents an official judgment on their records, indicating who was worthy of commemoration and who was not. Komnick links the restoration series to Vespasian’s deification arguing that for Titus the series played an important role in his legitimation, justifying his own dynastic succession based on the achievements of his predecessor.⁵⁷¹

Mattingly and Komnick, however, fail to note that not all commemorations in the restoration series are created equal: Divus Augustus is the anchor contextualizing the rest of the series. Titus issued restoration coins of Divus Augustus in the greatest iconographic variation and number of types. While other individuals commemorated may have been chosen for their positive record either as emperors or as imperial family members with distinguished military service, based on the obverse legends several of the types appear to have been chosen for their familial relationship to Divus Augustus: Tiberius is identified as the son of a god, TI CAESAR DIVI AUG F AUGUST IMP VIII; Drusus as the son and grandson of a god, DRUSUS CAESAR TI AUG F DIVI AUG N; and Germanicus as the son and grandson of a god, GERMANICUS

⁵⁶⁸ On the symbolic potential of repetitive imagery, particularly in Roman sculpture, see Gazda 1995, 142-4.

⁵⁶⁹ Mattingly 1920, 178.

⁵⁷⁰ Mattingly 1966b, xxi.

⁵⁷¹ Komnick 2001, 180.

CAESAR TI AUG F DIVI AUG N (Fig. 4.25).⁵⁷² Also significant are the reverse legends of the series. In his typology of the coins Komnick divides the coins of Titus into two broad groups: those in which Titus identifies himself as a *divi filius* in the reverse legend and those in which he simply employs his imperial titles, IMP T VESP AUG REST.⁵⁷³

Undoubtedly, as Komnick describes, Titus emphasized the relationship of Tiberius, Drusus, and Germanicus to Divus Augustus in order to draw a parallel to his own status as the son and successor to Divus Vespasian. Inclusion of Claudius and Galba in the series, however, accompanied by their own imperial titles, also expresses their value as imperial precedents despite the fact that Nero as *divi filius* of Claudius was not included in the series, probably also because Nero suffered broad memory sanctions. Furthermore, the fact that one group of the coins identified Titus as *divi filius* and one group did not signals that dynastic legitimation may not have been the only impetus for issuing the series. By asserting his status as emperor in his own right in the group of coins with the obverse legend IMP T VESP AUG REST, Titus positioned himself as successor to his Julio-Claudian predecessors not only in his status as son of a god, but also as an emperor. Emphasis on Divus Augustus as the context for the series recalled the dynastic origins of the Julio-Claudians, a parallel to the Flavians, but perhaps more importantly it would have reinforced the exalted origins of the Empire in a divine founder, one that the series presents as a predecessor directly linked to Titus.

Curiously, although by Titus' reign the cult of Divus Claudius would have been well established and his status as a god secure, the restoration coins of Titus do not invoke Divus Claudius. In addition, a restoration coin of Divus Julius is conspicuously absent. These omissions

⁵⁷² Tiberius: e.g. *RIC* II no. 187; *BMCRE* I no. 284; Komnick Type 2.0. Drusus: e.g. *RIC* II no. 217, *BMCRE* I no. 288; Komnick Type 8.1. Germanicus: e.g. *RIC* II no. 230; *BMCRE* I no. 295; Komnick Type 10.0.

⁵⁷³ Komnick 2001, 31-55.

demonstrate that while Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, Divus Claudius, and Divus Vespasian with their recurring ritual and monumental temples in the city of Rome were potential references for the emperors of 68-69, Vespasian, and Titus for inclusion in their symbolic programs, by the Flavian era the *divi* did not represent a coherent group.

In light of the fact that Vespasian completed and dedicated the Temple of Divus Claudius, it is highly unlikely that the failure to refer to Claudius as a *divus* in either the coin series of Titus or the *Lex Vespasiani* indicates that his status as a *divus* was still insecure under the Flavians.⁵⁷⁴ Divus Julius was similarly excluded from the restoration coin series, yet later calendars leave little question that the cult of Divus Julius continued throughout the Empire.⁵⁷⁵ The imperial past as represented by Titus in the restoration series could credibly exclude Divus Julius and Divus Claudius, while including Claudius and non-imperial, illustrious members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty such as Drusus and Germanicus. Exclusion of Divus Claudius and Divus Julius might indicate a desire to highlight the divinity of Augustus, and hence the divine origins of the Roman Empire. Mostly stamped in silver, bronze, and copper denominations issued by the imperial and senatorial mints, the restoration series of Titus may also signal the emperor's desire to associate himself with the Senate by demonstrating a joint effort to pay commemorative honors to the illustrious dead.⁵⁷⁶

Commemorative and Cultic Experimentation under Domitian

Anne Haeckl has observed that when Domitian ascended to the imperial office after the death and apotheosis of Vespasian and Titus the Gens Flavia was already a *domus divina*,

⁵⁷⁴ Arguing for Claudius' debatable status, see, e.g., Darwall-Smith 1996, 49.

⁵⁷⁵ On the *Feriale Duranum*, see Fink, Hoey and Snyder 1940. On the Codex Calendar of 354, see Salzman 1990.

⁵⁷⁶ Significant in this regard is the combination on As coins of the large SC with the restoration legend of Titus (Mattingly 1920, 182; Komnick 2001, 179).

leading Domitian to focus building efforts in Rome on glorification of his divine kinship to a degree unprecedented in earlier reigns.⁵⁷⁷ Because Vespasian and Titus died only two years apart, Domitian faced the unique situation of commemorating his deified father and brother simultaneously. The inclusion of Divus Titus in the Temple of Divus Vespasian was not in concept completely new, but it was the first time that two *divi* received state cult veneration in one temple. Inclusion of Divus Titus in the temple must have reminded viewers of successive additions of deceased emperors and family members in the Mausoleum of Augustus, a primarily retrospective monument glorifying members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and in which Vespasian's remains were temporarily housed after his death. Yet, the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus retained its traditional temple form and iconographic emphasis on cult veneration of eternal gods of the Roman state pantheon at the expense of references to personal attributes, the individual histories of Vespasian or Titus, or explicit reference to Domitian as their successor.

Considering the three other monuments built by Domitian to honor the deified members of his family, the Arch of Titus, Porticus Divorum, and Temple of the Gens Flavia, this section highlights the evolving negotiation in the representation of an eternal state god between personal history and dynastic considerations on the one hand and universalizing aspects of the god on the other hand. These monuments varied the temple model established with Divus Julius and his deified successors by straying from the existing repertoire of monumental options for commemorating the *divi*. Not only were references to lifetime events and dynastic connections more explicit in the Domitianic monuments commemorating the Flavian *divi*, but the aggregation of multiple gods in the Temple of the Gens Flavia was also unprecedented. With the important

⁵⁷⁷ Haackl 1996, 16.

exception of images of apotheosis that recurred in the second century with the Apotheosis of Sabina Relief and the Column Base of Antoninus Pius and Faustina, the Domitianic experimentation was not repeated. It is suggested here that such monuments strayed too far from the accepted mnemonic norms of the gods established by the temples.

Arch of Titus

In its prominent position at the rise of the Velian along the Sacred Way, and with its stunning monumental reliefs, the Arch of Titus has become, for modern observers, a more potent visual symbol of Titus' deification than the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus (**Fig. 4.26**). The elaborate sculptural program features two large panel reliefs on the interior of the single bayed arch: one depicting Titus' triumphal return from Palestine carrying spoils and the other of the goddesses Roma and Victory crowning Titus as he entered the city in a quadriga (**Fig. 4.27**). A square sculpted panel in the interior apex of the arch shows the apotheosis of Titus as he ascended to the heavens on the back of an eagle (**Fig. 4.28**). In the frieze below the attic panel a procession of soldiers bears the god of the river Jordan on a litter accompanied by animals for sacrifice and soldiers carrying booty. Sculptures of Roma and Fortuna, or as Davies has identified them, of Honos and Virtus, adorn the keystones.⁵⁷⁸ An attic inscription proclaims POPULUSQUE ROMANUS | DIVO TITO DIVI VESPASIANI F | VESPASIANO AUGUSTO (The Roman Senate and People (dedicate this) to Divus Titus Vespasian Augustus, son of Divus Vespasian). Arguing for a Domitianic construction date rather than Nervan or Trajanic, Michael Pfanner identifies the figures on the summit of the arch depicted in the booty relief as the two triumphal quadrigae of Titus and Vespasian. From this he calculates that the figure of a youth

⁵⁷⁸ Davies 2000.

astride a horse must be Domitian, who would not have been included in a state relief after his death and the declaration of memory sanctions against him.⁵⁷⁹

As the first monumental sculptural image of an emperor's apotheosis, the captivating image of Titus looking down on those passing under the arch from his perch atop the eagle, combined with the dedicatory inscription to Divus Titus, has guided recent interpretations of the arch. Stamper views the arch as a symbol of royal power recalling the portals where god-images made their seasonal entrances, epiphanic connotations that derive from eastern traditions of ruler worship.⁵⁸⁰ Rejecting the notion of a triumphal arch for the Jewish war or a memorial to Titus, Pfanner argues that Domitian erected the arch to commemorate the consecration of his brother. In this light, Pfanner interprets the allegorical figures in the Triumphator Relief as Victoria, Virtus, and Honos, virtues of the deceased emperor that qualify him for deification.⁵⁸¹ The elephant quadriga that originally crowned the arch would have reinforced this message while the passageway reliefs served as proof that the deceased emperor had earned the apotheosis depicted in the vault. Similarly, Penelope Davies views the arch, strategically placed to balance the Julio-Claudian presence in the area, as commemorating the admirable deeds that offer immortality through remembrance of triumph.⁵⁸² Still others argue that the arch was the final resting place for Titus' ashes, though it is more likely they were placed in the Temple of the Gens Flavia.⁵⁸³

The inscription, Pfanner further observes, omits Titus' official titulature or mention of the victory or triumph. Unlike the temple inscription, however, the inscription on the arch does not

⁵⁷⁹ Pfanner 1983.

⁵⁸⁰ Stamper 2005, 168-171.

⁵⁸¹ Pfanner 1983. *Cf.* e.g. Coarelli and Luisanna 1980, 96-9.

⁵⁸² Davies 2000, 71-2, 142-3.

⁵⁸³ Arguing that the chamber in the arch was fitted to receive the ashes of Titus, see Richard 1966, 139-40. That Domitian removed the ashes of Titus and Vespasian from the Mausoleum of Augustus to place them in the Temple of the Gens Flavia, see Chausson 2001, 348.

identify the god solely as Divus Titus but includes the longer form Divus Titus Vespasianus Augustus, highlighting the divine lineage of the new god and his connection to the imperial office, the holder of which was often referred to as Augustus. The Arch of Titus has long confused scholars because it seems to meld two distinct types of commemoration: a dedication to a god attested in an inscription devoid of titulature or historical or chronological context, combined with references to a specific historical event, the Judaean triumph. In effect this monument takes the notion of Divus Titus as an eternal, celestial god formulated through temple architecture and cult and incorporates it for the first time into an architectural context commemorative in function and retrospective in outlook.

If Pfanner is correct that the arch was originally intended by Domitian to commemorate Titus' deification, the unmistakable images of triumph would have brought Titus' victory to mind. Victory, standing beside Titus in the chariot and unambiguously identifiable by the enormous wings extending out behind her as the chariot moves forward, explicitly sanctions the Judaean victory and favor of the gods, and through the simultaneously visible vision of apotheosis immediately above the relief she is demonstrating the divine foreordination of Titus' apotheosis, an idea further conveyed by the eagle of Jupiter as the literal vehicle of apotheosis.

Templum and Porticus Divorum

The Chronographer of 354 lists the Divorum, alongside the Iseum and Serapeum and Temple of Minerva Chalcidica, as one of the works of Domitian in the Campus Martius, which may be added to the Odeum, Stadium, and Temple of Fortuna Redux.⁵⁸⁴ According to the Forma Urbis the Templum Divorum, dedicated to Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, was immediately

⁵⁸⁴ Chronog. a. 354, 146. The structures are listed in the same order in the Regionary Catalogues. Wiseman 1993, 280-1. On Domitian's building program in the fourth century chronicles, see Anderson 1983.

southeast of the Iseum in the area of the Saepta Julia and probably on land that was previously occupied by the Republican Villa Publica (**Fig. 4.29**).⁵⁸⁵ Historically it was in the Villa Publica, created for the taking of censuses and marshaling of armies for triumphs, that triumphant generals spent the night awaiting the decision on whether they would receive a triumph. A trace of suburban wall discovered in 1925 is believed to secure the general area of the Templum Divorum. This location is also in the area of a huge fire in 80 in the Campus Martius to the east of the Saepta Julia that may have substantially cleared the area for future building.⁵⁸⁶

The Porticus Divorum consisted of a rectangular portico, approximately 200 by 55 m, enclosed by porticos on the south, east, and west sides, and with a triple bayed arch at its only entrance on the north side. The portico, with thirty columns on the long sides and sixteen on the short sides, surrounded two small temple-like structures positioned antithetically at the northern end of the enclosed space, approximately 20 m by 13 m, one to Divus Titus and the other almost certainly to Divus Vespasian. Identification of the two aedes is based on an inscription dated to 153 concerning gifts by Salvia Marcellina in memory of her husband to the Collegium Aesculapiae et Hygiae.⁵⁸⁷ A grove or rows of trees, implied by regularly arrayed dots on the Forma Urbis fragments, may have occupied a portion of the walled, porticoed enclosure. On the east side a screen of columns partitioned off a large rectangular exedra.⁵⁸⁸ An unidentifiable, square quadrifrons structure marked by a column at each corner and two stairway approaches occupied the southern end of the *templum*.

⁵⁸⁵ FUR Frag. 35ab, pl. 26; 35cc, pls. 26 and 49; 35cdefghi, pl. 26; 35ii, pls. 26, 46.

⁵⁸⁶ Torelli 1992, 96. Suet. *Tit.* 8.3; Dio Cass. 66.24.1-3.

⁵⁸⁷ *CIL* 6.10234: indicates that the Lex Collegi Aesculapi et Hygiae held a meeting of 60 members in the Porticus Divorum in 'aede divi Titi' in 153 on Antoninus Pius' birthday.

⁵⁸⁸ Nieddu 1993, 9-10.

Like the Arch of Titus, the Templum Divorum had stronger associations with lifetime accomplishments than other monuments to *divi* to date, in particular with the Judaeen triumph of Titus and Vespasian. L. Richardson was the first to explore the topographical and ideological significance of Domitian's choice to construct the Templum Divorum on the site of the former Republican Villa Publica, the site where Titus and Vespasian, in keeping with tradition, spent the night before entering Rome in triumph after their Judaeen victories.⁵⁸⁹ The physical connection by a stairway from the Templum Divorum to the temple of Domitian's patron goddess Minerva Chalcidica further evoked martial success secured by support of the gods.⁵⁹⁰ If after the Flavian period triumphators were required to enter the Porticus Divorum and make sacrifices at the two aedes within the Templum Divorum, and Domitian built the complex in part to replace the old Villa Publica as Darwall-Smith suggests, then like the Arch of Titus and the Gens Flavia discussed below, the Templum Divorum represents an unprecedented combination of function with commemoration and veneration of the *divi*.⁵⁹¹

Temple of the Gens Flavia and the Imperial House

Under the Julio-Claudians only the so-called bad emperors routinely secured deification of their family members from the Senate, such as Poppaea and Sabina Poppaea, the wife and infant daughter of Nero. While under Caligula, his sister Drusilla was deified. Under Domitian, in addition to Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, imperial family members were deified at an unprecedented pace. Though Statius mentions a Diva Domitilla, deified under Titus, it is unclear whether the reference is to Domitilla the elder, wife of Vespasian, or Domitilla the younger,

⁵⁸⁹ Richardson 1976.

⁵⁹⁰ Anderson 1983. See also Jones 1992, 84-94.

⁵⁹¹ Darwall-Smith 1996, 156-158.

daughter of Titus.⁵⁹² In 80, under Titus, a coin celebrating Domitilla's deification bore the legend DIVA DOMITILLA AUGUSTA ET MEMORIAE DOMITILLAE.⁵⁹³ Domitian's first son died as an infant at some point before his father became emperor in 81 and was deified shortly after Domitian's accession, an event commemorated by a coin with an image of a nude baby boy in the guise of Jupiter sitting on a globe and surrounded by seven stars (**Fig. 4.30**).⁵⁹⁴ The child's mother, Domitia Longina, was simultaneously honored as Mater Divi Caesaris in the guise of Pietas. Domitian's niece Julia, daughter of Titus, after her death and consecration in 90, was probably the final deified member of the Flavian dynasty. After Julia's death, Martial charged Diva Julia with watching over Domitian's son and coopting the child's destiny from the Fates.⁵⁹⁵

Though there may have been some association of deified Flavian family members such as Domitilla and even Domitian's infant son with the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, Domitian's construction of the Temple of the Gens Flavia for the worship of the Flavian *divi* argues against it.⁵⁹⁶ If it was possible simply to include veneration of family members into the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, the temple might have satisfied Domitian's evident desire for a cult of the Gens Flavia. While the Senate decreed and, along with the people of Rome, dedicated a Temple to Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, there is no mention of Senatorial involvement in the Temple of the Gens Flavia, likely financed and built solely at the instigation of Domitian. The Senate's lack of involvement would have had serious implications, the most important of which was exclusion of the cult of the Gens Flavia from the state religion and the

⁵⁹² Stat. *Silv.* 1.94-98. On Domitilla as the sister of Titus, see Jones 1984, 153. On Diva Domitilla as the wife of Vespasian, see Wood 2010.

⁵⁹³ *BMCRE* II no. 270.

⁵⁹⁴ *RIC* II no. 154.

⁵⁹⁵ Mart. *Epig.* 6.3.

⁵⁹⁶ Chausson 2001.

marginalization of its significance to maintenance of the *pax deorum*. Although the Senate willingly decreed temple and cult first in favor of Divus Vespasian and later Divus Titus, with their ambivalent attitude toward imperial dynastic succession, it is no surprise that they were not involved in the establishment of a temple and cult to the Flavian Gens and imposition of a permanent religious obligation on the Roman state.

For Edward Dąbrowa the function of the Temple of the Gens Flavia as the main center of the Flavian family cult suggests an imitation of patterns set by the Julio-Claudian emperors, yet he too notes the novel notion of a cult sanctuary combined with a dynastic mausoleum.⁵⁹⁷ The closest precedent is outside of Rome's pomerium along the Appian Way toward Alba Longa. In Bovillae Tiberius built a *sacrarium gentis Iuliae* in which he placed a statue of Divus Augustus.⁵⁹⁸ Precedents for state veneration of the family gens of an emperor in the city of Rome might include the foundation in the Forum Iulium of the temple and cult of Venus Genetrix, though the goddess was fashioned as a divine ancestor of Julius Caesar and of the entire Roman people thereby preserving a collective Roman connection to the goddess.

The function of the Altar of the Gens Iulia located on the Capitoline Hill is more challenging.⁵⁹⁹ According to one hypothesis the Altar of the Gens Iulia is the official name of the Ara Pietatis dedicated by Claudius in 43 to commemorate the deification of Livia on 17 January 42. In this scenario the dedication of the altar by Claudius officially fulfilled a vow by Tiberius in 22 for the health of Livia when she suffered a serious illness. Torelli explains that although the official name of the altar may have at one point been the altar of the Gens Iulia the beneficiaries

⁵⁹⁷ Dąbrowa claims that neither Domitian's own pretensions to divinity, nor the need for his own legitimacy justified his decision to build the Temple of the Gens Flavia. He looks to Domitian's rarely cited adoption of the two sons of his cousin Flavius Clemens rooting the motivation for the Temple of the Gens Flavia in the expression of dynastic legitimacy of his heirs (Dąbrowa 1996, 153-7).

⁵⁹⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 2.41.1. See also, Hänlein-Schäfer 1985, 103.

⁵⁹⁹ La Rocca 1995.

of sacrifices were understood to be the assimilated Diva Augusta and Pietas rather than the Gens Iulia.⁶⁰⁰

Either way, the Temple of the Gens Flavia dedicated to the family of a ruling emperor went further toward personalization of cult around the living emperor and his family than ever before. J.C. Richard attributes importance to the official name as a *templum* rather than an *aedes*, suggesting to contemporaries a very different function than the Temple (aedes) of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the Forum.⁶⁰¹ While the canonical Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus does not admit to deification until after death, the Temple of the Gens Flavia exalts the divinity of the gens in the present. Significantly, though the Temple of the Gens Flavia was famous when built, there is no evidence that the cult or prominence of the complex lasted beyond the death of Domitian. Worship of the Flavian gens and exclusion from the state cult, combined with the monument's function as burial place for mortal remains as other scholars have suggested, may have contributed to a mnemonic disjunction in understanding the significance of the complex, which ultimately resulted in the cult's failure to remain relevant to the idea of the deified emperors and the Empire preserved in the collective memory.

Temple of the Gens Flavia: Architectural Form and Topography

As the first cult structure intended from the outset to house multiple deified members of the imperial family the Temple of the Gens Flavia was unique. Unfortunately very little is known about its form. Conjecture about the appearance of the Temple of the Gens Flavia falls into two camps. Those following the idea first presented by Giuseppe Lugli argue for a round structure, based in large part on ancient authors who interpreted the building as an imitation of the sphere

⁶⁰⁰ Torelli 1992, 74-9.

⁶⁰¹ Richard 1966, 134.

of heaven.⁶⁰² Kenneth Scott claims that an unidentified round temple containing a seated cult figure depicted on an aureus from 95 or 96 is the Temple of the Gens Flavia, while Darwall-Smith looks to a Domitianic sestertius bearing a round temple flanked by figures in military dress with a four step podium and enthroned central figure.⁶⁰³ Other scholars reject the round temple hypothesis in favor of a multi-tiered complex surmounted with a building having a rectangular plan, columnar façade, and triangular pediment. Torelli, Paris, and Candilio argue for a three-tiered structure consisting of two superimposed rectilinear platforms articulated with arches and aedicular niches, and a decastyle temple on the third level, as represented on a sestertius of Domitian (**Fig. 4.31**).⁶⁰⁴

The location of the Temple of the Gens Flavia hinges on a passage from Suetonius claiming that Domitian transformed the house of his birth into the Temple of the Gens Flavia.⁶⁰⁵ With respect to the location a general consensus has emerged that Domitian erected the Temple of the Gens Flavia on the presumed site of his birthplace on the Quirinal Hill attested by the remains of a grand Roman domus in the area of Santa Susanna near the Largo Santa Susanna and Via 20 Settembre. The identification of the Hartwig-Kelsey fragments with the Temple of the Gens Flavia and the discovery of a sumptuous Roman domus under the Caserma dei Corazzieri at No. 12 Via 20 Settembre, has led Torelli to argue in favor of this location near the Church of Santa Susanna, from which area excavators recovered a cippus with the name of Flavius Sabinus, believed to be Domitian's uncle and Vespasian's brother.⁶⁰⁶ Moreover, the evidence provided by

⁶⁰² Mart. *Epig.* 9.3.12; 34.2; Stat. *Silv.* 4.3.19.

⁶⁰³ *BMCRE* II no. 229. Scott 1975, 102; Darwall-Smith 1996. See also Turcan 2000.

⁶⁰⁴ Torelli 1987, 565; Paris 1994, 25; Candilio 1995, 198 ff.

⁶⁰⁵ Coarelli 1995, 368. Suetonius recounts that Domitian was born in the house that he later turned into the Temple of the Gens Flavia.

⁶⁰⁶ Torelli 1987.

the regionary catalogues identifying the ‘Gentem Flaviam’ near the Gardens of Sallust and the Baths of Diocletian, points to a site northeast of the exedra of the Baths of Diocletian near the Via Firenze.⁶⁰⁷ This interpretation is reinforced by the discovery of a cippus and another inscription, one discovered near the Vigna Sadoleti and the other from under the church of S. Andrew.

A proposal by Candilio recently followed by La Rocca persuasively revises established ideas. Candilio describes a monumental complex discovered during excavations in the foundation of the aula of the Baths of Diocletian at the opening of the Via Prigi, in the basement of the Church of San Bernardo, between the Church of San Bernardo and via Vittorio Emanuele Orlando (**Fig. 4.32**). Traces of several walls dated to the Domitianic period by brick stamps may constitute a porticoed precinct, with its perimeter punctuated by alternating semicircular and rectangular exedrae. Candilio has projected a quadriporticus of 123 m by 83 m surrounding the remains of a rectangular podium approximately 70 m by 47 m (**Fig. 4.33**). Along with the *in situ* remains La Rocca associates with the complex a colossal portrait of Titus, 1.52 m tall and now in Naples, that was discovered in the area immediately to the north of the Baths between Via Pastrengo and Via Cernaia.⁶⁰⁸ La Rocca also links the colossal portrait of Titus with a colossal portrait of Vespasian in Naples, erroneously thought to be part of the Farnese collection excavated from the Roman Forum.⁶⁰⁹ The colossal portrait of Titus definitively, and Vespasian probably, found in the immediate area further support Candilio’s theory. La Rocca rightly points out that the remains of a domus under Santa Susanna may very well be the home of Domitian’s

⁶⁰⁷ *CIL* 6.29788: Inter duos/perietes/ambitus privat(us)/Flavi Sabini. *CIL* 15.7451: T. Flavi Sabini.

⁶⁰⁸ Colossal portrait of Titus, Naples Archaeological Museum, west portico, inv. 110892, h. 1.52 m., from Via Pastrengo (La Rocca 2009, 497).

⁶⁰⁹ Colossal portrait of Vespasian, Naples Archaeological Museum, inv. 6068, head h. 75 cm., from the Farnese collection (Rosso 2009, 495).

uncle but that it is more likely that Domitian was born in his father's house, as yet unidentified, than in his uncle's house.⁶¹⁰

Temple of the Gens Flavia: Sculptural Program

One significant body of tantalizing evidence regarding the Temple of the Gens Flavia has survived in a collection of sculptural fragments in pentelic marble with veins of mica. While digging the foundations for the northern curving portico of the Piazza San Bernardo in 1901 workers discovered the fragments and sold them into the art market in two separate lots. Gerhard Koepfel later discovered that the Pentelic marble fragments in the University of Michigan and the Museo Nazionale Romano in Rome fit together.⁶¹¹

Fragments of freestanding columns shaped as stylized palm trees with mantle draped male figures leaning against them comprise the largest remains (**Fig. 4.34**).⁶¹² Associated with the columns are two fragments of an entablature decorated with griffins that flank ritual objects such as candelabra.⁶¹³ Other recognizable representations in the Museo Nazionale Romano include relief fragments of the head of a flamen in front of the Temple of Quirinus (**Fig. 4.35**), the head and neck of a sacrificial bull, the head of a soldier, a female head, and another male head that may be the Genius Populi Romani.⁶¹⁴

⁶¹⁰ La Rocca 2009, 228.

⁶¹¹ Koepfel 1980. On the discovery of the Hartwig-Kelsey fragments and a summary of earlier theories of their original context, see Gazda 1996.

⁶¹² Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. nos. 310252, max. h. 0.53 m, max. w. 0.34 m; 310256, max. h. 0.52 m, max. w. 0.30 m.

⁶¹³ Museo Nazionale Romano, inv. nos. 310254, max. h. 0.24 m, max. w. 1.029 m, max. d. 0.337 m; 310255, max. h. 0.53 m, max. w. 0.30m, max. d. 0.31 m.

⁶¹⁴ Museo Nazionale Romano, head of a flamen: inv. no. 310251, max. h. 0.40 m, max. w. 0.31 m, max. d. 0.17 m. Head of a bull: inv. no. 310253, max. h. 0.41m, max. w. 0.15 m, max. d. 0.243 m. Head of soldier: inv. no. 310257, max. h. 0.33m, max. w. 0.22 m, max. d. 0.24 m. Female head: inv. no. 319258, max. h. 0.17 m, max. w. 0.12 m, max. d. 0.14 m. Profile of a male head: inv. no. 310259, max. h. 0.19 m, max. w. 0.14 m, max. d. 0.08 m.

The profile head of a soldier in relief, a fragment of a lorica segmentata, the head of Vespasian wearing the corona civica (**Fig. 4.36**) and some architectural fragments are all housed in the Kelsey Museum.⁶¹⁵

Koeppel envisioned the Hartwig-Kelsey fragments as part of two panel reliefs on a small, sumptuously decorated arch at the entrance to the complex: a scene of sacrifice connected with the cult of the Flavian *divi* and an imperial adventus.⁶¹⁶ Torelli further claimed that the arch would have been the one oriented to the Alta Semita and that the ceremony was the official dedication of the Temple of the Gens Flavia.⁶¹⁷ Another more likely possibility, proposed by Paris, is that the fragments were part of two reliefs that adorned an altar precinct similar to the Ara Pacis and associated with the Temple of the Gens Flavia.⁶¹⁸ In the altar precinct advocated by Paris the male caryatids supported the physical superstructure, an allusion to the subjugation of the Judaeans that metaphorically supported the glory and security of the Roman state. The relief of the Temple of Quirinus with the head of a flamen is paired with the sacrificial bull decorated by fillets in a processional scene, and interestingly, provides an example of a detailed sacrifice scene, one similarly evoked by the imagery the frieze of the Temple of Divus Vespasian (**Fig. 4.37**).⁶¹⁹ In the adventus relief a larger than life-size figure of Vespasian, as evidenced by the proportions of the surviving portrait head, is reconstructed between a Victory

⁶¹⁵ Kelsey Museum of Archaeology: Soldier in relief: inv. no. 2425, max. h. 0.28 m, max. w. 0.24 m, max. d. 0.16 m. Lorica segmentata: inv. no. 2431, max. h. 0.23 m, max. w. 0.18 m, max. d. 0.16 m. Vespasian: inv. no. 2430, max. h. 0.21 m, max. w. 0.17 m, max. d. 0.10 m. Architectural fragments: inv. nos. 2424, max. h. 0.43 m, max. w. 0.35 m, max. d. 0.17 m; 2427, max. h. 0.18 m, w. 0.24 m, d. 0.12 m; 2426, max. h. 0.15 m, w. 0.18 m, d. 0.12 m.

⁶¹⁶ Koeppel 1980, 19.

⁶¹⁷ Torelli 1987.

⁶¹⁸ Paris 1994, 54-5.

⁶¹⁹ Paris 1994, 77-80, 90, pl. 4; Haeckl 1996, 26-31, fig. 24.

awarding him the *corona civica* as evidenced by the female head and another male allegorical figure, while the soldier stands to the left of the composition.

The themes of dynastic glory and triumph in the adventus of Vespasian greeted by a Victory, explicit in the entire conception of a monument to deified members of the Flavian Gens, and *pietas*, promoted by the sacrificial scene, are certainly appropriate themes under Domitian.⁶²⁰ If Paris is correct and the scene depicts a victory awarding Vespasian the *corona civica* there are some interesting implications. By this point Romans no longer placed stars on images of their deceased emperors in order to designate their divine status as they did with Divus Julius and for a short while with Divus Augustus. The cessation of the practice, however, did not indicate an ambivalence toward understanding an image as one of a *divus*, rather Romans were accustomed by the middle of the first century to, on some level, perceiving images of emperors who were dead and deceased as images of the *divus*. Bound up in the perception of images of *divi* outside their temples was, for the viewer, the knowledge that those figures were deified. While the context of a statue in a temple cella or an image in a temple pediment relief makes clear that the image is of a god, Haeckl is correct to point out that images of Vespasian might be perceived as the historical Vespasian or the divine Vespasian or some of both.⁶²¹ Even for viewers who lacked a detailed knowledge of early imperial history and the lives of the emperors, the image of the deified emperors would have been common knowledge from images in and adorning the gods' temples.

Haeckl has noted that the specificity of the relief placing the imperial cult sacrifice in front of the Temple of Quirinius functioned as a topographical reference point

⁶²⁰ Haeckl 1996, 30.

⁶²¹ Haeckl 1996, 31.

and signaled tacit acceptance of the other gods of the Quirinal to the Flavian *divi* in their midst.⁶²² In the *Punica* Silicus Italicus even predicts that Quirinus would give his seat to Domitian.⁶²³ Whether the scene in the temple pediment is of the augury performed by Romulus and Remus for the privilege of founding Rome as suggested by Hartwig, or the apotheosis of Romulus proposed by Paris, the image of the Temple of Quirinus operated on a similar level as the acroterial statues of Romulus and Aeneas on the Temple of Divine Augustus.⁶²⁴ It claimed that the present cult veneration of the Flavian Gens was similar to that of the distant Roman past and the Romulean archetype of apotheosis and by doing so sought to subsume it within the totality of Roman religious remembrance.⁶²⁵

Not just a generalized symbol, however, the Temple of Quirinus also emphasized the Sabine origins of the Quirinal, which, when combined with the Sabine connection to the Flavian Gens provided an avenue through which the Flavians could claim the Roman foundation myths as part of their family history. It might be argued that the iconography of the Temple of the Gens Flavia then, has attempted to appropriate, to an unaccepted degree, a Roman foundation myth. Such a claim on the Temple of Augustus, an eternal god of the Roman statue pantheon, seems to have been acceptable, in a way that a similar allusion on a monument specifically concerning the Flavians Gens was not. While the relief depicting a sacrifice underscores the sacred nature of the structure akin to the relief on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus, inclusion of imagery such as the adventus

⁶²² Haeckl 1996, 31.

⁶²³ 3.596-7, 527-8.

⁶²⁴ On these theories, see e.g. Paris 1988.

⁶²⁵ On the role of Romulus as an exemplar of apotheosis, see e.g., Davies 2000, 148-59.

scene of Vespasian reconstructed by Paris showing a deified emperor performing lifetime duties, does not recur in the material record of later temple to *divi*.

Temple and Tomb

The unusual combination of functions in the Temple of the Gens Flavia, as a temple for the veneration of specific gods and as a resting place for the mortal remains of deified members of the Flavians Gens, has intrigued scholars; however, the evidence for exactly what went on at the temple is sparse.⁶²⁶ Ancient sources reveal an underlying confusion. Haeckl has noted that none of the vocabulary typically used to refer to funerary monuments was included in the nomenclature of the Temple of the Gens Flavia affirming that it was not conceived or perceived as purely funerary.⁶²⁷ Moreover, with the record indicating that only remains of deified members of the Flavian Gens were deposited in the Temple of the Gens Flavia, the structure differs in function from the Mausoleum of Augustus which included deceased members of the Julio-Claudian family that were deified and those that were not. Yet ancient sources do refer to burial within the structure, specifically that when Julia's ashes were deposited in the Temple of the Gens Flavia they joined those of Vespasian and Titus. In a tribute to the eternity of the Temple of the Gens Flavia Martial describes how "the suppliant matron shall with prayer and incense propitiate the sweet divinity of the deified Julia."⁶²⁸

That the Temple of the Gens Flavia was renowned when built is evident from ancient sources. Martial gave eloquent poetic expression to the mythology of the deified emperors and

⁶²⁶ Haeckl 1996, 11.

⁶²⁷ Words such as *monumentum*, *cella memoriae*, *mausoleum*, *sepulchrum*, *heroum*, *antrum*, *sedes*, *domus*, *hospitum*, and *saxum* (Haeckl 1996, 21).

⁶²⁸ Mart. *Epig.* 9.1.6-7: (*eum voce supplex dumque ture placabit matron divae dulce Iuliae numen*).

their family members that was encouraged under the Flavians and centered around the Temple of the Gens Flavia. Speaking to a marble likeness of Diva Julia, one probably associated with the Temple, Martial asks:

Who would not think, Julia, that thou wert shaped by the chisel of Phidias? or that thou wert not the work of Pallas' skill? The white Lydian marble answers me with its speaking likeness and a live beauty glows in the placid face. Her hand with no rough touch plays with the Acidalian girdle which it has snatched small Cupid from thy neck. To win back the love of Mars and of the imperial Thunderer, from thee let Juno ask for thy cestos and Venus herself too.⁶²⁹

Martial further recounts that Jupiter himself envied the Flavian *divi* as Jupiter jealously contemplated what he referred to as the “Flavian temple of the Augustan heaven.”⁶³⁰

Although there was a monument to him on Crete, Jupiter lamented that the Flavian temple made it much more desirable to be Domitian’s father. In spite of its functionally hybrid nature, cult and funereal, Martial groups the Temple of the Gens Flavia with old shrines that Domitian restored and new ones that he built, thereby including the new temple as part of the ongoing tradition of religious building, specifically under Domitian but more generally in the city.

Yet, the Temple of the Gens Flavia did not serve as an *exempla* for later monuments: later imperial temples to *divi* did not combine cult and burial in the same *templum* nor did they purport to be a location for veneration of the imperial gens. There is clearly a difference in the Roman mind between what happens to a mortal who dies and what happens to one who dies and is deified, though both could happen to the same

⁶²⁹ Mart. *Epig.* 6.13: (*Quis te Phidaco formatam, Julia, caelo, vel quis Palladiae non putet artis opus? candida non tacita respondet imagine lygdos, et placido fulget vivus in ore decor. ludi Acidalio, sed non manus aspera, nodo, quem rapuit collo, parve Cupido, tuo. ut Martis revocetur amor summique Tonantis, a te Iuno petat ceston et ipsa Venus*).

⁶³⁰ Mart. *Epig.* 9.34: Jupiter laughed at the falsehood of his Idaean tomb when he saw the Flavian temple of the Augustan heaven . . . “You gave me,” he said, “a Gnosian monument. See how much greater a thing it is to be Caesar’s father” (*Iuppiter Idaei risit mendacia busti, dum videt Augusti Flavia temple poli . . . ‘Gnosia vos’ inquit ‘nobis monumenta dedistis: cernite quam plus sit Caesaris esse patrem*).

historical person. Silicus Italicus is careful to specify that Vespasian will not go to the lower world, but will be exalted to heavens and receive the same honors as Jupiter.⁶³¹ The significance of the building did not last, not solely because it came to be associated with its builder Domitian, whose condemnation may have had a chilling effect on the building's reception after his death, but because the memorial aspects of the building confused expectations. Indeed, other projects of Domitian, such as the expansive palace on the Palatine Hill, the Stadium of Domitian, and his completion of the Flavian amphitheater, retained their prestige despite memory sanctions against him.

Domitian as Son of a God and Father of Gods to Be

Under the Flavians the idea of deification based on merit continued and evolved to the point that the *divi* might have been conceived of as surpassing the gods. For instance, Martial claimed that because of Domitian's benefactions to gods undoubtedly including the Flavian *divi*, he is even more deserving of apotheosis than Hercules. While the epithet *divi filius* was less conspicuous under the Flavians than it had been under Augustus and even Tiberius, the Arval Brethren highlighted the status of Titus and Domitian as the sons of a god.⁶³² Quintilian similarly praises Domitian for his *pietas* for securing immortality for his deceased and deserving kin.⁶³³

Domitian's position as son of one god and brother to another suggested to some that he would not only become a god himself but that he would become the father of a god. In the *Punica*, Jupiter addresses Domitian on earth as, son of gods and father of gods to be and again "as a child of gods, one who creates gods, a lodging in heaven will receive you, father and

⁶³¹ Sil. *Ital. Pun.* 3.594-596.

⁶³² Coarelli 1995, 20.

⁶³³ Quint. *Int. Or.* 3.7.9.

brother will place you between them, near at hand will gleam the temples of your son, become a constellation.”⁶³⁴ Envisioning Domitian placed between Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus may allude to the hypothetical future day when his statue could literally be placed between that of his brother and father in the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus and the Temple of the Gens Flavia. The poetic image of Domitian near the gleaming temples of his son may be pure flattery, or alternatively, Domitian may have expressed the intention to build such a structure. Extensive commemoration of the deceased infant, such as that on coins signifying the child’s deification by depicting the baby boy seated on a globe surrounded by seven stars, indicates his importance.⁶³⁵

Domitian’s position in space and lineage between Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus on the one hand, and his deified son on the other, enhanced the sacred aura of Domitian’s reign and signaled the first time that deification was anticipated two generations down the line. Statius specifically calls the *imperium* of Domitian sacred.⁶³⁶ This poetic conceit had no religious ramifications in terms of the *pax deorum*; there was no question that Domitian was not a god to whom the Roman state had ritual obligations. The prospect of past and future imperial gods, however, undoubtedly enhanced the sacrality of the imperial office. The remembrance of previous emperors as eternal gods of the Roman state pantheon elevated the status of emperors legitimately following in their footsteps.

⁶³⁴ Sil. Ital. *Pun.* 3.607, 609-611, 625-629: Then, O son of gods and father of gods to be, rule the happy earth with paternal sway. Heaven shall welcome thee at last, in thy old age, and Quirinus give up his throne tween them; thy father and brother shall place thee between them; and hard by the head of they deified son shall send forth rays (*o noate deum divosque dature, beatas imperio terras patrio rege. Tarda senectam hospitia excipient caeli, solioque Quirinus concedet, mediumque parens fraterque locabunt; siderei iuxta radiabunt tempora nati*).

⁶³⁵ *RIC* II no. 209A.

⁶³⁶ Stat. *Silv.* 5.1.207.

While the potential deification of future emperors was certainly implied visually and even broached explicitly by poets under the Julio-Claudians, the possibility took on new meaning with the construction of the Temple of the Gens Flavia. For the first time a building to house the cult of a *potentially* deified emperor was built in Rome before the death of the emperor. With the deification of each deceased member of the Flavian Gens and the deposition of their ashes in the temple there could be no question of what Domitian expected to happen after his death.

Statius addressed Domitian directly, begging that Domitian remain content to hold the reins of mankind, rule over land and sea, grant constellations, and refrain from ascending to heaven as a *divus* even though the gods would gladly share heaven with him.⁶³⁷ Though the poetic conceit is similar to that of Ovid foretelling the deification of Augustus, with the presence in the urban landscape of the Temple of the Gens Flavia, the plea of Statius takes on a different connotation. The reference to ‘granting constellations’ is clearly to Domitian’s tenacity in having his family members deified and would bring to mind the place where those constellations were collectively venerated, the Temple of the Gens Flavia. Although he must have privately envisioned a temple solely dedicated to the future Divus Domitian, in a sense Domitian has attempted to expedite his own deification after death by providing a ready made cult building and eliminating the need to construct a new one. In his dedication at the beginning of the *Argonautica*, the poet Valerius Flaccus presents the same idea by referring to Domitian’s establishment of the cult of *divi*, his foundation of the Temple of the Gens Flavia, and Vespasian as a constellation in heaven raised up from the cloudy earth.⁶³⁸

⁶³⁷ Stat. *Silv.* 4.2.22.

⁶³⁸ Val. Flac. *Arg.*

Conclusion

While Flavian poets lauded the divinity of the deified emperors along with other Roman state gods, ancient sources reveal that, as is usually the case, reception was not so simple. In one of his epigrams Martial bids his companion Callistus to pour more Falernian wine so that the two might enjoy themselves because life is short and as the Mausoleum of Augustus teaches, even the gods can perish.⁶³⁹ It is thought that from his house on the Quirinal Martial would have had a clear view of the Mausoleum of Augustus. Martial's sarcasm tacitly acknowledges an uneasiness about the future, one that manifests itself in uncertainty over imperial continuity. Moreover, Martial implies that for some, the simultaneous contemplation of death and divinity may have been difficult to reconcile. It is perhaps this difficulty that caused a mnemonic disjunction in the understanding of the Temple of the Gens Flavia.

After the end of Domitian's reign, the only Flavian *divi* whose cults remained prominent in the collective memory were those of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, cults housed in a temple of the state cult. These newly secured cults not only affirmed the tradition of deification established in the early Empire, they supplemented the cults of Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, and Divus Claudius. New incarnations of an earlier tradition, Lowenthal observes, makes the original better known, and each remembering of an event alters the previous memory to incorporate subsequent acts of appreciation.⁶⁴⁰ At the end of the Julio-Claudian period, Romans looked back on their founder Divus Augustus and his divine father, Divus Julius, and their divine successor, as unique. By the end of the Flavian era, the earlier *divi* were part of a group of *divi*, yet a subset of a larger category of eternal state gods.

⁶³⁹ Mart. *Epig.* 5.64.

⁶⁴⁰ Lowenthal 1985, 208, 264.

CHAPTER 5

TRAJAN: CONSOLIDATING THE GOOD AND BAD EMPERORS (98-117)

Introduction

The Senatorial condemnation of Domitian after his death in 96 was a reminder that imperial authority and the treatment of the emperor's memory after death were not unconditionally guaranteed. Writers such as Tacitus openly recognized the vicissitudes of imperial rule.⁶⁴¹ Domitian, as Caligula and Nero had done before for their successors, provided a foil against which Trajan contrasted his desirable qualities. By the death and deification of Trajan in August of 117, the 144 year-old Roman Empire had witnessed a critical mass of deified emperors and emperors whose memory did not fare so well. By this time an emperor's memory suffered one of two fates, deification or some constellation of memory sanctions. With Suetonius in the late first century and early second century there was a simultaneous surge in the interest in imperial biography.⁶⁴²

Focusing on the reign of Trajan, this chapter investigates the connection between the biography of the historical emperor and his deceased, deified counterpart as constructed through architecture, cult, and ritual in the city of Rome, a question that at its core is related to the fundamental dichotomy between remembering and forgetting. It is argued here that an alternative characterization, one based on cognitive studies of episodic and semantic, or gist, memory requires a more nuanced understanding of symbolic structures. The memory of the emperor

⁶⁴¹ Remarking on the fortunes of Vitellius, Tacitus noted that one day Vitellius was an emperor and lord of all mankind, and the next abandoned his seat of high fortune to give up imperial power (*Tac. Hist.* 2.68).

⁶⁴² Liebeschütz highlights the reign of Trajan as the turning point in Latin literature, at which time Latin historiography became biography and epic and satire ceased (Liebeschütz 1979, 202-4). This surge in the interest in biography written by a third party after the death of the subject is different than emergence of political autobiography and memoirs of the late Republican period, a genre that Flower links to the divisive political climate and need of the individual to publish their own account of their deeds while living in the interest of advancing their careers (Flower 2010, 164-8).

concretized in the temples and cult to divi accorded with the gist of the emperor's life as lived, a gist that summed up the completed life and was at once a continuation of the memory of the historical person and a revision, or a forgetting. In this regard Trajan's aggregation of the "good" emperors in his restoration coin series is instructive. Representing the good emperors to the almost complete exclusion of all other emperors, the Trajanic series innovatively consolidated the collection of good emperors by playing on nuanced conceptions of restoration and visually emphasizing the status of the coins as serial objects.

Domitian: Damnatio or Divus?

Foretold by many omens including lightning strikes on the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter, the Temple of the Flavian Gens, and Domitian's bedroom on the Palatine, the assassination of Domitian on September 18, 96 was instigated by palace conspirators with Domitian's chamberlain Parthenius in the lead.⁶⁴³ According to the *Fasti Ostienses* recording Domitian's death the Senate declared Nerva the new emperor later that day.⁶⁴⁴ In contrast to the events following Caligula's death, contemporary sources after Domitian's assassination record no discussion by the Senate or otherwise of a Republican restoration or attack on the memory of the deified emperors, evidence perhaps of an acquiescence to the Roman Empire that D. McAlindon attributes to the disappearance of those who cherished outmoded ideas regarding the senate's function or objected to the monopoly of power in the hands of the emperor.⁶⁴⁵ Indeed, by 96 no one remained that had lived in a Rome without Divus Julius and Divus Augustus.

⁶⁴³ Suet. *Dom.* 14-16.

⁶⁴⁴ Murison 2003, 153: On the same day M. Cocceius Nerva was named Emperor (Eodem die M. Cocceius N[erva] | imperator appellat[us est]).

⁶⁴⁵ McAlindon 1956, 132.

Although Domitian's assassination did not result in civil war or widespread violence, the untimely and controversial death of the emperor was a destabilizing force. Shortly after Nerva's accession the Senate passed a decree requiring the removal of Domitian's images, effacement of inscriptions, toppling of statues, and dismantling of votive shields and arches.⁶⁴⁶ Yet, as with other rulers before Domitian who were subject to memory sanctions, there is ample evidence that the posthumous condemnation of Domitian's memory was far from unanimous outside of the Senate. Army factions including the German legions and the provinces of Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia, and Moesia Superior not only opposed the sanctions, but the Praetorian Guard called for the Senate to deify Domitian.⁶⁴⁷ Based on Domitian's uneasy and violent relationship with the Senate deification was highly unlikely, however, the Praetorian Guard's insistence suggests that some believed it was at least a possibility. John Granger points out that with the survival of Domitian's wife, Domitia Longina, a Flavian restoration was not out of the question, a point supported by a story from the *Epitome de Caesaribus* recounting a rumor that after Nerva's accession Domitian was still alive and prepared to reassume power.⁶⁴⁸ Similarly, epigraphic evidence presents a less than monolithic response to Domitian's condemnation. An analysis of inscriptions around the empire reveals that although Domitian's name was erased in some instances, in at least half of the surviving inscriptions the Senate's declaration of sanctions was ignored.⁶⁴⁹

In a mutiny under Capserius Aelianus in October 97 the Praetorian Guard threatened Nerva demanding that Domitian's murderers be punished. Nerva relented by executing the

⁶⁴⁶ Cass Dio 68.1.1. The senatorial decree required that, "all inscriptions be erased and all record of him obliterated ..." (*novissime eradendos ubique titulos abolendamque omnem memoriam decerneret*) (Suet. *Dom.* 23). On the defaced and recarved portraits of Domitian, see Varner 2004, 111-35.

⁶⁴⁷ Suet. *Dom.* 23.1; Cass. Dio 68.3.3. See also Jones 1992, 160-2; Flower 2006, 239-53.

⁶⁴⁸ *Epit. de Caes.* 12.1-3. Granger 2003, 67.

⁶⁴⁹ Granger 2003, 49-51; 67-70.

alleged assassins and giving a speech praising the mutineers for their tenacity in seeing justice done, actions that ultimately undermined his power and necessitated the swift appointment of a successor popular with the Senate, people, and army.⁶⁵⁰ Only weeks after the Praetorian Guard's mutiny Nerva declared Trajan, at that point a successful general and governor of Upper Germany, to be his adoptive son and successor.

An edict of Nerva, the substance of which was preserved in a letter from Pliny the Younger to Trajan, attests to another unintended consequence of the memory sanctions against Domitian: the destabilizing force of the condemnation resulting from uncertainty over the condemned emperor's policies, benefactions, and regulations.⁶⁵¹ Pliny explains that Nerva issued the edict to allay fears of those who had received favors from Domitian by confirming certain privileges issued during Domitian's reign.

About Domitian's condemnation Brian Jones wrote, "such was the almost inevitable fate of the last member of a dynasty in the Roman imperial period, denigration and vilification served to justify the military or political coup that removed him."⁶⁵² While true, the cause and effect implied by this statement, that the denigration of the emperor's memory was caused by his status as the last of the dynasty, is not so straightforward. In fact, an emperor's low esteem with the Senate at the time of their death often lead to the negative posthumous judgment and the lack of a suitable dynastic replacement meant that no one was left to influence the Senate's opinion in the immediate term. Even emperors with a dynastic successor, such as Caligula who was succeeded by his uncle Claudius, and later Hadrian who was succeeded by his adoptive successor Antoninus Pius, were not guaranteed deification. The instability of Nerva's reign

⁶⁵⁰ On the succession problem, see Hammond 1956, 86-91; Granger 2003, 67-102.

⁶⁵¹ Pliny *Ep.* 10.58.7.

⁶⁵² Jones 1992, 160.

combined with his equivocation in the matter of Domitian's memory despite the senatorial condemnation, meant that it would not be until the reign of Trajan that the Roman elite freely and unequivocally disparaged Domitian as a compelling contrast to Trajan's superiority.⁶⁵³

Divus Nerva

Very little is known of the cult of Divus Nerva. Though Nerva was only in office from September 96 until January 98, at the instigation of Trajan from his headquarters in Cologne the Senate promptly deified Nerva after his death. Precedent for deification after an exceedingly short reign may be found with Titus whose time as emperor lasted only from June 79 until September 81. From the moment of Trajan's accession he looked to imperial precedents set by emperors unrelated to him by either blood or adoption. For example, Trajan ensured the burial of Nerva's ashes in the Mausoleum of Augustus, deemphasizing the conception of Nerva's reign as a break with the past and the establishment of a new dynasty of which Trajan would have been a part, and instead highlighting Nerva's position in the imperial tradition that began with Augustus and the Julio-Claudians.⁶⁵⁴ With broad support of the military, Senate, and people, and his status as adoptive son, Trajan's accession to Augustus from his position as Caesar was uncontroversial as implied by Pliny's later announcement that Trajan's merits called for his adoption long before the event.⁶⁵⁵ Yet Nerva's short reign had been unstable and plagued by strife caused by the dispute with the army and Praetorian Guard over Domitian's memory. With Trajan's adoption,

⁶⁵³ Flower (2006, 261-2) describes how Domitian was, under Trajan and especially as described by Pliny, to be understood as the exact opposite of Trajan,

⁶⁵⁴ On Nerva's epitaph from the Mausoleum of Augustus, CIL 6.40376, that included only Nerva's lifetime titles, see Gradel 2008.

⁶⁵⁵ Pliny *Pan.* 6.3. Hammond argues that Domitian employed the cognomen Caesar in the same capacity as Vespasian and Titus, to connect them with the family that had founded the empire (Hammond 1956, 83).

Pliny claimed, “The country reeled to take refuge in your embrace; the empire which was falling with its emperor was put in your hands at the emperor’s word.”⁶⁵⁶

In the Panegyrics Pliny specifies that the gods claimed Nerva to take his place in the heavens, “thinking that nothing merely mortal should follow his godlike and immortal act . . . ,” no doubt with Nerva’s appointment of Trajan as successor in mind.⁶⁵⁷ Significantly, only Pliny cites a temple raised to Divus Nerva yet no mention is made of its location, size, or appearance. Pliny’s claim that Trajan equipped Divus Nerva’s cult with altars, couches, and a priest also lacks specific details and there is no other literary or archaeological evidence that Trajan built a temple for Divus Nerva in Rome.⁶⁵⁸ Brown has suggested that an unidentified, octastyle temple depicted on a series of Trajanic sestertii dated 105-107 represents a temple to Divus Nerva, however, this identification is pure speculation.⁶⁵⁹ Pliny cites honors to Divus Nerva in the context of praising Trajan’s pietas toward his adoptive father and imperial predecessors, a sentiment that if genuine on Trajan’s part would have required not only a temple but also tears representing genuine emotion. The reference to a Temple of Divus Nerva may be interpreted in light of Pliny’s desire to paint a convincing picture of Trajan’s virtues.

While no Trajanic calendars survive, later calendars suggest that there was some form of annual cult to Divus Nerva who was likely one of the divi celebrated with annual animal sacrifices in the Feriale Duranum, a military festival calendar found in Dura Europa and in use

⁶⁵⁶ Pliny *Pan.* 6.3: (*Confugit in sinum tuum concussa res publica, runesque imperium super imperatorem imperatoris tibi voce delatum est*).

⁶⁵⁷ Pliny *Pan.* 10.4-5: (. . . *quem di ideo caelo vindicaverunt, ne quid post illud divinum et immortale factum mortale faceret* . . .). Based on circumstantial evidence of Pliny’s conformist nature and his *Panegyrics*, Roche (2002) argues that we can accept Pliny’s speech as reflecting key elements of Trajan’s own self-presentation.

⁶⁵⁸ Pliny *Pan.* 11.1. *Cf.* Chausson, discussing a theory of Palombi that an area north of the Capitol across the Via Lata at the point of departure of the Via Flaminia may have had sufficient space for what was referred to in antiquity as the ‘Platea Traiani’ that possibly housed a temple or cult place to Nerva (2001, 349).

⁶⁵⁹ Brown 1940, Pl. IV.3.

under Alexander Severus in the early third century.⁶⁶⁰ In addition, a celebration including circus games in honor of Nerva's birthday occurred on November 8 as attested by the *Fasti Furi* Philocali from 354 and was likely instituted at Nerva's death.⁶⁶¹ Where these sacrifices and celebrations occurred and whether they began immediately after Nerva's death or were a later development is unknown, though when the calendars are interpreted in light of Pliny's claims it is reasonable to assume that veneration of Divus Nerva began sometime during Trajan's reign.

Numerous inscriptions dated to Trajan's reign fashion Trajan as the son of Divus Nerva in a mode reminiscent of epithets of Augustus as son of Divus Julius, Tiberius as son of Divus Augustus, Titus as son of Divus Vespasian, and Domitian as son of Divus Vespasian and brother of Divus Titus. Examples include an inscription from a shrine to the *Lares Augusti*, the Genius of the Emperors, and Trajan as son of Divus Nerva found on the Tiber island; a cippus boundary stone found near the Ponte S. Angelo; a record of the Arval Brethren dated to 101; and the dedication of a portrait statue found near the Circus Maximus to Trajan as *DIVI NERVAE FILIO* by the thirty-five tribes of the Roman plebs.⁶⁶² In addition, dated as late as 108-109, almost ten years into Trajan's reign, a small marble architrave bears a dedication to the *Lares Augusti* of the *Vicus Iovis Fagutalis*, the Genius of the Emperors and Trajan as the son of Divus Nerva.⁶⁶³

Despite the numerous epigraphic references to Trajan as *divi filius*, scholars have correctly observed a general aversion to representations of Nerva in the visual production under

⁶⁶⁰ Fink, Hoey and Snyder 1940, 181-6.

⁶⁶¹ Degrassi 1963, 259. See also, Salzman 1990, 30-4.

⁶⁶² Hammond (1956, 83) argues that Domitian was the first emperor to use the cognomen Caesar without a preceding praenomen and as a title indicating an heir. Shrine to *Lares Augusti*: Gordon 1964, no. 160, *CIL* 6:1.451. Record of the Arval Brethren: Gordon 1964, no. 161, *CIL* 6.2074. Cippus: Gordon 1964, no. 162. Portrait dedication: Gordon 1964, no. 168.

⁶⁶³ Gordon 1964, no. 171.

Trajan.⁶⁶⁴ The memory of Nerva as a *divus* seems to have met a similar fate to *Divus Julius* only it happened within the reign of his successor rather than over several generations. While Augustus extensively commemorated *Divus Julius* as a god of the Roman state pantheon and in his capacity as divine predecessor from the beginning of Augustus' reign, by the end of the Julio-Claudian dynasty the memorial emphasis of *Divus Julius* was on the god's role as divine progenitor.

In contrast, Trajan did not issue the first coins commemorating Nerva's consecration until ten years into his reign. When *Divus Nerva* first appears on coins it is in heraldic opposition to *Divus Pater Traianus*, Trajan's biological father, bringing attention to the generative role of Trajan's biological and adoptive divine fathers and the corresponding justification for remembering them (**Fig. 5.1**).⁶⁶⁵ Pliny deftly employs a literary apostrophe when, in the *Panegyrics*, he addresses *Divus Nerva* directly reminding him that his one great deed was Trajan's adoption, that Trajan is the better man, and that *Divus Nerva* owes his deification to his adoptive son.⁶⁶⁶ Trajan's assertion of dual divine descent, one biological and one adoptive and imperial, complicates the expected dynastic trajectory. Trajan seems to be claiming dynastic descent from *Divus Nerva* at the same time that he is diluting it by pointing out his biological descent from *Divus Pater Traianus*. This strategy, however, does not seem so risky once it is apparent, as argued in this chapter, that Trajan's claims of legitimacy evidenced by the Trajanic restoration coin series depended not only on *Divus Nerva*, but also on all of the *divi* that preceded him.

⁶⁶⁴ See, e.g., Roche 2002, 44.

⁶⁶⁵ *RIC* II no. 726.

⁶⁶⁶ Pliny *Pan.* 10.6, 89.1. See also, Roche 2002, 44-5.

The Gist of the Matter

This dissertation has proposed that the architecture, image, and cult of the deified emperors in Rome shaped the understanding of the deceased, deified emperor in the Roman collective memory as an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon, a conception that ultimately reflected on the eternal and unchanging nature of the Roman Empire itself. With the death of Domitian in the late first century, however, the Romans' interest in imperial biography, one of the many alternative ways of defining and proscribing the memory of the deceased emperor, surged. During the second century history gave way to imperial biography, at which time J.H. Wolf G. Liebeschuetz argues that Latin historiography, epic, and satire collapsed after the reign of Trajan in favor of imperial biography under the Antonines.⁶⁶⁷ This section explores how the monolithic viewpoint suppressing the individuality of the dead emperor presented by the architecture, image, and cults of the *divi*, and the complex, detailed, and multivalent perspective offered by imperial biographies, influenced the Roman knowledge or understanding of the *divi* as eternal gods.

Related to this question of knowledge is the dichotomy set up in cultural studies more broadly between continuity on the one hand, and revision, a concept which may include a reinterpretation of the past in the present or an outright omission in present narratives of certain aspects, events, or people from the past, on the other. Within memory studies a similar dichotomy exists between remembering as a form of a continuity, a way of accurately evoking the past in the present, and forgetting as a form of revision, in which some part of the past is partially or completely omitted or revised in the present. Criticism of Maurice Halbwachs theory of collective memory has stemmed from his insistence that memory is a construction in the

⁶⁶⁷ Liebeschuetz 1979, 202-4.

present shaped solely by present concerns; that memory doesn't preserve the past but adapts it for present purposes.⁶⁶⁸ In various formulations Halbwachs' critics argue that collective remembrance must contain elements of preservation, observing that societies "must maintain the symbolic code in order to revise it,"⁶⁶⁹ and "it is important to maintain the proper balance between change and continuity."⁶⁷⁰

While I don't dispute the validity of these perspectives contrasting remembering and forgetting they should be a starting point, rather than an endpoint. This dichotomy has resulted in analyses of cultural phenomenon, in particular discussions of collective memory, in which various aspects of culture, including visual culture, are slotted into one of two categories: something is remembered and therefore continuous with its historical referent, or something is forgotten and therefore revised from its historical referent. Problematic here are the values implied by the terms continuity/remembering and revision/forgetting. Both terms imply a sacrosanct, true, or accurate original that has either been brought faithfully and accurately into the present or that diverges in a meaningful way thereby compromising the integrity of the original. In most instances, however, the past is not unambiguously deposited into an objective social archive or record awaiting our comparison. Whether forgetting or remembering is desirable of course depends on one's perspective toward the original event or person and how the original is characterized. Moreover, revision or forgetting in a collective context is usually viewed in hindsight as manipulation in order to convince people that something did or did not happen in a way that they otherwise might not believe. In a Roman context Alain Gowing has

⁶⁶⁸ See Connerton 1989; Schwartz 1990; Confino 1997; Gowing 2005.

⁶⁶⁹ Schwartz 1990, 85.

⁶⁷⁰ Orlin 2007, 88.

pointed out that, “in the hands of a Roman history is endlessly mutable and dynamic, otherwise it would risk becoming irrelevant. This is more than simple revisionism.”⁶⁷¹

In terms of social change Paul Ricoeur has presented a more refined understanding noting that, “the categories of continuity and discontinuity, of stability and instability, have to be treated as opposite poles of a single spectrum.”⁶⁷² Yet, there are few theoretical alternatives to the two ends of this spectrum. In part, perhaps it is because textual sources and literary accounts of historical people and events tend to contain specific details of who, what, and when which beg comparison with ‘historical’ facts. How does visual culture factor into such an analysis? The following proposal of one possible alternative point on the continuum between remembering and forgetting provides another approach to understanding symbolic structures, that is narratives, pictorial representations, monuments, and shrines accumulated and transmitted across generations, and mnemotechnologies, objects and practices that train and produce an individual’s memory in culturally appropriate ways.⁶⁷³ This proposal is based on the intersection between the way symbolic structures such as monuments and ritual create memories, and hence knowledge, and a cognitive concept of memory that is referred to here as ‘gist’.

Edward Tulving first articulated a long-recognized distinction between two parallel memory-processing operations. Episodic memory receives and stores biographical information about temporally dated events, while semantic, or gist memory, is the organized knowledge that a person possesses about words and other symbols and is not event specific.⁶⁷⁴ Episodic and semantic memory are not two different systems, rather they account for different levels of

⁶⁷¹ Gowing 2002, 96.

⁶⁷² Ricoeur 2004, 225. On social memory as, “marked by a dialectic between stability or historical continuity and innovations and changes,” see Climo and Cattell 2002, 15.

⁶⁷³ Symbolic structures: Schwartz 2000, 8-9. Mnemotechnologies: LeGoff 1996.

⁶⁷⁴ Tulving 1972, 391. *Cf.* critics of Tulving who argue that cross-cultural comparisons are necessary to test cognitive theories, e.g. Fentress and Wickham 1992, 20-2.

specificity in complex representations of knowledge.⁶⁷⁵ This distinction is readily apparent in the scientific methodologies for understanding episodic and semantic memory.⁶⁷⁶ Psychologists test episodic memory by determining whether an individual's recall of specific memorized information is correct or incorrect. In contrast, in tests that address gist memory, admittedly much less studied than episodic memory, psychologists generally consider all participant responses to be valid and useful data because there is no evaluation with respect to accuracy. In an interesting parallel, it seems many cultural studies of memory at the two ends of the remembering and forgetting spectrum also focus primarily on accuracy of episodic memory, to the exclusion of gist.

Gist may be defined as the substance or essence of the matter and relates not only to how we remember but also to what we remember. Cognitive psychologists have documented some of the processes by which humans use incoming information to formulate memories. People do not, and more importantly cannot, process all the information that they confront in daily life. The relationship between our memory and experience is attenuated by the forgetting that naturally occurs in response to the demands placed on memory by our environment. It is only bits and pieces of incoming data, what Ulric Neisser calls fragments of experience, which provide a basis for memory.⁶⁷⁷ This essential culling of experience, Daniel Schacter explains, allows us to form an accurate picture of the general features of our world and a general recollection of the contours of our pasts. Indeed, Richard Terdiman characterizes forgetting as the most constant element of

⁶⁷⁵ Craik 2007, 132.

⁶⁷⁶ Tulving 1972, 393-4.

⁶⁷⁷ Schacter 1996, 40-56.

recollection, an essential precondition for recollection that makes our memory of the past possible.⁶⁷⁸

Ancient Roman society also recognized that the human mind is more adept at remembering concepts and generalities than specific details. In his exposition on using mental imagery to boost recall, the author of the *Auctor ad Herennium* emphasized that the memory of concepts was the point rather than verbatim recall.⁶⁷⁹ In her extensive study of the cognitive aspects of remembering in antiquity, Jocelyn Small has concluded that the ancient standard of accuracy was what she calls *gist*.⁶⁸⁰ In a written biography, for example by Plutarch, an event could be truthful but inaccurate, meaning that it could have happened as remembered because it is consistent with the theme or *gist* of one's life. The propensity for authors to make inferences based on *gist*, what could have or even should have happened, may explain inconsistencies among accounts of the same person's life.⁶⁸¹ Recent readings of Livy support this view. Although accuracy was not paramount, it was crucial for rhetorical force that accounts make sense in terms of narrative content and contribute to a coherent portrayal of the subject.⁶⁸² Prioritizing consistency and plausibility over accuracy carried over into material representations. In portraits, for example, physical accuracy was not a primary concern so long as the portrait was in character and conveyed the *gist* or essence of the person depicted.

Lack of specific detail in favor of *gist* could function not only to make something more memorable, but could also enhance rhetorical force. Drawing an analogy between the great fortunes of men and the sublime, Pseudo-Longinus acknowledges his awareness that great spirits

⁶⁷⁸ Terdiman 1993, 22.

⁶⁷⁹ Small 1997, 115.

⁶⁸⁰ Small and Tatum 1995, 164; Small 1997, 192-5.

⁶⁸¹ Small 1997, 192-3.

⁶⁸² Miles 1995, 67-78.

have flaws, “. . . for invariable accuracy incurs the risk of pettiness, and in the sublime, as in great fortunes, there must be something which is overlooked.”⁶⁸³ That is to say, for some purposes dwelling in the details misses the point.

Gist in the formulation of individual memory has its correlation in collective memory, for which the key is simplification, according to James Fentress and Chris Wickham, “[memory is] conventionalized, because the image has to be meaningful for an entire group; simplified, because in order to be generally meaningful and capable of transmission, the complexity of the image must be reduced as far as possible.”⁶⁸⁴ A priority for collective memory is the readability, plausibility, and accessibility of the conception. In other words, too much detail could detract from a coherent story. For some scholars this simplification and schematization tied to collective memory stands in contrast to analytical history’s supposed goal of giving an accurate account of the past at the cost of self-serving narratives.⁶⁸⁵

Psychological research on collaborative recall, though new in comparison to the study of individual memory, has similarly concluded that in terms of quantity recalled, socially shared memories may be simpler focusing on central details rather than providing a richer, more detailed account. Specifically, research has shown that collaborative recall aids groups in determining what is most important about an event thereby recalling only the details that assist the group in fulfilling its social and identity goals.⁶⁸⁶ For a living emperor the lack of detail inherent in the symbol of, for example Divus Augustus as presented in the context of the Temple of Augustus discussed in Chapter 1, may have also been an advantage. By glorifying the past

⁶⁸³ Ps. Long., *Subl.* 33.2.

⁶⁸⁴ Fentress and Wickham 1992, 31-2, 47-8.

⁶⁸⁵ Wertsch and Roediger III 2008.

⁶⁸⁶ Collaborative recall in groups includes only the propositions necessary for the task at hand and contained significantly higher proportions of correct central ideas in experiments (Harris, Paterson and Kemp 2008, 225-6).

there is a danger of overrating its importance and dooming the present emperor to failure if they are unable to live up to expectations created by the past.⁶⁸⁷ The simplified conception of each deified emperor as presented in temple and cult precluded a deed by deed comparison of the present emperor with his predecessors, though such comparisons inevitably occurred in other media such as panegyric and imperial biography further emphasizing the differences in mnemonic strategy between remembrance of emperors in the literary sources and through architecture and image.

Yet, the term simplification can be misleading. Simplification implies that rendering something more intelligible results in less complexity in terms of meaning. In the case of symbolic structures such as the temples of the divi, simplification of a life often does just the opposite resulting in ideas that are more compelling because they are easier to understand while simultaneously investing them with many levels of meaning because of their lack of specificity. It is not that the details are not important, rather in the context of remembering great individuals like the Roman emperors any reputation that proves durable necessarily translates the existence of that person into imaginative terms that resonate with the structure of meaning and value in the present.⁶⁸⁸

It seems Plutarch wrote his *Lives* with this in mind. Born in about AD 45 or 50 in the reign of Claudius, Plutarch enjoyed a long career publishing his *Lives* in the early years of Trajan's reign. His lofty purpose as described in his own words in the introduction to the *Life of Alexander* was not to write histories, rather, as the title of his work indicates, he strove to write lives. Clarifying his approach Plutarch wrote:

⁶⁸⁷ Lowenthal 1985, 66-7.

⁶⁸⁸ Cubitt and Warren 2000, 3.

. . . in the most illustrious deeds there is not always a manifestation of virtue or vice, nay, a slight thing like a phrase or a jest often makes a greater revelation of character than battles where thousands fall, or the greatest armaments, or sieges of cities. Accordingly just as painters get the likenesses in their portraits from the face and the expression of the eyes, wherein the character shows itself . . .so I must be permitted to devote myself rather to the signs of the soul in men, and by means of these to portray the life of each, leaving to others the description of their great contests.⁶⁸⁹

Precisely what constitutes a ‘life’ according to Plutarch remains unclear, however, he tempers the expectations of his audience who it seems might otherwise be expecting the enumeration of great deeds. He reminds his readers that famous sieges, great armaments, and bloody battles may be relevant but are by no means the entire or even most important way of understanding a life.

As Cubitt and Warren have succinctly stated, “What resonates is not the life as lived but the life as made sense of, the life as imaginatively reconstructed and rendered significant.”⁶⁹⁰ In reproducing a life in the collective memory the goal is to make something coherent out of an incoherent existence. So the representation of an individual in collective memory should not only be consistent and accord with the gist of the life as lived, more importantly it must reinforce the narrative pattern of history of which it becomes a part.⁶⁹¹ With the apotheosis of their heads of state as a measure of the gods’ support for the Romans’ imperial mission as discussed in Chapter

⁶⁸⁹ Plut. *Alex.* 1.2-3: (ουτε γαρ ιστοριας γραφομεν, αλλα βιους, ουτε ταις επιφανεσταταις πραξεσι παντως ενεστι δηλωσις αρετης η κακιας, αλλα προσμα βραχυ πολλακις και ημα και παιδια τις εμφασιν ηθους εποησε μαλλον η μαχαι μυριονεκροι και παραταξεις αι μεγαισται και πολιορκιαι πολεων. ωσπερ ουν οι ζωγραφοι τας ομοιοτητας απο τον προσωτον και τον περι την οψιν ειδων, οισ εμφαινεται το ηθος, αναλαυβανουσιν, ελαχιστα των λοιπων μερων φροντιζοντες, ουτως ημιν δοτεον εις τα της ψυχης σημεια μαλλον ενδυεσθαι και δια τουτων ειδοποιειν τον εκαστον βιον, εασαντας ετεροις τα μεγαθη και τους αγωνας).

⁶⁹⁰ Cubitt and Warren 2000, 3.

⁶⁹¹ Cubitt and Warren 2000.

4, the *divi* contributed to the sustenance of Romans' view of themselves as divinely ordained people. But how did each deified emperor relate to his historical counterpart?

Pliny gives some idea of elite attitudes toward the reputations of the emperors in his Letters to Trajan, “. . . an emperor is no sooner elected than his fame is assured for all time, for better or for worse; he need not seek a lasting reputation (it will last in spite of him), but a good one . . . ”⁶⁹² A description of the contrasting qualities of Trajan and Domitian dominates the introduction to Pliny's Panegyrics, signaling to Julian Bennett that the enormity of the Principate and the legitimacy of the new reign were still matters of public concern.⁶⁹³ For Pliny there were only two options for the categorization of an emperor, good and bad. Pliny is consistent with Richard Alston's observation that normative narrative construction of 'good' and 'bad' model identities were firmly within the traditions of Roman historiographies.⁶⁹⁴ Pliny's characterization should not be taken as pure flattery, rather, giving some idea of what was at stake, Pliny reflected on the need for every citizen to cultivate the memories of great men of the past or risk the loss of Rome's heritage.⁶⁹⁵

Good did not mean perfect and bad did not mean an emperor was completely lacking in any admirable qualities or deeds, rather when speaking of *gesta* referred to the totality of the emperor's reign, a notion explained by Appian, “From this example the Romans now pay like honors to each emperor at his death if he has not reigned in a tyrannical manner or made himself odious.”⁶⁹⁶ Tacitus is more explicit in his evaluation of Tiberius describing some periods of his

⁶⁹² Pliny *Pan.* 55.9-10 (*Praeterea ut quisque factus est princeps, extemplo fama eius, incertum bona an mala, ceterum Aeterna est. Non ergo perpetua principi fama, quae invitum manet, sed bona concupiscenda est*).

⁶⁹³ Bennett 1997, 63.

⁶⁹⁴ Alston 2008, 158.

⁶⁹⁵ Flower 1996, 268-9.

⁶⁹⁶ App. 2.20.148: (Ρωμαιοι τον εκαστοτε την αρχην τηνδε αρχοντα, ην μη τυχη τυραννικος ων η επιμεμπτος).

reign that he viewed as positive and some as negative, however based on the weight of the evidence combined with Tiberius' inherent character flaws Tacitus concluded that Tiberius was one of the bad emperors.⁶⁹⁷ Ultimately, tending to a favorable reputation was, for Tacitus, an essential task of any emperor and equated to a moral duty in his eyes because reputation was so closely associated with virtue.⁶⁹⁸ Similarly, though Caligula was one of the worst emperors according to the written sources, in summarizing Caligula's character Josephus cited not only his ill-temper, murderous disposition, propensity to incest, and lack of public works, but also his excellent oratorical skills, command of the Greek and Roman language, and extensive learning. In the end however, Caligula's learning could not counteract his abusive exercise of authority.⁶⁹⁹ Josephus' use of this obituary technique to summarize someone's life was consistent with the similar technique employed by Tacitus.⁷⁰⁰

Cognitive research also suggests that visual culture of the divi, the temple and images of the deified emperors, influenced accounts of them in the biographies and other written accounts concerned in part with specific episodes of an emperor's life. Though the precise mechanisms of semantic encoding are not understood, psychologists agree that the semantic or gist memory system plays an important role in the retrieval and storage of episodic memory.⁷⁰¹ In experiments, once a group settled on a particular interpretation of an event, particular details of the event that conflicted with the settled interpretation faded while parts of the story that fit the interpretation remained.⁷⁰² Thus, when biographers sought to portray a life they may have been

⁶⁹⁷ See, e.g., Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.51) on the various characterizations and periods of Tiberius' character.

⁶⁹⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 4.38.

⁶⁹⁹ Jos. *Ant. Jews* 19.2.5.

⁷⁰⁰ Goud 1996, 477.

⁷⁰¹ Tulving 1972, 391.

⁷⁰² See, e.g., Fentress and Wickham 1992, 35-6.

starting from a perception based on the knowledge derived from temples and cult that the emperor was one of the good emperors.

Psychologists have even suggested that the generation of semantic knowledge may induce episodic forgetting inconsistent with the gist association due to increased competition for mnemonic resources arising from the encoding of semantically generated items.⁷⁰³ For example, eyewitness memory for specific details of an observed automobile accident may be impaired by the generation of semantic knowledge. It is really no longer necessary for an eyewitness to remember the exact speed and trajectory of an oncoming car once the eyewitness knows that the accident was caused by the driver's recklessness, and may even cause the eyewitness to forget any behaviors of the driver that contradicts the idea of recklessness, such as the driver putting on their blinker before turning.

Similarly, retrieving previously studied traits about a person, can impair memory for other non-retrieved traits of the same person.⁷⁰⁴ It seems that the visual culture of *divi* influenced the ancient biographers for whom the accuracy of individual facts and events emperor's life diminished in importance so long as they conformed to the gist presented by deification. Though ancient authors could present divergent viewpoints of a reign after the emperor's death, for purposes of Roman collective memory the meaning of deification lay in its declaration and repeated recollection through architecture and cult of the eternal god rather than the specifics of the emperor's life. That people recalled particular emperors as a god and one of the good emperors should remind us, Zerubavel observes, that collective memory consists not

⁷⁰³ Bäuml 2002.

⁷⁰⁴ Bäuml 2002.

only of specific historical figures but also distinctly generic types of figures, a phenomenon he calls mnemonic typification.⁷⁰⁵

In summary, simplification in the collective memory through the suppression of biographical detail in the construction of Divus Julius, Divus Augustus, Divus Claudius, Divus Vespasian, and Divus Titus as evidenced by architecture, iconography, and ritual was not tantamount to forgetting the historical emperor, rather the memory of the emperor as deified emphasized the gist of his reputation, summing up his life in the most general possible terms as one of the good emperors. While literary genres such as biography and panegyric and other classes of monuments such as triumphal arches, commemorative statuary, and relief sculpture (as discussed in Chapter 1) may emphasize episodic details of an emperor's reign, the icon of the deified emperor presented him as an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon and one of the good emperors.⁷⁰⁶

A dead emperor's life could be summed up in a way that a living emperor's life could not because the life was over and safe from the unexpected.⁷⁰⁷ The temples did not necessarily render the deified emperors better known than the infamous ones, rather it signified that they were more important to the Roman collective identity. At least some monuments built by, or dedicated to, every emperor survived in the Roman landscape, but only the deified emperors received temples. To be deified and receive a temple in Imperial Rome, however, an emperor simply needed to be good enough to be good. In terms of each historical emperor, his deified

⁷⁰⁵ Mnemonic typification reveals the outlines of the conventional categories into which we tend to mentally lump similar figures or events together (Zerubavel 2003, 25).

⁷⁰⁶ Cf. DeJong and Hekster who argue that there was no objective idea of 'good' and 'bad'. While true, DeJong and Hekster focus on the often contested process by which the memorial decisions are made (DeJong and Hekster 2008). In contrast, the discussion of 'good' and 'bad' emperors herein refers to the final formulation once the decision has been made and enters into the collective memory. Once an emperor, died, was deified, and received a temple there was little ambiguity in religious terms.

⁷⁰⁷ As Lowenthal (1985, 40) has stated, "Hindsight enables us to comprehend past scenes as we cannot those of the incoherent present."

counterpart was at once a continuation and a revision. If effective, the representation was consistent with the life, however, the emperor as a *divus* was also an entirely new conception. Each *divus* was a composite but one entirely lacking in detail and therefore defying definitive comparison to the historical person.

Psychological research of gist memory reveals some possible advantages of the memorial strategies employed in the temples to *divi*. First, the memory of the emperor embodied in temples to the *divi* may have endured beyond the memory of the emperor as discerned from particular events and actions. Human cognition is naturally prone to a slower rate of forgetting for the categories of semantic information than the details of episodic information. Research has shown that richly detailed information is mnemonically unstable because it is more susceptible to forgetting or transformation than gist memory.⁷⁰⁸ In the late Republic and early empire there was some skepticism over the historical details of individual careers as handed down by the great families. Livy complained about the misleading influence of family histories and outright falsehoods found in eulogistic inscriptions attached to the portrait statues of the elite suggesting the recognition that individual deeds could be faked or distorted.⁷⁰⁹ Tacitus also acknowledges how the perspective of the person remembering an event could unduly influence their recollection. Of Galba's actions in the tense moments immediately before his assassination Tacitus recounts that reports of Galba's last words varied according to the hatred or admiration of the individuals.⁷¹⁰ Deification of the emperor on the other hand, was in theory removed from the domain of family or dynastic commemoration and cloaked in the collective judgment of the Senate thereby lending it increased authority.

⁷⁰⁸ Brainerd and Reyna 1990, 15-9.

⁷⁰⁹ Livy 8.40.3-5. On this aspect of Livy, see Miles 1995, 64-67. On the Romans' skepticism over early triumphal history, see Beard 2007, 75-6.

⁷¹⁰ Tac. *Hist.* 2.91.

Second, generalities are by definition harder to question. Gist memory accepts a wider range of inputs which suggests that negative and positive accounts of a particular emperor could exist in parallel with the temples, for example in an imperial biography, and not contradict the overarching message that that emperor was one of the good ones.⁷¹¹ Romans clearly recognized that the details of memory were malleable. For example tituli of esteemed ancestors in the atrium of a Roman house could be rewritten, expanded, or edited over time to accommodate the needs of rival claimants in the family or the family's growing prestige.⁷¹² While posterity debated the details of an emperor's reign, so long as the gist of the emperor's reputation remained favorable deification still accorded with the life as remembered. Indeed, the temples may have provided valuable evidence to posterity suggesting a more favorable interpretation of various events and motivations of an emperor's reign.

Finally, what psychologists refer to as the fuzzy processing preference dictates that cognition is prone to operate as close to the gist end of the specificity spectrum as possible.⁷¹³ In other words, semantic or conceptual knowledge about the past, as opposed to episodic or detailed facts, most often features in remembering and delivers the optimum amount of information for a minimal of cognitive effort.⁷¹⁴ Posthumously categorizing emperors as an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon, one of the good ones, or subjecting them to memory sanctions, as one of the bad ones, was the highest level of specificity required for the Romans to build their imperial past. The cost of this mnemonic strategy was a general loss of differentiation and particularization of the emperors as deified, however, this loss was balanced somewhat by the

⁷¹¹ Brainerd and Reyna 1990, 19-20.

⁷¹² Flower 1996, 184.

⁷¹³ The simplest gist that can support accurate response is the probable basis of information processing (Brainerd and Reyna 1990, 15-23; 1992).

⁷¹⁴ Conway 2007.

deeds and accomplishments of individual emperors as remembered via other vehicles of ‘external symbolic storage’ such as monuments, images, and inscriptions in the Roman landscape and literary works like imperial biographies.

The Restoration Coin Series of Trajan: Consolidating the Good

Trajan set an enduring benchmark during his reign by defining a collection of good emperors in terms of the *divi*. In the tradition established by the restoration coin series of Titus and Domitian, Trajan issued an exceptional series of gold coins invoking the memory of his six officially deified predecessors and consolidating the group of good rulers: Julius Caesar, Augustus, Claudius, Vespasian, Titus, and Nerva. With two exceptions, Tiberius and Galba, the series omitted emperors who had not been deified. On the reverses of all of the coins was an identical legend including the imperial title of Trajan terminating in the abbreviation REST, for *restituit, he restored*: IMP CAES TRAIAN AUG GER DAC P P REST.

One approach to this series views the coins as artifacts, analyzing the workings of the Roman mint and arguing for an antiquarian motivation to reproduce obsolete coins providing a material continuity with the past.⁷¹⁵ Others have focused on the imagery and iconography of the coins, that also included restored coins from the Republican period, claiming that they were either intended to honor or remember politically significant events or people.⁷¹⁶ For Harold Mattingly and Hölger Komnick the series was intended to represent Roman history as a harmonious and consecutive whole, to commend the Empire as its natural conclusion, and to

⁷¹⁵ See e.g. Buttrey 1972.

⁷¹⁶ General principles of selection for the Republican coins: subjects of historical and legendary interest such as Roma, the she-wolf and twins, Quirinus, and individual people like Pompey and Brutus; topographically significant types such as the Basilica Aemilia and Temple of Vesta; types representing deities like Jupiter, Juno and Minerva; personifications like Concordia and Libertas; and references to prominent Republican families (Komnick 2001, 175-8).

demonstrate that with the *Libertas* of Trajan's reign the emperor had no reason to fear the memory of the Republic.⁷¹⁷ An approach taking into account the status of the coins as 'restored' objects, however, should inform our understanding. An examination of the seriality of the coins, first in a material sense as repetitive objects ostensibly derived from previous emperors' coins, and second in their cumulative memorial evocation of Rome's successive good rulers, reveals the reciprocal and mutually constitutive relationship between past, present, and future embodied in the coins.

The Coins

For each *divus* Trajan issued at least one coin bearing a portrait of the emperor accompanied by his lifetime titles, and another bearing an image of the god with his divine name. There were two issues depicting Caesar with lifetime titles on the obverse paired on the reverse with either a *lituus*, jug, and ax, or alternatively, an image of Venus standing with her elbow resting on a column beside which lay a spear, helmet, and shield.⁷¹⁸ The priestly implements may refer to the selection of Caesar as *Pontifex Maximus* or his early cooption into the priestly colleges and Venus must allude to Caesar's divine ancestry. On the *Divus Julius* reverse a winged *nemesis* holds a *caduceus* in her right hand while a snake crawls at her feet (**Fig. 5.2**).⁷¹⁹ *Pax-Nemesis* may represent either the balance of fortune or divine retribution for the unjust. When viewed in conjunction with *Divus Julius Pax-Nemesis* would have brought to mind the victories of Augustus avenging Caesar from which the Roman Empire was born, and Caesar's subsequent divinely ordained apotheosis. A crocodile on the obverse of Augustus' lifetime coin

⁷¹⁷ Mattingly 1926; Komnick 2001, 175-8.

⁷¹⁸ Sacred implements: *BMCRE* III no. 1a; Komnick Type 52.0. Venus: *RIC* II no. 806; *BMCRE* III no. 696; Komnick Type 53.0.

⁷¹⁹ *RIC* II no. 815; *BMCRE* III no. 698; Komnick Type 54.0.

clearly evokes the conquest of Egypt while the Divus Augustus coin (**Fig. 5.3**) and its legionary eagle between two standards could have referred to the momentous return of the Parthian standards or simply reinforced the message of Augustus' military might.⁷²⁰ Personifications or goddesses occupy the obverses of all the Claudius issues: Spes with a flower in her hand on the lifetime issue, and Concordia seated holding a patera and cornucopia or Vesta holding a patera and torch on the Divus Claudius issues (**Fig. 5.4**).⁷²¹

The lifetime issues of Vespasian and Titus evoke associations with conquest and allude to the Flavian Judaean victory. For Vespasian the image on the obverse depicts a kneeling captive under a tropaeum, and for Titus the obverse bears a trophy and two shields.⁷²² A winged lightning bolt atop a draped throne graces the obverses of the Divus Vespasian (**Fig. 5.5**) and Divus Titus (**Fig. 5.6**) issues.⁷²³ Finally, an image of two clasped hands signifying Concordia was represented on the obverse of the lifetime issue of Nerva and on one of the Divus Nerva issues.⁷²⁴ A detailed representation of what may be a statue of Divus Nerva pulled in a biga of elephants, symbols of eternity, on the obverse of the Divus Nerva coin may depict a cult procession in honor of the god (**Fig. 5.7**).⁷²⁵

Trajan's restoration series may be distinguished from the earlier restoration series issued under the emperors Titus and Domitian, and from coins that simply imitated earlier issues

⁷²⁰ Crocodile: *RIC* II no. 819; Komnick Type 56.0. Standards and eagle: *RIC* II no. 820; *BMCRE* III no. 699; Komnick Type 57.0.

⁷²¹ Claudius and Spes: *RIC* II no. 822; *BMCRE* III no. 145; Komnick Type 59.0. Divus Claudius and Concordia: *RIC* II no. 823; *BMCRE* III no. 700; Komnick Type 60.0. Divus Claudius and Vesta: *RIC* II no. 823a; Komnick Type 61.0.

⁷²² Vespasian: *RIC* II no. 827; Komnick Types 64.0, 65.0. Titus: *RIC* II no. 831; *BMCRE* III no. 704; Komnick Types 68.0, 69.0.

⁷²³ Divus Vespasian: *RIC* II nos. 828, 829; *BMCRE* III nos. 702, 703; Komnick Types 66.0, 67.0. Divus Titus: *RIC* II no. 833; Komnick Type 70.0.

⁷²⁴ Lifetime issue: Komnick Type 72.0. Divus Nerva with clasped hands: *RIC* II no. 836; Komnick Type 73.0.

⁷²⁵ *RIC* II nos. 835, 836; Komnick Types 73.0, 74.0.

without explicitly identifying the coin as restored.⁷²⁶ First, unlike the Flavian series, issued sporadically over several years, an identical legend on each reverse of the Trajanic series suggests that the coins were issued together as a group and justifies a programmatic interpretation. Second, with very few exceptions, the Flavian coins bear obverse and reverse image combinations that are known to have existed on pre-Flavian coins. In contrast, not one of the *divus* coins in the Trajanic series duplicated an existing prototype, but instead each offered a new combination of divine portrait and reverse iconography.⁷²⁷ For example, there is no coin before Trajan with an obverse bearing the head of *Divus Julius* wearing a laurel crown, paired with the reverse depicting a winged *Nemesis* holding a caduceus.⁷²⁸ While coins commemorating *Divus Julius* are known from the reign of Augustus and his successor Tiberius, the *Pax-Nemesis* reverse first appears in the late Republic on coins by C. Vibius Varus, and not again until the reign of the emperor Claudius with whose image it was paired (**Fig. 5.8**).⁷²⁹ A coin obverse of *Divus Vespasian* is coupled with a winged thunderbolt atop a throne, a fitting symbol for Vespasian who had delivered Rome from the horrors of civil war and restored the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, but one that appeared previously only the obverses of Titus.⁷³⁰ Perhaps the

⁷²⁶ On issues of Vespasian imitating Augustan prototypes, see Mattingly 1926; Cox 2006, 144-57. On the restoration coinage of Titus, see p. 166. Mattingly 1920; Komnick 2001, pp. 27-108. See Buttrey (1972) on silver coinage of Vespasian that some believe should be understood as deliberately imitating types of Augustus. Buttrey argues that while the series is highly imitative, there is no specific Augustan reference and simply borrowed from previous types independent of any association with its original issuer. Moreover, he asserts that it was impossible for the public to know that types long out of circulation were being revived on the current coins. Of course the pivotal difference between the series of Vespasian possibly imitating Augustan types is that unlike the restoration series the imitation coins were not marked restored.

⁷²⁷ Mattingly (1926) first made this observation.

⁷²⁸ *RIC* no. 815; *BMCRE* III no. 698; Komnick Type 54.0.

⁷²⁹ Claudian issue with *Pax-Nemesis*: *RIC* I² no. 9.

⁷³⁰ *Divus Vespasian*: *RIC* II nos. 828, 829; *BMCRE* III nos. 702, 703; Komnick Types 66.0, 67.0.

most striking play with the notion of a ‘restored’ coin was in the case of Divus Nerva, for whom Trajan struck no consecration coins before this series.⁷³¹

Finally, the series of Titus and Vespasian did include a number of great Romans from the imperial families other than the deified emperors but did not include any Republican restored coins. In addition to Divus Augustus and Divus Claudius the series of Titus restored coins of Tiberius, Galba, Agrippa, Drusus, Nero Claudius Drusus, Germanicus, and Agrippina the Elder, presenting a much broader view of imperial history than the Trajanic series, which included only two coin types of emperors that were not deified: Tiberius and Galba.

Of the two types in the Trajanic series that do not include the deified emperors, one represents Tiberius on the obverse identified as TI CAESAR DIVI AUG F AUGUSTUS, with a seated Livia holding a scepter and flower on the reverse.⁷³² This coin has been used as evidence that the memory of Tiberius did not fare as poorly as generally believed, however, more significant than the existence of Tiberius on the coin was his status as *divi filius*. Tiberius was only the second *divi filius* and that status, combined with Livia, the female progenitor of the Julio-Claudian dynasty, provides a clue that the importance of Tiberius lies in his ability to provide an additional link in the chain of continuity between Augustus and Claudius. That the Tiberius and Galba coins are issued within a series of *divus* coins further suggests that interpretations of them should be guided by their relationship to the deified emperors.

The best analogy for the inclusion of Galba in this series may be found in Republican tombs of the great Roman families.⁷³³ Analyzing the *elogia* and *tituli* in the tomb of the Scipios,

⁷³¹ Divus Nerva with clasped hands: *RIC* II no. 836; Komnick Type 73.0. Divus Nerva with elephant biga: *RIC* II nos. 835, 836; Komnick Types 73.0, 74.0.

⁷³² *RIC* II no. 821; Komnick Type 58.0.

⁷³³ Restoration coin of Galba: Komnick Type 63.0.

Flower illustrates how individuals were incorporated into family traditions.⁷³⁴ In particular, great men of the family were celebrated with prominent positions in the tomb and long inscriptions detailing offices held, virtues embodied, and benefits bestowed. Although some family members, like L. Scipio, younger brother of Hispanus, and L. Cornelius Scipio, son of the conqueror of Antiochus, died before holding office and did not receive full *elogia*, they were nonetheless included in the tomb and fully identified within the context of the family history. As Flower has observed, such individuals were significant for their potential and were represented as integrated with the family group and worthy of the political careers they never attained.⁷³⁵ Similarly, Galba was invoked for the promise of his reign that was violently cut short and to provide a link in the chain between *Divus Claudius* and *Divus Vespasian*. Though Galba was not deified, his claim to divine descent, tracing his family tree back to Jupiter through his great grandfather Quintus Catulus Capitolinus and back to King Minos through his mother's side, may have suggested to later Romans that Galba had the support of the gods despite his untimely end.⁷³⁶ With the inclusion of Galba in the series Trajan was asserting that even the devastating civil wars of 68-69 did not threaten the viability of the Roman Empire.

Trajan as Restorer

Understanding Trajan's novel approach to the series and the purposeful identification of Trajan as a restorer, demands a nuanced understanding of the Latin verb *restituere*. In legal parlance, *restituere* meant the restoration of someone or something to a former state such as

⁷³⁴ Flower 1996, 166-80.

⁷³⁵ Flower 1996, 168-9.

⁷³⁶ Suet. *Gal.* 2-3.

making someone financially whole after a legal dispute.⁷³⁷ When describing the action of someone who restored a building, religious structure, or an institution, the term could have a broader range of meanings, though in all cases the act of restoration necessarily invoked an entity's past existence brought into the present. An inscription dated to 29 December 100, identifies a group of magistrates of the Vicus Censori who restored (*restituerunt*) a shrine to the Lares Augustorum, the Genii of the Emperors, and Trajan.⁷³⁸ The inscription itself specifies that the shrine was dilapidated through age, thereby highlighting past use of the shrine and repairs that brought the altar back to an operational state.

More complicated is Augustus' claim in the *Res Gestae* to have restored 82 temples in the city of Rome.⁷³⁹ In Livy's view Augustus was the “. . . founder and restorer of all our temples . . .”⁷⁴⁰ Suetonius, who famously recounts that Augustus claimed to have found Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble, gives additional insight into the temple restorations and attests that Augustus not only revived and rebuilt neglected structures but also enhanced and improved them as befitted an empire.⁷⁴¹ Coins such as Galba's *Libertas Restituta* issues seem to deliberately invoke the ambiguity inherent in the term (**Fig. 5.9**).⁷⁴² After the perceived tyranny of the recently deceased emperor Nero, Galba issued the liberty restored coins, a concept different than, but playing off of, ideas of a *Libertas Reddita*, or a return to liberty, likely of the Republican period. By lifting up a kneeling personification of *Libertas* with *Roma* standing in

⁷³⁷ Though Komnick discusses the use of the word *restituere*, he does not delve into nuanced understandings of the word but rather focuses on instances of its earliest use on coins (Komnick 2001, 3-8).

⁷³⁸ Gordon 1964, no. 171.

⁷³⁹ On *RGDA* 20.4, see Cooley 2009, 194-5.

⁷⁴⁰ Livy 4.20.7 (. . . *templorum omnium conditorem ac restitutorem* . . .).

⁷⁴¹ Suet. *Aug.* 28.

⁷⁴² Galba, *RIC* II no. 485.

the background Galba could be suggesting that he is returning to the freedoms of the republic, or he could be implying that he has provided a superior liberty bolstered by the imperial system.

There is no such ambiguity in the use of *restituit* on the coins of Trajan. The lack of a distinct prototype precludes the limited notion of returning to a former state, while the innovative combinations of obverse and reverse imagery argues instead that Trajan is presenting himself as a restorer, in the sense of one who has improved what came before through creation and enhancement. The Roman artistic process known as *aemulatio*, or emulation, encompassed a similar notion. *Aemulatio* describes the creative rivalry with previous works through which artists produced new works drawing on many sources.⁷⁴³ Based on norms of coin production and legends, the answer to the question of what Trajan is restoring and improving must be the coins. The selective reference to previous emperors, however, introduced Trajan's claim to be capable not only of safeguarding the continuity of the empire but also of bringing it to greater heights than under past emperors. Indeed, with his Dacian conquests and the annexation or conquest of Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria, Trajan physically enlarged the empire to its greatest extent. Thus, the coins are genealogically bound to past issues, as Trajan was to his good imperial predecessors, yet the emperor demonstrated that he was able to build on and transcend the limitations of the past to formulate a new Roman Empire in the present, as he created the 'restored' coins.

Unlike previous series issued in a variety of denominations, the Trajanic series was issued only in gold, a material that reinforced Trajan's message in various ways. The supply of money in certain denominations was necessarily limited by the availability of the materials,

⁷⁴³ Gazda 1995, 135-6; Perry 2005.

particularly precious gold coinage.⁷⁴⁴ The Trajanic series likely incorporated at least some of the gold used in pre-Neronian money literally appropriating the substance of earlier coins into the new objects. According to Dio, in 107 Trajan demonetized all of the precious metal coinage issued prior to Nero's numismatic reforms of 64 by melting down the coins.⁷⁴⁵ Mattingly claims that Trajan issued the restoration series after the demonetization, a date consistent with Trajan's titles referencing the Dacian conquests on the obverses.⁷⁴⁶ Komnick associates the issue of the restoration series with the first decade anniversary of the Dacian triumph and the dedication of the Forum of Trajan in 112.⁷⁴⁷

Furthermore, importation of precious metals was associated with booty and exploitation of natural resources following Roman conquests.⁷⁴⁸ For instance, the first Roman large-scale silver issuances came only after the influx of silver from indemnities paid by the Carthaginians following the First Punic War. On only one day of his triumphal procession in Rome Sulla displayed fifteen thousand pounds of gold and one hundred and fifteen thousand pounds of silver.⁷⁴⁹ On the occasion of his triumph over Britain the emperor Claudius announced the contribution by a region in Spain of a crown of gold seven thousand pounds in weight, and another by Gallia Comata weighing nine thousand pounds.⁷⁵⁰ Significant acquisitions of mines before Trajan included silver and gold mines in southern Spain after the second Punic War and the gold mines north of Spain following campaigns of Augustus in 25-23 B.C.E. With Trajan

⁷⁴⁴ *CIL* 6: 1.451; Gordon 1964, Cat. 160.

⁷⁴⁵ Cass. Dio 68.15.3.

⁷⁴⁶ Mattingly 1926.

⁷⁴⁷ Komnick 2001, 137-8.

⁷⁴⁸ Howgego 2007, 7-9. On the triumph as one of the main avenues through which wealth was introduced to Rome, see Beard 2007, 68.

⁷⁴⁹ Pliny *NH* 33.5.14-16.

⁷⁵⁰ Pliny *NH* 33.16.

came the conquest of Dacia and imperial control of extensive and valuable indigenous Dacian gold. Trajan imported so much gold that it caused a drop in the price of gold in Egypt in 108.⁷⁵¹ With this association in mind, it is plausible that Trajan issued the restoration exclusively in gold in order to recall his triumph, in which case the coins also served as trophy objects embodying his victory and expansion of the Roman Empire.

Though clearly identifiable as a series by the reverse legends and the corresponding obverses bearing portraits of the divi, this was not a closed series creating a fixed canon of good emperors, rather the imperial series was still under the formative influence of the imperial line. The repetition of sameness in legend and portrait in the coins, and differentiation in the specific god and reverse image, was a conscious strategy that could easily be read as a continuum excluding variants that did not accord with the vision of the imperial past presented.⁷⁵² The use of highly recognizable portraits of deified emperors that were visually available to the Roman viewer from monuments dominating the visual landscape of Rome would have enhanced the repetitive effect.⁷⁵³ The succession of the good emperors representing the Roman Empire, a dynamic institution with an ongoing history, raised the question of who was the next divus, and the legend identifying Trajan on the reverse, gave the answer.

Not all Roman viewers necessarily understood the complex layering of meanings embodied in the coins. Mattingly warns scholars “not to attach too much importance to such minor forms.”⁷⁵⁴ A similar caution should be issued not to attach too little significance. Fears has characterized the Trajanic restoration series as, “. . . central to Trajanic imperial ideology as

⁷⁵¹ Other factors that influenced the drop in the price of gold were the extent to which such imported metals were used as money and how hard that money was made to work (Howgego 1992, 4).

⁷⁵² On the advantages of repetition, including its use as an essential tool for expressing emulation, see Gazda 1995.

⁷⁵³ Howgego 1992, 6.

⁷⁵⁴ Mattingly 1926, 275.

statues and *elogia* of great Romans in the Forum of Augustus were to that of Augustus.”⁷⁵⁵ Coins were not consumed in isolation and their messages reinforced, and were reinforced by, cultural expressions in festivals and processions, public buildings and other monuments, epigraphy, and literature. Moreover, it is likely that the intended audience was an educated population.⁷⁵⁶ Gold was a denomination generally circulated among the elite, members of their households, and those with whom they did business. The diffusion of gold coins was more widespread than has previously been believed, however, the high value of the coins remained suitable for larger rather than smaller transactions, and the ease of transport made it an attractive mode of currency for military pay and external, long-distance trade to the Roman provinces.⁷⁵⁷

That Romans paid attention to their coins is attested by their high degree of numismatic self-consciousness.⁷⁵⁸ For instance, many Roman imperial coins and medallions owe their types and dates of issuance to coincidences in year or calendar date with important anniversary years.⁷⁵⁹ Andrew Meadows and Jonathon Williams’ study has persuasively argued that by the late Republic Romans viewed coins as monuments, or *monumenta*, in their own right, the purpose of which was to persuade as well as bear witness and remind viewers of gods, people, or events represented on the coins.⁷⁶⁰ Among a range of connotations of Juno Moneta whose temple housed the Roman mint, they assert, was her conception as the Roman Mnemosyne whose job in

⁷⁵⁵ Fears 1981, 943

⁷⁵⁶ Using the Roman civil war of 68-69 as a test case to employ theories of branding in the analysis of ancient coins, Hekster persuasively argues that while not absolute, trends in messages on coins of different denominations are discernable (Hekster 2003).

⁷⁵⁷ Howgego 1992, 16-22.

⁷⁵⁸ Grant points out that questions about whether the public could be sufficiently informed for numismatic commemoration to be worthwhile are anachronistic. He cites the *acta diurna* and other public announcements as some of the many ways that the Roman imperial administration could communicate public events to the populace (Grant 1950).

⁷⁵⁹ Grant 1950.

⁷⁶⁰ Meadows and Williams 2001.

the context of the Roman mint was to certify the authenticity of memory and recording of the past presented through text and image on the coins.⁷⁶¹ The capacity of coins to be restored as attested by this series, further bolsters the claim that for Romans coins functioned as monumenta.

Display and viewing practices of serial image collections in Rome, such as *imagines* in the Roman house, portrait galleries in the Forum of Augustus, and shield portraits in the Forum of Trajan, demonstrate that certain ensembles were particularly effective at provoking contemplation of the future as well as the past and present. Noble families displayed busts, or *imagines*, of their illustrious ancestors as the dominant feature in the atrium of the household, a large, central space designed for waiting and formal social reception. Likely carved of wax and preserved in small wooden cupboards, or *armaria*, mounted around eye level or above, each portrait was identified with a label bearing the deceased ancestor's name, highest offices held, and greatest deeds.⁷⁶² Spoils of war along with *imago clipeatae* consisting of bronze shields adorned with silver portraits were hung high up on the wall and complemented the *armaria* below.⁷⁶³ As prominent family members died collections of *imagines* grew and overflowed into rooms adjoining the atrium. Integral to the evolving display was an accompanying painted family tree described by Pliny, in which lines joining portraits of family members highlighted familial connections.⁷⁶⁴

Ancient sources viewed the *imagines* as a burden for the young whose families expected them to live up to the standards of their ancestors.⁷⁶⁵ Thus, which living members of the family

⁷⁶¹ Cf. Buttrey, who criticizes the tendency to see coins as bearers of messages just as easily conveyed through literary, epigraphic, or other representational forms (Buttrey 1972).

⁷⁶² On the context of *imagines* in the Roman atrium, see Flower 1996, 185-210.

⁷⁶³ Winkes 1979.

⁷⁶⁴ Pliny *NH* 35.6-8; Juvenal 8.1-23.

⁷⁶⁵ See, e.g., Pliny *Ep.* 3.3.6, on the expectation that the younger generation should resemble their esteemed fathers and grandfathers.

would one day warrant inclusion in the esteemed group of ancestors and pass on their own imago to posterity could not have been far from viewers' minds when contemplating these displays.⁷⁶⁶ Noting that some Romans buried their father's and grandfather's masks in oblivion through their disgraceful deeds, Seneca lamented that the living even had the capacity to posthumously impugn the hard-earned reputations of their ancestors.⁷⁶⁷

In the public sphere the over life-size portrait statues occupying elaborately adorned niches in the hemicycles of the Forum of Augustus echoed the presentation of a common past through distinguished individuals fundamental to displays of imagines in the Roman house. Joseph Geiger rightly contends that although the component parts of the statue galleries in the Forum of Augustus invoked long and well-known traditions, the assemblage and forging of the parts into a distinct entity constituted something new.⁷⁶⁸ An image of Aeneas fleeing the burning of Troy with his son Ascanius and aged father Anchises anchored the northwest exedra and was flanked by his descendants including the kings of Alba Longa, Julius Caesar, and other prominent members of Augustus' Julian family (**Fig. 5.10**). Across the Forum a statue of Romulus, the founder of Rome and the city's first king and triumphant general, dominated the southeast exedra, which contained images of the Roman kings and other great men from the more recent Republican past.⁷⁶⁹ Inscriptions mounted below the statues described each individual's career and achievements.⁷⁷⁰ As conceived, the assemblage was a closed series in relation to the past but open to the future. Significantly, Suetonius and Cassius Dio tell us that

⁷⁶⁶ Livy 3.58.2.

⁷⁶⁷ Sen. *Cont.* 1.6.3-4.

⁷⁶⁸ Geiger 2008.

⁷⁶⁹ On the statues lining the exedrae, see Ov. *Fast.* 5.563-6; Suet. *Aug.* 31.5.

⁷⁷⁰ Flower 1996, 182-4.

the design itself provided empty niches to accommodate statues of bronze for those whose future services to the state would equal past heroes.⁷⁷¹

Though the evidence is sparse, the series of shield portraits in the Forum of Trajan sheds some additional light on this issue of serial portraits.⁷⁷² In 112 Trajan dedicated his monumental forum adjacent to the Forum of Augustus and consisting of a central arch, a forum proper with flanking colonnades and hemicycles, the Basilica Ulpia, Greek and Latin libraries, and the Column of Trajan (**Fig. 5.11**). *Imago clipeatae* embellished the attics of the colonnades surrounding the Forum. In addition to part of a frame, a fragment of an embellished cuirass with a scale pattern, winged gorgon, and stylized lightning bolt flanking a winged spear survive.⁷⁷³ Portrait fragments attributed to the *imago clipeatae* have been most recently identified as Nerva (**Fig. 5.13**), Trajan's mother (**Fig. 5.12**).⁷⁷⁴ In addition, the Markus Trunk has recently attributed the Caesar Farnese to an *imago clipeata* in an attic in the Forum of Trajan (**Fig. 5.14**).⁷⁷⁵ Based on his reconstruction of the Forum placing a portrait above each intercolumniation, James Packer has estimated that there would have been at least 60 shield portraits in addition to those adorning the central triumphal arch that constituted the southern entrance to the complex (**Fig. 15**).⁷⁷⁶

⁷⁷¹ Suet. Aug. 31.5; Cass. Dio 55.10.3. See also Geiger 2008, 57-8, 84-5.

⁷⁷² Pliny (*NH* 35.4-14) emphasizes the military associations of shield portraits claiming that the first shield portrait in Rome was hung in the Temple of Bellona, dedicated to the goddess of war.

⁷⁷³ Fragment of the frame: Packer 1997, 380-1, Cat. no. 102, fig. 57. Cuirass from an *imago* with pattern of scales on the cuirass and framed winged gorgon, paludamentum embellished with stylized lightning bolt flanking a winged spear: Packer 1997, 380, Cat. no. 189, figs. 51-53.

⁷⁷⁴ Portrait of Nerva (?), from clipeus on east colonnade, over two times lifesize: Packer 1997, Cat. no. 190. Portrait of Agrippina the Elder/Trajan's mother, from clipeus on east colonnade: Packer 1997, 381, Cat. no. 191, fig. 58. On identification of the female portrait from the Forum of Trajan as Trajan's mother rather than Agrippina the Elder, as well as full bibliography on the portrait, see von Boschung and Eck 1998.

⁷⁷⁵ Farnese Caesar: National Archaeological Museum of Naples, inv. 6038, h. 120 cm. On the Farnese Caesar and its reconstruction in an *imago clipeata*, see Trunk 2010.

⁷⁷⁶ Packer 1997, 426. On the central arch, see Packer 1997, 85-93. For the east colonnade and hemicycle, see Packer 1997, 5-108.

The surviving portraits indicate that Trajan's imperial predecessors must have been included in the portrait series along with prominent female members of their families. Whether designers provided vacant positions for later additions is uncertain, however, the unmistakable association of shield portraits with famous ancestors would evoke an evolving familial display.⁷⁷⁷ Even if there was no provision for later additions, the context of the shield portraits in a Forum that culminated in the Column of Trajan celebrating the Dacian triumphs, and otherwise repeatedly glorified Trajan through image and inscription, left no question that Trajan had surpassed his predecessors. Though Komnick has noted the potential programmatic connection between the Trajanic restoration series and the Forum of Trajan in which Trajan is represented as the culmination of Roman historical development, he neglects the prospective aspect of the coins series.⁷⁷⁸

The Trajanic series created a new version of the past by selectively invoking the memory of deified emperors and provoking consideration of the present and future. By (re)presenting the six deified emperors as a coherent group to the almost complete exclusion of all others, the coins series signified their continued importance in the evolution of the Roman Empire, as the imagines, "symbolized the continuing role of the ancestors within the household."⁷⁷⁹ Excluded were Nero and Otho, who committed suicide, and Caligula, Vitellius, and Domitian, who were all assassinated. These "bad" emperors presented inassimilable breaches in the collective narrative, the omission of which benefited the emperor as well as the people of Rome by allowing the construction of a coherent narrative of one aspect of their collective identity, that of a divinely ordained Roman Empire. A cognitive basis for the elimination of negative exempla

⁷⁷⁷ On *imago clipeatae*, see, e.g., Winkes 1979.

⁷⁷⁸ Komnick 2001, 180.

⁷⁷⁹ Flower 1996, 222.

from the collective record may be found in research that suggests that people remember themselves as above average in possessing positive characteristics, called a self-enhancing memory distortion.⁷⁸⁰ Trajan's denial of history was required to present the Roman Empire as an eternal and unchanging order. The gods could not have favored emperors who met an untimely end through desperation-fueled suicide or assassination. Trajan's restoration coin series bridged the historical gaps of the "bad" emperors by presenting temporally noncontiguous emperors as all fulfilling the same roles: emperors and gods of the Roman state.⁷⁸¹

Reinforcing the message of an eternal Empire with a limitless past, present, and future is the *Aeternitas Augusti* series that Trajan issued in the second half of his reign, continuing the explicit commemoration of *Aeternitas* as an aspect of the imperial office first begun under Vespasian. *Aeternitas* first appeared on a Trajanic coin in 111 standing holding busts of Sol and Luna (**Fig. 5.16**).⁷⁸² The reverse legend, COS V P P S P Q R OPTIMO PRINC encircling the image of *Aeternitas* and AET AUG flanking the goddess makes explicit her characterization as a quality of the imperial office. Similar issues in 111 and again between 112-117 signify the importance of this idea in Trajanic imagery.⁷⁸³

Moreover, by adapting the memory of individual deified emperors through their inclusion in this exalted group Trajan elevated their memorial status. As Gazda has stated, the "act of repeating in itself implies the continuing significance of the exemplum and its revalidation in the new image and context."⁷⁸⁴ Along with temples to the deified emperors, cult veneration, and other visual imagery in the city of Rome, Trajan's restoration coin series ensured the continued

⁷⁸⁰ White, Coppola and Multunas 2008.

⁷⁸¹ On this editing process, see Zerubavel 2003, 40.

⁷⁸² *RIC* II no. 91.

⁷⁸³ See, e.g., *RIC* II no. 229.

⁷⁸⁴ Gazda 1995, 144.

importance of this select group of past emperors. Posterity may judge the impact of the series from the lack of a need for any similar collection until the consecration series of the deified emperors issued by Trajan Decius during his reign from 249 to 251, almost one hundred and forty years later.⁷⁸⁵

As a point of clarification, comparison to the Forum of Augustus, imagines in the Roman atrium, and the Forum of Trajan is not intended to suggest that the mnemonic strategies employed to commemorate individuals memorable for a specific set of deeds and accomplishments within groups of ancestors or heroes of the state or the gens are identical to those employed for the deified emperors. Rather, the focus in the examples of portrait collections presented above is on viewing and display practices that evoke consideration of the present and future as well as the past. As asserted throughout this dissertation, commemoration of the deified emperors tended to suppress individual biography in order to transform the emperor into an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon.

The Trajanic restoration series is in accord with this view. Taking into account the reverse iconography of the coins, only the Divus Augustus, Divus Vespasian, and Divus Titus types could be interpreted as referencing lifetime deeds of the deified emperor: the standards and eagle of the Divus Augustus coin may recall Augustus' return of the Parthian standards, and the lightning bolt atop a draped throne of the Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus coins may have brought to mind Vespasian's rebuilding of the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus after its destruction by fire in 69. Yet, both reverses bear generalized iconography open to other interpretations. Augustus' own commemoration of the return of the Parthian standards, for example, had a narrative quality with the event conveyed by either a representation of the Parthian standards

⁷⁸⁵ See Chapter 7 below.

accompanied by the legend *SIGNIS RECEPTIS*, an image of the standards within the Temple of Mars Ultor, or a kneeling Parthian in the act of returning the standards.⁷⁸⁶

Moreover, as in the inscriptions accompanying the temples to the deified emperors, there is no explicit identification of dynastic identity on the *divus* coins, a fact readily conveyed by the emperor's titles on the lifetime coins. Of course many Romans were undoubtedly aware of each emperor's dynastic identity, but for purposes of commemorating the *divi* such associations were minimized in order to emphasize the commemoration of divine status, as were any specific reference to important lifetime events. Legends on the obverses identifying the god in two words have more in common with restoration coins depicting other gods accompanied by no identifying legend or simply the name of the god, such as *ROMA*, than with issues depicting the emperors during their lifetimes.

In addition, it is important to note the differing selection criteria between the southeast exedra of the Forum of Augustus, a dynastic assembly commemorating great men of the Julian family, and the imperial period coins of the Trajanic series. Only emperors, almost all of them deified, make the cut in the Trajanic series. That Trajan did not include any of his biological family members, not even his later deified biological father, is significant. Of course, with the exception of his father Marcus Ulpius Traianus, a prominent senator and general from Spanish Baetica, it does not appear that the prestige of the Ulpian Gens extended beyond its provincial domain.⁷⁸⁷ Thus, even though formulating a deep and prominent biological ancestral stock probably was not an option for Trajan, the fact remains that by this point in the development of

⁷⁸⁶ *SIGNIS RECEPTIS*: *RIC I*² nos. 82a, 86b. Parthian standards within the Temple of Mars Ultor: *RIC I*² no. 105. Kneeling Parthian returning the standards: *RIC I*² nos. 228, 314.

⁷⁸⁷ On the gens Ulpia and their rise to power under Trajan's father, see Bennett 1997, 1-26.

the Roman Empire Trajan presented his imperial ‘ancestry’ in terms of a the deified emperors, eternal archetypes for the imperial present.

Trajan and the Temples to the Divi: Establishing Continuity

While images of the divi such as those on the restoration coin series of Trajan functioned as succinct and effective references to an emperor’s status as a good emperor, so too did the temples of the divi. Two monumental reliefs likely dated to the reign of Trajan employ temples to divi as topographical markers: the Anaglypha Traiani (for which a Hadrianic date is also possible), and the lower left relief on the northwest side of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum depicting Trajan’s return to Rome from Germania in 99.⁷⁸⁸ Each measuring 5.5 m long and 2 m high, the two relief panels of the Anaglypha Traiani now located in the Curia are linked visually by corresponding representations of the Ficus Ruminalis and the statue of Marsyas from the Roman Forum adorning the front side of each slab (**Fig. 5.17**).⁷⁸⁹ Panel A (**Fig. 5.17a**) shows the emperor on a podium surrounded by lictors addressing a crowd and depicts the announcement of the congiarium. In Panel B (**Fig. 5.17b**) soldiers carrying the books, or tabulae, containing the registration of citizens’ debts to the treasury walk through the Roman Forum to burn the books on the occasion of a remission of taxes. The procession of a suovetaurilia including a bull, sheep, and pig grace the reverse side of both panels.⁷⁹⁰ A series of monuments in the Roman Forum

⁷⁸⁸ A Trajanic date for the Anaglypha Traiani is based on the statue of a seated emperor, a monument believed to be either Nerva or Trajan erected to commemorate the institution of the *alimenta* and represented on Trajanic coins dating from 103-111, and a known debt forgiveness program implemented by Trajan following his Dacian victory in 102. A Hadrianic date of the Anaglypha Traiani is strongly suggested by Cassius Dio (69.8.1, 72.32.2) who describes the physical destruction of Roman tax records in the Forum of Trajan and witnessed by Hadrian in 118, but contradicted by the depiction of the event in the Anaglypha Traiani in the Roman Forum when sources clearly record the debt forgiveness of 118 as taking place in the Forum of Trajan.

⁷⁸⁹ On the Anaglypha Traiani see, Plutei Traiani, *LTUR* II:240-249. On the significance of the statue of Marsyas, see Torelli 1992, 102-6.

⁷⁹⁰ On problems of identification and dating the Anaglypha Traiani, see Torelli 1992, 89-119.

occupies the background of each slab. The monumental span of Panel A includes encompasses the rostra of the Temple of Divus Julius, Augustus' Parthian Arch, the Temple of Castor, and the Basilica Julia ending with the Ficus Ruminalis and the Marsyas statue, while the monumental span of Panel B begins with the Ficus Ruminalis and the Marsyas, then displays the Basilica Julia, an arch over the Vicus Iugarius, the Temple of Saturn, and ends with the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus.⁷⁹¹

Anthony Bonanno and Stefano DeAngeli convincingly contend that the presence of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, represented as a Corinthian hexastyle temple, along with the other monuments in the Anaglypha Traiani performed a didactic function specifying the location of the acts depicted in the reliefs.⁷⁹² The actions depicted, the announcement of the congiarium and abolition of citizens' debts, combined with their setting in the Roman Forum and repetition of the Marsyas statue representing *libertas* emphasized imperial policies in favor of the Roman people. Omission of architectural details such as inner facades of the temples with their doors and the foreshortened representation of the Temple of Vespasian and Titus in Panel B were artistic strategies employed to avoid viewer confusion and increase recognizability.⁷⁹³ Bonanno further suggests that the *suovetaurilia* on the reverse side of the Anaglypha Traiani indicated the religious sanction of the imperial acts depicted on the historical reliefs.⁷⁹⁴

There is, however, more to representations of the architecture than a scene setting function. Visual records of the physicality of the city also have the capacity to promote particular ideologies and to foster identity of the city by offering a vision of the city to be held in the mind

⁷⁹¹ Plutei Traiani, *LTUR* II:240-249.

⁷⁹² Bonanno 1976; De Angeli 1992, *Testimonianze figurate*, Cat. no. 1.

⁷⁹³ When artists made choices in how to represent an individual building in relation to the image of which it was a part, the artist could make an architectural image immediately recognizable by including as little as one or two features (Grunow 2002, 15-6).

⁷⁹⁴ Bonanno 1976.

of the viewer and associated with activities occurring in particular places.⁷⁹⁵ With monuments encircling the Roman Forum almost continuously the artist could have chosen a different span of monuments or included fewer monuments in the background. The prominent Marsyas statue and Ficus Ruminalis could have performed the function of site identification on their own. The horizontal scale of the buildings is greatly reduced in relation to the figures and events for which the monuments form the background, perhaps to include a greater span of the monument landscape. In other words, as in other Roman historical reliefs, accuracy was not paramount; there must have been other purposes and the images probably would have been understood on multiple levels.⁷⁹⁶ By conceptualizing the Roman Forum in a schematized language compressing monuments into a view that didn't really exist and bookending the composition with the monuments to his deified predecessors including the first, Divus Julius, and the most recent, Divus Vespasian and Titus, Trajan visually encompasses the entire monumental tradition of deification. Even if the Anaglypha Traiani reliefs are Hadrianic, this alternative interpretation still stands. In the case of a Hadrianic date, Hadrian followed in the Trajanic tradition established by the restoration coin series discussed above, by including, but ultimately looking past his immediate predecessor to his imperial ancestors. In a Hadrianic context, depicting the statue of either Trajan or Nerva on Panel A combined with the monuments of his illustrious deified predecessors positioned Hadrian as the most recent of the good emperors. Conspicuous for its absence of course is the infamous and colossal Equus Domitiani of the most recent 'bad' emperor, undoubtedly dismantled and removed after the end of Domitian's reign.⁷⁹⁷

⁷⁹⁵ See Cooper 1999.

⁷⁹⁶ Distortion of temple proportions is common in relief sculpture in order to fit the buildings into the composition in accordance with larger design goals (Grunow 2002, 26). In the Anaglypha Traiani the Roman Forum appears flattened as though along a straight road even though the span of buildings depicted turns twice at the southwest and southeast angles of the Forum.

⁷⁹⁷ On the Equus Domitiani and a recent theory about its location in the Roman Forum, see Thomas 2004.

Unlike the Flavian motivation for creating a temple pendant to the Temple of Divus Julius, though, it seems unlikely that the Anaglypha Traiani intentionally invoked the two previous dynasties, though that may have been an unwelcome side effect. Indeed, after the spectacular ending of the first two dynasties, and most recently the assassination of Domitian, it is significant that Trajan made no claims during his reign to establishing a dynasty. Trajan adopted Hadrian, his former ward, a governor, and legate, only on his deathbed.⁷⁹⁸

Another relief, in the lower left of the northwest side of the Arch of Trajan in Beneventum, shows several personifications, likely the Genius Ordinis Equestris, Genius Senatus, and Genius Populi Romani, receiving Trajan after his entry into Rome. Only partially visible behind the figures is a temple with at least four unfluted columns, of which the two central columns frame two slightly ajar, bronze doors. The temple is embellished with moldings above the door, Corinthian capitals bearing a double series of acanthus leaves and, significantly, the indication of a flower in the center of the abacus and a frieze of sacred implements. Based on these last two architectural elements scholars have identified the monument as the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus, an alternative to the previously accepted identification as the Curia.⁷⁹⁹ DeAngeli points out that the programmatic arguments that support an identification of the building as the Curia, that of an allegory valorizing the relationship between the Senate and emperor and the role of Providentia, may also be made for an identification of the Temple of Vespasian, such as the further legitimation of the new emperor in the Flavian dynastic tradition from which Trajan inherited his power.⁸⁰⁰

⁷⁹⁸ Cf. *Historia Augusta* (*Had.* 4.6-10), suggesting that Plotina falsified Hadrian's adoption papers after Trajan's death.

⁷⁹⁹ See, e.g., De Angeli 1992, *Testimonianze figurate*, Cat. no. 2.

⁸⁰⁰ De Angeli 1992, *Testimonianze figurate*, Cat. 2. For a summary of alternative interpretations of the adlocutio panel on the Arch of Beneventum, see Torelli 1992, 89-92.

If the Arch of Beneventum relief depicts the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus I would argue that, like the Anaglypha Traiani, the goal was not to evoke the previous dynasty, the final member of which was officially condemned. Rather, Trajan actively positioned himself as a successor to the previous good emperors venerated in the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus. Nerva's reign too was somewhat problematic and so this relief would have looked back to the last truly successful emperors. Indeed, the slightly open doors may have suggested to viewers a festal day in association with Trajan's triumph and corresponding sacrifice to Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the temple.

Conclusion

The version of the imperial past presented by Trajan and his relationship to it was, of course, not the only one. In the late first century and early second century the interest in imperial biography presenting specific details of previous imperial reigns surged, yet, the imperial biographies and monolithic view presented by the temples to *divi* were not necessarily at odds. Details of the imperial biographies could present negative aspects of an emperor's reign yet still accord with the construction of the deified emperor as an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon and one of the good emperors.

After Augustus there were almost as many "bad" emperors as good: a poor statistic for an imperial system whose history was intimately bound up with its emperors. Romans recognized that the memory of one's past could be a burden, and so too for the emperors the imperial past could be a burden.⁸⁰¹ So-called bad emperors weakened imperial viability. In his two short years of rule after the assassination of Domitian, Nerva, Trajan's adoptive father, never regained

⁸⁰¹ Tac. *Hist.* 4.7.

complete control. Interestingly, it appears that Trajan's rule was remarkable for its continuity with prominent administrators serving, and policies instituted, under Domitian.⁸⁰² Despite the practicalities of rule, however, the representation of an imperial office with an illustrious past populated by deified emperors, a stable yet dynamic present, and a more glorious future was essential to the success of the imperial system. In his contemplation of future emperors, Pliny the Younger's *Panegyric* of Trajan attests to Trajan's success. Noting that Trajan had eclipsed his imperial predecessors, Pliny pointed out that Trajan laid a heavy burden on princes to come who would be judged by the examples they elected to follow.

⁸⁰² For a review of the evidence, see Waters, who asserts that Domitian *and* Trajan were committed to a policy of increasing autocracy (Waters 1969). See also Flower 2006, 256.

CHAPTER 6

HADRIAN: EXPANDING AND EXPLICATING THE TRADITION (117-138)

Introduction

Hadrian's alterations to the religious, political, and urban landscape of Rome extended beyond, yet were intimately bound up with, his expansion of the cults of *divi* to include Divus Trajan, Diva Plotina, Diva Marciana, and Diva Matidia. At a time when the Senate and army criticized Hadrian for abandoning the expansionist policies of Trajan, there was a risk that Rome would appear stagnant and weak as Hadrian attempted to defend Rome's borders from enemy invaders, especially barbarians living just beyond Rome's eastern and northern borders.⁸⁰³ Indeed, Hadrian's biography pointed out that Hadrian defied expectations by engaging in no serious wars of aggression during his reign.⁸⁰⁴ During Trajan's expansion of the Empire to its greatest extent, it appeared limitless in potential. In contrast, without campaigns beyond Rome's borders, the Empire suddenly appeared to be bounded in a concrete way that occupants of Hadrianic Rome had not yet known.

Hadrianic strategies to defend the borders, such as construction of his great wall in Britannia, further demarcated Rome's edges, creating a tension with the notion of an Empire limitless in space and time.⁸⁰⁵ A much-restored inscription found at Jarrow announces the building of the wall and the, ". . . necessity of keeping intact the empire [within its borders] had been imposed upon [Hadrian] by divine instruction".⁸⁰⁶ Hadrian's expansion of the cults of

⁸⁰³ On Hadrian's military policies in contrast to Trajan, and his reasons for abandoning Trajan's "plans to rival Alexander", see Danziger and Purcell 2005, 163-9, 268-75.

⁸⁰⁴ *SHA Had.*

⁸⁰⁵ On Hadrian's Wall as part of a policy of imperial containment, see Everitt 2009, 222-5.

⁸⁰⁶ Translation by Everitt 2009, 222.

divi should be considered, not only as a strategy to legitimate his reign, which many believed to be undeserved because of Plotina's manipulation, but also as part of his overarching program to underscore the eternity of the Roman Empire, a concept vividly and concretely embodied in the Temple of Venus and Roma. Gagé speaks of osmosis between the emperor and Rome in the notion of politico-religious eternity, with the continuity of the head person as a condition for the eternity of the city.⁸⁰⁷ An analysis of Hadrian's architectural priorities in Rome, combined with corresponding numismatic issues, presents a vivid picture of merging ideologies that rendered notions of the eternal emperor and the eternal Empire almost indistinguishable in the official realm.

Hadrian's Divine Parents

Though the Senate promptly deified Trajan after his death, initial coin issues in 117 under Hadrian do not specifically commemorate the deification of Trajan; rather they highlight the transfer of power from Divus Trajan to Hadrian, reflecting Hadrian's awareness of the controversy over his accession. Reverse images of Divus Trajan handing a small globe to a togate figure of Hadrian emphatically proclaim the propriety of Hadrian's accession (**Fig. 6.1**).⁸⁰⁸ Dual standing figures of Divus Trajan and Hadrian clasping hands with the legend PARTHIC DIVI TRAIAN AUG F P M TR P COS P P ADOPTIO similarly promote Hadrian's succession by adoption (**Fig. 6.2**).⁸⁰⁹ A papyrus fragment found in Egypt records that Apollo himself announced Hadrian's accession, "I, Phoebus, have just risen with Trajan up to the heavens on a chariot drawn by white horses, and I come to announce the new lord Hadrian. To him may all

⁸⁰⁷ Gagé 1936, 136.

⁸⁰⁸ *RIC* II no. 2. Obv: IMP CAESAR TRAIAN HADRIAN OPT AVG GER DAC, laureate bust. Rev: PARTHIC DIVI TRAIAN AUG F P M TR P COS P P (*RIC* II no. 2c).

⁸⁰⁹ *RIC* II no. 3.

things be joyfully subject both by his own arête, and by the ka-tyche-genius of his father, the deified one.”⁸¹⁰

Hadrian honored Divus Trajan as well as Diva Plotina after her death and deification in 123 at which time Hadrian delivered an emotional funeral oration.⁸¹¹ Hadrian honored them separately as well as together as his divine parents, certainly recalling his own adoption and simultaneously underscoring their celestial and eternal nature. An aureus issued between 132 and 134, towards the end of Hadrian’s reign presents jugate busts of a bareheaded Trajan and Plotina with stars over their heads and in the surrounding field the legend DIVUS PARENTIBUS (**Fig. 6.3**).⁸¹² Games in honor of Divus Trajan and Diva Plotina further underscored the dual divine nature of Hadrian’s ancestry.⁸¹³ Also innovative, Hadrian issued the first coin with the legend CONSECRATIO. On a quinarius stamped after Plotina’s death, Diva Plotina appears on the obverse, and on the reverse a standing eagle and the legend CONSECRATIO, further signifying her change in ontological state to the sacred.⁸¹⁴ With a range of potential overlapping meanings, the eagle may have recalled the eagle carrying Titus to his celestial destiny in the attic of the Arch of Titus, or, as a symbol of Jupiter and the reigning emperor it may have proclaimed the sacrality of the imperial office.

While justification of his adoption was a paramount concern, commemoration of Divus Trajan’s eternal nature soon became a priority. At the end of 117 Divus Trajan appeared on coins alone in the form of a draped and cuirassed laureate bust with the dative legend DIVO TRAIANO PATRI AUG (**Fig. 6.4**), issues narrowly preceding, and linked to, an aureus honoring

⁸¹⁰ For bibliography and translation, see Joost-Gaugier 1998, 34, fn. 107. See also, Fears 1977, 238-9.

⁸¹¹ Dio Cass. 69.10.3; *SHA Had.* 12.2.

⁸¹² See, e.g., *RIC* II no. 232A. For a draped bust of Trajan, see *RIC* II no. 232.

⁸¹³ *SHA Had.* 19.5.

⁸¹⁴ *RIC* II no. 734.

Divus Trajan that bears a nimbate phoenix on the reverse (**Fig. 6.5**).⁸¹⁵ A bird that perishes but then rises again from the ashes, the phoenix was a fitting analogy for deified emperors whose bodies burned on the funeral pyre, only to ascend to the heavens as gods.⁸¹⁶ More important, however, is the strong solar association of the phoenix, which regenerates on a cycle of anywhere from 500 to 1462 years, with cyclical regeneration, an idea intimately bound up with the Roman notion of imperial eternity that seems by this time to have incorporated the notion of rise and decline cycles.⁸¹⁷ In other words, the incorporation of the phoenix in the iconography of Divus Trajan seems to be an implicit recognition that the Empire is able to endure highs and lows yet endlessly survive.⁸¹⁸

Tacitus explains that when the phoenix is near its death, “it builds a nest in its own country, and sheds on it a procreative influence, from which springs a young one, whose first care on reaching maturity is to bury his sire,” rendering it a powerful model for Hadrian as the living emperor paying homage to his deified father.⁸¹⁹ Robert Etienne links the phoenix, also present on coins commemorating Hadrian as the spirit of the Saeculum Aureum, specifically to a notion of continuity in which Hadrian guarantees the prosperity of the Empire through dynastic means.⁸²⁰ While this is certainly one understanding, the phoenix as an image of cosmic eternity

⁸¹⁵ Bust of Divus Trajan: see, e.g., *RIC* II no. 24b. Nimbate Phoenix: *RIC* II no. 28.

⁸¹⁶ On cremation, either real or simulated, as a prerequisite to deification see e.g., Davies 2000, 9-11.

⁸¹⁷ Tac. *Ann.*, 6.28: That the creature is sacred to the sun and distinguished from other birds by its head and the variegation of its plumage, is agreed by those who have depicted its form: as to its term of years, the tradition varies (*sacrum soli id animal et ore ac distinctu pinnarum a ceteris avidbus diversum consentiunt qui formam eius effinxere; de numero annorum varia traduntur*). On the phoenix and deification, see Grether 1939, 171-2; Bickerman 1973, 19-20; Turcan 1983, 24-5.

⁸¹⁸ Etienne 1986, 446.

⁸¹⁹ Tac. *Ann.*, 6.28: (*Confecto quipped annorum numero, ubi mors propinquet, suis in terries struere nidum eique vim genitalem adfundere, ex qua fetum oriri; et primam adulto curam sepeliendi patris*).

⁸²⁰ Etienne 1986, 446. On the reverse is Hadrian, standing holding phoenix on a globe and emerging from an oval frame, and legend SAEC AUR (*RIC* II no. 136).

and cyclical renewal also ties into the long history of the imperial office in which Hadrian's succession to Trajan was just the most recent.

Leaving no doubt about the divinely ordained nature of Hadrian's accession, a series of sestertii touted the gods' support of Hadrian in his new role with an image of Hadrian raising his right hand to receive a scepter from a flying eagle and the legend, PROVIDENTIA DEORUM S C (**Fig. 6.6**).⁸²¹ While Providentia Augusti glorified the imperial foresight that provided for a suitable successor, the Providentia Deorum issue exalted the role of the gods in securing the continual and peaceful existence of the Roman Empire.⁸²² When viewed in conjunction with the coin discussed above representing Divus Trajan handing a small globe to a togate figure of Hadrian (**Fig. 6.1**), it is evident that the gods who provided for Hadrian's succession included Divus Trajan and, by extension all of the other *divi* now residing in the celestial heavens. There may be more questions than answers about the Temple of Divus Trajan; however, it was during this time of uncertainty when Hadrian was defending his accession and foregrounding the eternity of his divine father that Hadrian's work on the Temple of Divus Trajan was conspicuously underway in Rome.

The Elusive Temple of Divus Trajan

Location

Recent discoveries may have solved the long-contested issue of the location of the Temple of Divus Trajan placing it immediately to the northwest of, and on axis with, the Forum of Trajan (**Fig. 6.7**). Fragments of the Forma Urbis showing the northwest corner of the west

⁸²¹ *RIC* II no. 589.

⁸²² Tracing the development of Providentia from a primarily human quality in the late Republic to a divine quality under the Empire, and on the Providentia Deorum issues, see Charlesworth 1936. See also, Fears 1977, 243-4.

library and indicating the beginning of a colonnaded portico running north originally suggested to early excavators and later commentators that the Temple of Divus Trajan may have been northwest of the Column of Trajan (**Fig. 6.8**). Likewise, a sixteenth century drawing of a lost fragment of the Forma Urbis from the east library shows a colonnade running north with columnar spacing similar to the peristyle surrounding the Column of Trajan.⁸²³

During excavations north of the Column of Trajan that began in 1993 geological cores detected no trace of the temple's massive podium. In addition, Roberto Meneghini discovered that the paving north of the Column was two meters lower than the Column precinct.⁸²⁴ Based on this information Meneghini challenged conventional wisdom by proposing that the Temple of Divus Trajan stood at the southeast end of the Forum creating a configuration of temple and flanking colonnades framing the forum proper that derived from other imperial fora, namely the Forum of Augustus, Forum of Julius Caesar, and Forum Transitorium (**Fig. 6.9**).⁸²⁵ From Meneghini's discoveries that the Equus Traiani was not in the center of the Forum of Trajan but approximately twenty meters to the south of center, and that the south wall was not straight but segmented and oriented inward, he reasoned that the entrance to the Forum of Trajan was on the north end rather than the south end.⁸²⁶ With the entrance on the north end, he reconstructed column drums found in the area as belonging to a monumental propylon articulating a grand entrance to the Forum of Trajan from the direction of the Via Flaminia (**Fig. 6.10**).⁸²⁷ Yet, subsequent excavations between the Forum of Trajan and Forum of Augustus revealed no

⁸²³ Rodríguez Almeida 1981, pl. 28, 9. See also, Packer and Burge 2003, 132-3.

⁸²⁴ For a summary of Meneghini's position, see Packer and Burge 2003, 110-6

⁸²⁵ Meneghini 1998.

⁸²⁶ See, e.g., Meneghini 2001. For a summary of Meneghini's arguments, see 1999.

⁸²⁷ On the grey granite columns, see Packer 1997, vol. 1, 458-460.

definitive evidence of either a monumental arch or a grand temple, but the foundations of a walled, enclosed space that may link the two fora (**Fig. 6.7**).⁸²⁸

Disregarding Meneghini's proposal, Claridge located the Temple of Divus Trajan north of the Forum suggesting that a non-axial alignment at some distance from the Forum might explain the absence of a podium in Meneghini's excavations. Such an alignment may have been dictated by the placement of libraries in a scheme that did not involve the main Forum when planned.⁸²⁹ Though this theory has not been widely accepted, Claridge observes that although the imperial fora are orthogonally oriented, they are only on axis with respect to their own internal spaces.⁸³⁰ She astutely points out that whether the Temple of Divus Trajan was precisely on axis with the Forum or not would have been difficult to appreciate on the ground. Publishing new reconstructions, Packer similarly disagreed with Meneghini's interpretation, producing new reconstructions reverting to his original placement of the Temple of Divus Trajan north of the Forum as published in his 1997 volume on the Forum, noting among other reasons: that the order of the grey granite columns with the corresponding capital would have been 3 m taller than the library walls and the tallest in the Forum, an inappropriate dimension for a propylon but fitting for a temple; the 29 grey granite shafts now known are too many for a propylon; and the north walls of both libraries are notched to receive the peperino walls that defined the temenos indicating a porticoed structure north of the Column of Trajan (**Fig. 6.11**).⁸³¹

Excavations conducted in late 2011 contributed additional evidence to this vexed problem. Under the Palazzo Valentini excavators discovered two more fragmentary columns of

⁸²⁸ Excavations in 1998-2000 in the area south east of the Forum of Trajan discovered foundations and walls of unknown purpose that suggest some sort of a square vestibule with colonnades on three sides outside the enclosure wall of the Forum of Augustus.

⁸²⁹ Claridge 2007.

⁸³⁰ Refuting Claridge's argument, see also Packer 2008, 474

⁸³¹ Packer and Burge 2003, 19-22.

grey granite along with some fragments of Corinthian capital. Perhaps most importantly, a series of core samplings has identified what seem to be two cement foundations up to ten meters deep. A small network of rooms with low brick arches under the Palazzo Valentini may be rooms originally within the podium of the Temple of Divus Trajan.⁸³² Based on the new evidence, Fabio Cavallero's reconstruction includes a monumental propylon consisting of six projecting columns in the central sector of the wall that closed the portico around the Column (**Fig. 6.12**).⁸³³ He also retains the two meter drop in ground level from the Column precinct heading north. Taking into account the network of rooms and the location of the core samplings, Cavallero places a hexastyle Temple of Divus Trajan with chambers in the podium north of, and on axis with, the Column (**Fig. 6.13**). The podium consists of a series of rooms enclosed by a lining of blocks necessary to support the colonnade of the pronaos and the walls of the cella. The second foundation, discerned from core samples, supported the podium.⁸³⁴ Based on the curvature of an adjacent street and ancient structures just outside of the temenos, Cavallero reconstructs the surrounding porticos as curving inward toward the temple.

Date and Appearance

Though the location of the Temple of Divus Trajan north of the Column of Trajan appears more secure, whether it was begun under Trajan, planned under Trajan and begun under Hadrian, or a wholesale product of Hadrian remains controversial. Archaeological evidence generally favors a Hadrianic date for construction of the Temple of Divus Trajan, also attested by

⁸³² Cavallero 2011.

⁸³³ For the new reconstruction, see Cavallero 2011, 52-3.

⁸³⁴ Cavallero 2011, 54.

the author of Hadrian's biography in the Augustan History.⁸³⁵ For example, brick stamps of structures in the area between the Column of Trajan and the Via Lata and Via Flaminia support a Hadrianic date.⁸³⁶

Opinions that Trajan or his architect, Apollodorus of Damascus, was responsible for the design of the Temple of Divus Trajan on axis with the Forum of Trajan derive from its position as the culminating ideological and physical element in the Forum of Trajan complex, and from a number of Trajanic sestertii depicting unidentified octastyle temples on the reverse.⁸³⁷ Packer cites the sophisticated geometry of Apollodorus' architecture that relied on the principle of climactic theme and variation, of which the Temple of Trajan would have been the final and most grandiose expression in the Forum of Trajan complex.⁸³⁸ Against a Trajanic date, John Patterson reasons, "comparison of the Forum of Trajan with the other Imperial Fora might suggest that a temple should have been an integral part of the complex from the beginning; but it seems suspiciously contrary to precedent for a 'good' emperor like Trajan to have himself deified during his lifetime."⁸³⁹

Images of octastyle temples on two different Trajanic coin types have been identified as the Temple of Divus Trajan.⁸⁴⁰ Neither type mentions the name of the temple or the god and they are dated to between 105 and 107, more than twenty years before the temple's dedication by Hadrian in 129, which would make them representations of a planned project rather than an existing building. One type shows an octastyle temple on a high podium with elaborate

⁸³⁵ *SHA Had.* 19.1.

⁸³⁶ Boatwright 1987, 85-86.

⁸³⁷ On the Temple of Divus Trajan planned as part of the original Forum of Trajan, see, e.g. Packer 1997.

⁸³⁸ Packer 1997, 268-276.

⁸³⁹ Patterson 1992, 210

⁸⁴⁰ For a summary of the numismatic evidence for the Temple of Divus Trajan discussing all of the variants, see Packer 1997, 467-70.

sculptural elaboration consisting of multiple pedimental and acroterial figures. Mounted on a pedestal between the central two columns, a cult statue that appears to be a draped female holds a scepter and cornucopia (**Fig. 6.14**).⁸⁴¹ If this is the Temple of Divus Trajan, Zanker conjectures that the female goddess may have been Plotina as she would eventually appear in a temple that Trajan commemorated while still in the planning stages.⁸⁴² Though there is a later example of the emperor Antoninus Pius dedicating a temple to his wife who predeceased him, Plotina died after Trajan in the early years of Hadrian's reign, making this scenario highly improbable.

Another Trajanic coin represents a similarly elaborate octastyle temple, with a seated cult statue of indeterminate gender between the central columns of the façade (**Fig. 6.15**).⁸⁴³ Flanking the temple are monumental porticoes terminating in pedimented gables. On these types there may also be an altar in front of the steps of the temple and two statues on podia before the end columns of the pronaos. M. Pensa suggested that it was either the Temple of Matidia or a temple begun by Trajan for an unknown deity.⁸⁴⁴

That Trajan built a temple to Divus Nerva, as Pliny states, but never finished, leaving it for Hadrian to complete and rededicate to Divus Trajan as argued by Strack would also be highly irregular.⁸⁴⁵ Though the *ius divina* might have provided a procedure for reconsecration of a *templum* to a new god, Hadrian's treatment of Divus Nerva suggests that he would not have disregarded the memory of Divus Nerva in so flagrant a manner as to eliminate a temple in progress. Divus Nerva was not central to Hadrian's visual program; however, Hadrian invokes Divus Nerva repeatedly in inscriptions as his divine grandfather preceding Divus Trajan,

⁸⁴¹ *RIC* II no. 575.

⁸⁴² Zanker 1970.

⁸⁴³ *RIC* II no. 577.

⁸⁴⁴ Pensa 1969-1970, 271-4.

⁸⁴⁵ Strack 1931, 150-4.

Hadrian's divine father. For example, the inscription on a cippus restored by the college of augurs in accordance with the Senate and by authority of Hadrian, identifies Hadrian as the son of Divus Trajan and grandson of Divus Nerva, 'EX AUTHORITATE IMP CAESARIS DIVI TRAIANI PARTHICI F DIVI NERVAE NEPOTIS TRAIANI HADRIANI AUG.'⁸⁴⁶

Packer identifies the coin representation as the Temple of Divus Trajan reasoning that Trajan must have planned and begun construction on the project during his lifetime without taking a firm position on the identity of the god within.⁸⁴⁷ The *ius divina*, however, would have required consecration of the *templum* to Divus Trajan, making the temple's future occupant clear. Moreover, as the largest temple to date that if begun during Trajan's lifetime would have been a part of the grandiose and imposing Forum of Trajan complex, it is difficult to imagine that inhabitants of Rome would not have wondered or known to which god the temple was dedicated.

Arguments that the image represents the Temple of Jupiter Victor or Ultor on the Palatine Hill are based on later representations of the Temple of Jupiter Victor on coins of Severus Alexander and claim that Trajan restored this temple during his reign.⁸⁴⁸ This brief summary of just a few of the controversies over the unidentified octastyle temples on Trajanic coins is sufficient to demonstrate that, although it is an attractive theory to see the Temple of Divus Trajan in the coins because it might give some idea of the eventual appearance of the temple, the identification is too uncertain to be reliable.⁸⁴⁹

If the Temple of Divus Trajan is the enormous structure that must have occupied the space to the north of the Column of Trajan, then a number of observations may be made about

⁸⁴⁶ Gordon 1964, no. 178.

⁸⁴⁷ Packer 1997, 467-8.

⁸⁴⁸ On identification of *RIC* II no. 577 as Jupiter Victor, see Hill 1989, 33.

⁸⁴⁹ Discussion of the iconography of the Temple of Divus Trajan and of the cult statue have been based primarily on the Trajanic coins. For a discussion of sculptural and decorative program, see, e.g., Packer 1997, 282-3.

the Temple's form and architecture. It was likely the first imperial temple with a façade of monolithic foreign stone. Evidence discovered during excavations during this century and the last in the area north of the Column of Trajan and comprehensively published by James Packer, suggests a colonnaded building on a grand scale: granite column shafts measuring 14.8 m high (50 Roman feet), and a marble Corinthian capital for a total order height of approximately 17.7 m (60 Roman feet).⁸⁵⁰ With a lower diameter of the column shafts at 1.858 m the order of the structure to which these columns belongs is the same as the Temple of Mars Ultor. Taking into account dimensions of the Temple of Mars Ultor, Packer estimates that the Temple of Divus Trajan would have been approximately 51 m deep, 32 m high, and 36 m wide with a cella divided into a central nave and two side aisles (**Fig. 6.16**). Additional fragments discovered in the courtyard of the Palazzo Valentini may have belonged to an interior with superimposed orders of cabled and fluted columns, the lower of which had shafts of pavonazzetto and the upper with shafts of giallo antico.⁸⁵¹ Rose granite columns of a similar diameter found nearby may have belonged to an enclosing portico springing from the lateral walls of the temple.⁸⁵²

Other architectural elements recovered from this area and believed to be associated with the Temple of Divus Trajan are fragments of an architrave/frieze from an order with ressauts, frieze with acanthus scrolls, and a cornice with medallions.⁸⁵³ Packer conjectures a semi-circular apse holding a seated cult statue of Divus Trajan with a bare upper torso, draped legs and waist and holding a scepter or victory.⁸⁵⁴ An image of a seated Divus Trajan with a fold of cloak over

⁸⁵⁰ Corinthian capital of white marble: Packer 1997, cat. nos. 50, 50A, and 89. For a summary of all of the gray/red granite shafts found under the Palazzo Valentini, see Packer 2003, 113-4.

⁸⁵¹ Shaft of giallo antico: Packer 1997, cat. no. 44. Shaft of pavonazzetto: Packer 1997, cat. no. 63.

⁸⁵² Packer 2008, 476, 63-70.

⁸⁵³ Architrave frieze from an order with ressauts: Packer 1997, cat. nos. 128, 130, 131. Cornice with acanthus scrolls: Packer 1997, cat. no. 110. Cornice with medallion: Packer 1997, cat. no. 172.

⁸⁵⁴ On the cult statue, see, e.g., Packer 1997, 135-6.

one shoulder and holding a branch and scepter on a coin of 118 may represent a prospective image of the cult statue (**Fig. 6.17**).⁸⁵⁵

In sum, even if the location of an eventual Temple of Divus Trajan on axis with the Forum of Trajan was planned under Trajan, the inscriptions and literary sources make clear that later Romans perceived the Temple of Divus Trajan as a Hadrianic building created in collaboration with the Senate rather than a temple designed under Trajan and later dedicated to his own divinity. Trajanic coins do not provide sufficient evidence to counteract this point and though the accuracy of the *Historia Augusta* has been questioned, the author of Hadrian's biography plausibly recalled that the Temple of Deified Trajan was a cooperative effort between Hadrian, who requested Trajan's deification, and the Senate that enthusiastically granted it.⁸⁵⁶

Topographical and Ideological Context

Scholarly emphasis on the axiality of the temple and its unity with the rest of the Forum of Trajan minimizes the impact of the two profound central cross-axes formed by the Basilica Ulpia and the Greek and Latin libraries. In contrast, Boatwright has observed that with the interruption to the longitudinal axis caused by the Basilica Ulpia, the Temple of Divus Trajan really constitutes a secondary complex and that the Column of Trajan would have served as the culminating element of the Forum (**Fig. 6.7**).⁸⁵⁷ From within the temenos of the Temple of Divus Trajan the Basilica Ulpia would have obscured the Forum of Trajan from view and separated the temple from the forum proper (**Fig. 6.11**). Conversely, the Basilica would have blocked the view

⁸⁵⁵ *RIC* II no. 627b; *BMCRE* III no. 1832.

⁸⁵⁶ *SHA Had.* 6.1-3.

⁸⁵⁷ Boatwright 1987, 81-7.

of the Column of Trajan and Temple of Divus Trajan from the Forum.⁸⁵⁸ Reality on the ground may have led to Dio's identification of the Column, Greek and Latin libraries, and Basilica Ulpia with the Forum of Trajan but not the Temple of Divus Trajan.⁸⁵⁹ Whether a propylon or multi-level columnar screen is reconstructed between the Column of Trajan and the temenos of the temple, it now appears that Column and temple were intended to be two separate precincts.

Designers of the Temple of Divus Trajan would have been aware of the ambivalent reaction to the Temple of the Gens Flavia, a monument that brazenly combined burial with veneration of the deified emperors and their deified family members. Whether Zanker is correct in his view that Trajan originally intended the Column to function as a tomb, by the time of construction of the Temple of Divus Trajan the ashes were likely contained in the Column.⁸⁶⁰ Rejecting the combination of tomb and cult veneration, designers enhanced the architecture of separation between the Column of Trajan and the Temple of Divus Trajan, making an important distinction between the two complexes.

It was not only the architecture of separation that highlighted the differing religious and mnemonic status between the Forum and Column, and the Temple of Divus Trajan; images of Trajan in the Forum of Trajan and in the Temple of Divus Trajan would also have been understood differently. Hadrian dedicated the temple precinct and aedes to Divus Trajan long after Trajan dedicated the Forum and Basilica Ulpia on 15 January 112 and the Column of Trajan on 18 May 113. An inscription discovered near the Temple of Divus Trajan beginning with EX S

⁸⁵⁸ Even the 40 meter tall Temple of Divus Trajan would not have been visible from the Forum (Galinier 2007).

⁸⁵⁹ Cass. Dio 68.16.3.

⁸⁶⁰ Zanker 1970. Cf. Claridge (1993, 11), that the original purpose of the chamber at the base of the Column was not burial, but rather, based on the military trophy imagery on the exterior of the base, it probably housed votives. The inscription on the base of the Column of Trajan, *CIL* 6.960, states that it was dedicated to Trajan by the Senate and People of Rome to demonstrate the great height of the hill that Trajan removed for his public works. On the inscription, see e.g. Claridge 1993, 9-10.

C foregrounds the Senate's involvement in commissioning the temple: "In accordance with a decree of the Senate: to the deified [emperor Trajan] and Plotina, [the emperor Hadrian], son of the deified [emperor Trajan] and grandson of the deified Nerva . . . to his parents."⁸⁶¹

Portrait statues of Trajan in the Forum, Basilica, and Libraries emphasized Trajan's lifetime accomplishments and victories through iconography and inscriptions listing detailed titulature. In contrast, the sacred status of the cult statue of Divus Trajan was defined by architectural context as well as ritual that would have resolved any ambiguity or theological question about Trajan's status. Peter Stewart underscores the unique status of cult statues, which were distinguished from other images by custom and ritual as well as language.⁸⁶² Dedication of the cult statue of Divus Trajan and its aedes resulted in an inherent identity between the religious act and the image, making their association inseparable in the mind of the viewer.⁸⁶³

Emphasizing consecration as the recategorization of something profane to something sacred, Florence Dupont has noted that after apotheosis the emperor became a god, wholly and entirely. Thus, for purposes of the *pax deorum* and state religion there was no theological speculation on the mode of existence of Divus Trajan.⁸⁶⁴ With the exception of the Temple of the Gens Flavia, an experiment that was not to be repeated, the Romans maintained a separation between tomb and temple. Discussing the potential confusion caused by mixing burial and veneration of the gods, Dupont explains that places and times of burial, as *sacra privata*, were prohibited from merging with *sacra publica*. Though topographically proximate, it is the separation between Trajan's ashes in the Column of Trajan and the veneration of Divus Trajan in

⁸⁶¹ Translation by Packer 2001, 83.

⁸⁶² Stewart 2003, 189.

⁸⁶³ On Pausanias' distinction between images defined by ritual and those that are defined by the history of commission or creation, see Elsner 1996, 520-2.

⁸⁶⁴ Dupont 1989, 398-9.

the god's temple that is crucial. Indeed, the close proximity, without assimilating the functions of retrospective funerary commemoration and prospective divine veneration into one monument only highlights the differing functions of the two monuments.

Yet, the close proximity to, and visibility of, the Column of Trajan from the stairs of the Temple of Divus Trajan does suggest an intentional relationship (**Fig. 6.18**). A viewer ascending the stairs of the Temple of Divus Trajan who turned to look back would have had a view of the upper portion of the Column, as well as intermittent glimpses of the lower portion of the Column through the columnar screen. The northwest side of the Column facing the Temple of Divus Trajan arguably bears the most significant scenes on the Column. In a masterful analysis of scenes on each of the eight vertical faces of the Column, Galinier notes an indisputable prominence of scenes featuring Trajan on the vertical northwest axis making it the primary vertical axis, one without battle scenes but that unmistakably emphasizes themes of Trajan's *pietas* and victory.⁸⁶⁵ As just one example the scene of the goddess Victory inscribing a shield with the record of Roman victory appears on the northwest axis facing the Temple of Divus Trajan (**Fig. 6.19**). Claridge has even proposed two phases in construction of the Column: the first, dedicated along with the rest of the Forum of Trajan and honoring Trajan as benefactor of the new Forum, and the second, Hadrian's addition of the helical frieze in conjunction with construction of the Temple of Divus Trajan.⁸⁶⁶

While the specific Dacian victories commemorated in the Forum of Trajan are obviously implicated in the imagery of the Column, so too is the idea of imperial success and the divinely ordained augmentation of Empire through conquest. This idea is also celebrated in the colored

⁸⁶⁵ Claridge similarly observed that that although the helical frieze begin over the inscription on the south, the victory writing on the shield and several other key episodes are on the north (Claridge 1993).

⁸⁶⁶ Claridge 1993.

marbles enlivening the Forum by recalling not only the imperial power necessary to organize the vast human resources that supplied Rome with expensive foreign stones, but also the riches of the provinces and the emperor's mastery over nature.⁸⁶⁷ Barbara Burrell has argued that the 50 Roman foot granite monoliths from the façade of the Temple of Divus Trajan proclaimed Trajan's triumphs over his Eastern enemies in keeping with the triumphal message repeated visually in the Forum of Trajan.⁸⁶⁸ Exploring how the theology of victory in Roman imperial ideology conveyed more than just military victory, Fears concludes that the cults of the *divi* represent the culmination of the theology of victory: "through an excess of virtue the emperor can conquer death itself, and in overcoming death he provides the continued assurance and well-being of the social order."⁸⁶⁹ The northwest side of the Column conveys ideas of Trajan's victory over death and continuation of the Roman order, fitting concepts for a viewer looking back from the steps of the Temple of Divus Trajan toward the Forum.⁸⁷⁰ The Greek and Latin libraries would focus a viewer's perspective narrowly on the images of the Column visible, if at all depending on the viewpoint, from the steps of the Temple of Divus Trajan.

Part of the Column's innovation, Davies explains, lies in its capacity to manipulate visitors mentally and physically in the service of promoting perpetuation through memory. The helical form forces viewers to walk in a circle around the Column, repeatedly reenacting the military *decursio* around the funeral pyre (**Fig. 6.20**).⁸⁷¹ When the viewer passes from the Column precinct into the temple complex, however, the funerary reenactment ends; the

⁸⁶⁷ Packer 2008, 476-7.

⁸⁶⁸ Packer 2001; Burrell 2012.

⁸⁶⁹ Fears 1981, 819.

⁸⁷⁰ Packer 2008.

⁸⁷¹ Davies 2000, 121-8, 20.

architectural configuration encouraged a single viewpoint of the Column when looking south, or when looking north, by focusing the viewer's attention unequivocally on the temple.

Colonnades originating near the back walls of the Greek and Latin libraries curved inward as they extended north to connect with the back of the Temple of Divus Trajan creating a complex in which vision and access were severely restricted.⁸⁷² Further emphasizing the confined space was the enormous size of the Temple of Divus Trajan, comparable to the Temple of Mars Ultor yet built in a precinct that was only a fraction of the size of the Forum of Augustus. The Temple of Divus Trajan, on a podium at least four meters tall, must have seemed enormous within the confined space, making difficult a clear view of the temple in its entirety. Based on architectural correspondences between the Temple of Divus Trajan and Hadrian's other projects such as the Pantheon, Temple of Diva Matidia, and Temple of Venus and Rome, scale and materials seem to have been more important than legibility.

Approaching the temple, a viewer literally and metaphorically would have turned her back on the historical emperor commemorated in the Forum and on the Column of Trajan, in favor of religious veneration of an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon. Pointing out all of the different roles that Trajan plays in the imagery of the Forum of Trajan, Packer interprets the complex as a biography in stone, one that progressively revealed the stages in the emperor's life as an evolution from mortality to deification. Though connected topographically, however, the Temple of Divus Trajan is ultimately separate from the 'biography in stone', the three dimensional memorial of the *virtus* and deeds of the emperor embodied in the Forum of Trajan. Though no definitive evidence survives to indicate the sculptural program of the Temple, based

⁸⁷² Packer 1997, 276.

on the other temples to the deified emperors it is unlikely that the imagery commemorated specific events or accomplishments of Trajan's life.

Urban Context of Divus Trajan

Considering the Temple of Divus Trajan in terms of Hadrian's contemporaneous building program in the city of Rome, rather than as a part of the Forum of Trajan, provokes further considerations. For instance, Boatwright aptly observes that a number of Hadrianic building projects in Rome evoked Rome's beginnings. Though Boatwright specifically cites the Temple of Venus and Roma, the Temple of the Bona Dea, and the Auguratorium, the Temple of Divus Trajan should be considered within this context.⁸⁷³ The temples to the deified emperors were a manifestation of the gods' divine approval of the Roman imperial mission; each new *divus* recalled deified prototypes such as Romulus/Quirinus, founder of Rome itself, and Divus Augustus, founder of the Roman Empire. Moreover, if as argued in Chapter 5, by the reign of Trajan one conception of Rome's imperial history was in terms of the deified emperors, each of which represented just one part of the imperial office at the head of the eternal Roman state, then associations of the Temple of Divus Trajan with Rome's continuity from its founding to the present would have been readily apparent.

'Hadrianic' Pantheon

Other Hadrianic structures directly or indirectly connected to worship of the *divi*, including the Temple of Diva Matidia and the Hadrianic phase of the Pantheon, came to occupy a large area in the central Campus Martius (**Fig. 6.21**). Based on a systematic analysis of brick-

⁸⁷³ Boatwright 1987, 84.

stamps found in the area of the Pantheon Lise Hetland has shifted the start date of the Pantheon to the late Trajanic period, revealing that the Temple of Divus Trajan and the Pantheon were likely under construction early in Hadrian's reign at the same time. Contemporaneous construction is further supported by the assertion that the limited supply of 50-foot grey granite columns from Mons Claudianus in Rome at the time were diverted to the Temple of Divus Trajan while the porch and intermediate block of the Pantheon were adjusted to accommodate available 40-foot grey granite monoliths (**Fig. 6.22**).⁸⁷⁴

Though the precise connection of the Pantheon to imperial veneration remains unknown, its association on some level is almost certain.⁸⁷⁵ Careful analysis of the pediment slabs during a restoration project has revealed holes indicating the attachment of a bronze eagle within a corona civica embellished with flowing ribbons, an emblem that had become associated with the imperial office, and may have recalled the corona civica placed over the door of Augustus' Palatine residence in 27 BCE for his role in saving the lives of citizens by ending the civil wars (**Fig. 6.23**).⁸⁷⁶ Kjeld de Fine Licht, among others, has conjectured that the Agrippan Pantheon was a thinly disguised temple for the cult of the Julian household gods and the family of Augustus; he sees no grounds for the assumption that the Hadrianic building was accompanied by any change in the temple's religious function.⁸⁷⁷ Yet as Christiane Joost-Gaugier has pointed out, Cassius Dio's mention of the statues of Venus, Mars, and Divus Julius is in the past tense, whereas his opinion that the Pantheon's semi-dome reminded him of Heaven is in the present

⁸⁷⁴ On the date of the Pantheon as late Trajanic, see Hetland 2007. On the diversion of columns, see Davies, Hemsoll and Jones 1987.

⁸⁷⁵ For a summary of arguments regarding identification of the Pantheon's cult statues, see.

⁸⁷⁶ On the finds of Lucos Cozza during restoration work in 1954, see, de Fine Licht 1968, 45-7, 192-3; Ziolkowski 1999; Stamper 2005, 200-2. On the award of the corona civica to Augustus, see *RG* 34.2; Dio Cass. 53.15.4.

⁸⁷⁷ de Fine Licht 1968, 193.

tense suggesting an alteration in cultic configuration from the original to the later Pantheon.⁸⁷⁸

By Hadrian's reign, in addition to Divus Julius there were seven more deified emperors. Though purely hypothetical, it is plausible that images of the *divi*, consolidated into a group and presented in the coins series of Trajan, may have been included in the Pantheon along with the planetary deities more commonly believed to have graced the interior niches and aediculae such as Mercury, Mars, Venus, Jupiter, the Moon, the Sun, and Saturn.⁸⁷⁹

Even if the *divi* were not directly venerated as cult recipients within the Pantheon, though it is likely that at the very least Divus Julius had at some point been included, the structure was associated with the sacrality of the imperial office and represents a cosmology of Roman religion of which the *divi* were a part: “. . . the shrine proper could contain effigies only of the gods, as the dedication would require. But these gods did not necessarily have to be solely the ancient and traditional ones, for ‘all gods’ could and did include deities of recent origin.”⁸⁸⁰ As the most perfect geometric shape with no beginning and no end, the sphere that constituted the dome of the Pantheon's rotunda, symbolized the hoped for unity, continuity, and perfection of Empire (**Fig. 6.24**).⁸⁸¹ Built to symbolize the community of heaven, the dome of rotunda was a physical diagram of eternity in which the point at the center, the home of Rome's gods, is omnipresent to all of the surrounding points on the sphere, evoking Roman conceptions of eternity.⁸⁸² Gilded bronze stars mounted in each of the dome's coffers encouraged the symbolic association of the spherical form with the heavens, as did the oculus at the apex of the dome, allowing the sun and

⁸⁷⁸ Cass. Dio. 53.27. Joost-Gaugier 1998, 25.

⁸⁷⁹ Summarizing theories of the Pantheon's cult statues, see Ziolkowski 1999.

⁸⁸⁰ MacDonald 2002, 77.

⁸⁸¹ MacDonald 2002, 88-9; Stamper 2005, 200-1.

⁸⁸² See Chapter 1, 27-30.

the moon to continually reenact their eternal cycles in the building's interior (**Fig. 6.25**).⁸⁸³

Finding meaning in the Pantheon beyond its dedication to specific gods, the identity of which are in all likelihood lost forever, Macdonald interprets the Pantheon as the temple of Rome, the Empire, and the whole world, a temple that embodied the “. . . unity of the perpetual existence and function of the state with the never-ending revolutions of the planetary clockwork.”⁸⁸⁴

According to Joost-Gaugier, however, the Pantheon may have also had a much more personal meaning for Hadrian. Hadrian's horoscope, based on complex calculations determining the conjunction of the sun and moon in relation to the other planets on the day of his birth, determined that the person born under Hadrian's specific configuration was destined to become ruler of the world.⁸⁸⁵ Thus, Hadrian's devotion to the sun and the moon, to which he attributed his own god-given destiny to rule the world, manifested itself in the design of the Pantheon where he is known to have exercised his administrative and judicial powers.⁸⁸⁶ Even more than general associations with the sun and moon, Robert Hannah and Giulio Magli have recently explained that the diameter of the oculus was carefully measured to focus the sun's rays on different parts of the Pantheon's interior at different times of the year.⁸⁸⁷ Specifically, the sun's rays call particular attention to the entrance on the equinoxes and 21 April, the day of Rome's founding and the day that Hadrian transformed from the Parilia to the Romaia, in honor of the Fortune of Rome and the date of the city's birthday (**Fig. 6.26**).⁸⁸⁸

⁸⁸³ On the interior of the Pantheon, see Ziolkowski 1999; Stamper 2005, 197-200.

⁸⁸⁴ MacDonald 2002, 88-92.

⁸⁸⁵ Joost-Gaugier 1998, 34. On Hadrian's use of the Pantheon for administrative and judicial cases, see Cass. Dio. 69.7.

⁸⁸⁶ Joost-Gaugier 1998, 35.

⁸⁸⁷ Hannah and Magli 2011, 493-502.

⁸⁸⁸ On the Romaia and the Temple of Venus and Roma, see Boatwright 1987, 121-3.

Other architectural references in the Pantheon to the temples of the *divi* further linked its ideological message to the veneration of the deceased emperors. If the Temple of Divus Trajan was the first temple in Rome to employ gray granite monoliths in spectacular 50 Roman foot proportions, the connection between them and the 40 Roman foot monoliths erected in the pronaos of the Pantheon at around the same time could not be missed. In addition, in what may have been a deliberate quotation of the frieze of sacred implements on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus, a series of frieze panels over the central vaulted passageway of the pronaos and interspersed in two levels between the pilasters high up on the lateral walls of the Pantheon's intermediate block bore sacrificial instruments among looped garlands.⁸⁸⁹ Each of the original twenty-eight panels, eight in the entrance passageway and ten on each side of the building, is an independent panel with its own frame. The motifs include sacrificial utensils and floral garlands affixed to decorative candelabra by ribbons. In addition to the objects depicted on the frieze of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, such as the patera, guttus, apex, aspergillum, and urceus, the reliefs on the Pantheon also included a lituus and an incense box called an *acerra*.⁸⁹⁰

Temple of Diva Matidia

By building the Temple of Divus Trajan and the Temple of Diva Matidia shortly after her death in 119, Hadrian was, like Vespasian, concerned first with enlarging the cadre of deified emperors and only then with pursuing other objectives through his building program.⁸⁹¹ The

⁸⁸⁹ Though not in their original location, the 13 surviving frieze blocks remain visible on the exterior walls of the intermediate block of the Pantheon along the Via della Rotonda.

⁸⁹⁰ On the panel reliefs from the Pantheon, see de Fine Licht 1968, 79-84.

⁸⁹¹ Brickstamps indicate that Hadrian's work in the Roman Forum and on the Palatine came after the Temple of Divus Trajan and his work in the Campus Martius.

women in Trajan's life played an important supporting role and, for Hadrian, provided a crucial connection to imperial power through the female line. Consequently, the Senate deified Marciana, the beloved sister of Trajan, after her death between 112 and 114.⁸⁹² Likewise, after her death in 119 the Senate deified Matidia, Marciana's daughter, Trajan's niece, and Hadrian's mother-in-law, for whom he delivered an emotional public eulogy.⁸⁹³ Sabina, Matidia's daughter and Hadrian's wife, provided the final familial link between Hadrian and Trajan. Noting the questionable circumstances under which Hadrian assumed control after Trajan's death, James Oliver asserts that Hadrian was required to rely on more than the widely disbelieved story about adoption, and so he connected himself even more closely to Trajan through Marciana, Matidia, and Sabina.⁸⁹⁴

As previously for Plotina, Hadrian's numismatic commemoration of Marciana and Matidia bore the CONSECRATIO legend in the reverse signifying their sacred natures (**Figs. 6.27 and 6.28**).⁸⁹⁵ Based on the reverse iconography, it appears that explicitly linking the *divae* to the imperial office through the symbol of the eagle holding a scepter was a priority. As an attribute of any good emperor, Hadrian's *pietas* toward his deceased family members was also a topic of one issue that further attested to the sacred nature of Diva Matidia.⁸⁹⁶ A Hadrianic denarius with Diva Augusta Matidia on the obverse is combined with the imperial aspect of

⁸⁹² Everitt 2009, 195. Cf., Jame Oliver, who attributes Marciana's deification to Hadrian, claims that Trajan would not have wanted to emulate Caligula, the last emperor to deify his sister (Oliver 1949).

⁸⁹³ On the dispute over the date of Matidia's deification, see Boatwright 1987. Noting the eulogy of Matidia, *CIL* 14.3579 (Boatwright 1987, 58-9, fn. 73). For reference in the Arval Brethren records to Diva Matidia: *CIL* 6.2080. Cf. inscriptions after her death that do not include the title 'Diva': *CIL* 10.3833, 4744-4747.

⁸⁹⁴ Oliver 1949.

⁸⁹⁵ Consecratio issue of Diva Marciana: see, e.g., *RIC* II no. 748. Consecratio issue of Diva Matidia: see, e.g., *RIC* II no. 751.

⁸⁹⁶ See, e.g., *RIC* II no. 757. Obv: DIVA AUGUSTA MATIDIA, bust of Diva Matidia. Rev: PIETAS AUG.

pietas, Pietas Augusti, shown in the act of sacrificing over a garlanded altar on the reverse.⁸⁹⁷

Obverse portraits of Diva Augusta Marciana were also accompanied by a reverse with a carpentum drawn by two mules indicating incorporation of effigies of the goddess in ceremonial processions (**Fig. 6.29**).⁸⁹⁸ The S-C or EX SENATUS CONSULTO continues to emphasize the role of the Senate in deification, likely to be understood in conjunction with the reigning emperor.⁸⁹⁹

Unfortunately, the evidence for the Temple of Diva Matidia is scarce, yet for purposes of understanding deification the dedication of a temple solely to an imperial woman represents a major deviation from the established tradition.⁹⁰⁰ That Diva Matidia continued to be a recipient of cultic veneration well into the third century if not later, as attested by the Severan *Feriale Duranum*, suggests that the expansion in the tradition was an acceptable one. Though Boatwright appropriately sees in the Temple of Diva Matidia an effort to elevate the imperial family above the rest of humanity, unlike Domitian, Hadrian did not include the cult of secondary family members such as Matidia in the cult of Trajan and Plotina by inaugurating the Temple of Divus Trajan as a family shrine.⁹⁰¹ This distinction appears to have been more important than has been previously noted. For Davies the relevance of imperial women such as Matidia lies in their potential to suggest fertility and continuity of the dynastic succession, one avenue to the stability on which the state depended at times of uncertainty over the transmission of power.⁹⁰²

⁸⁹⁷ See, e.g. *RIC* II no. 757.

⁸⁹⁸ Carpentum drawn by two mules: *RIC* II no. 749.

⁸⁹⁹ Reverse with legend EX SENATUS CONSULTUM and either Marciana or Vesta holding a pater and scepter seated on a cart drawn by two elephants: *RIC* II no. 747.

⁹⁰⁰ On the Temple of Diva Matidia, see Oliver 1949, 37-8, 58-61.

⁹⁰¹ Boatwright 1987, 97.

⁹⁰² Boatwright 1987.

A fragment of lead pipe bearing an inscription designating it ‘for the Temple of Matidia’ indicates the general location of the temple in the Campus Martius near the modern Via del Seminario and Church of St. Ignatius to the west of the Pantheon.⁹⁰³ Regionary catalogues for Regio IX confirm the temple’s location in this area along with a Basilica of Matidia and Marciana, all consistent with Hadrian’s elaboration of the Campus Martius with religious and imperial monuments.⁹⁰⁴ A sole surviving inscription also attests to an otherwise unknown Altar of Diva Matidia.⁹⁰⁵

Numerous sections of cipollino columns 1.7 m in diameter indicating a 50-foot high column shaft, and smaller columns of grey granite have been tentatively assigned to the Temple of Diva Matidia, largely by default because no other known monument in the area could have accommodated such a large columnar order.⁹⁰⁶ Coarelli conjectures a total column height based on the cipollino stumps of 17 meters, exceeding the Pantheon and matching the Temple of Divus Trajan.⁹⁰⁷ Multiple smaller grey granite column shafts with a diameter of about 1.10 m also found in the area are believed to be from either an interior order or perhaps a temple portico associated with the Temple of Diva Matidia.

Interestingly, although no securely identifiable coin representation of the Temple of Divus Trajan exists, a bronze medallion of Hadrian now in Vienna commemorates the Temple of Diva Matidia. The bronze medallion provided a starting point for Heinrich Dressel’s

⁹⁰³ *CIL* 15.7428.

⁹⁰⁴ The Regionary catalogue lists the ‘*basilicam Matidies et Marcianes*’ in the area of the Pantheon of Agrippa (Boatwright 1987, 19).

⁹⁰⁵ *CIL* 6.31893.b.

⁹⁰⁶ On the smaller, granite columns found in 1966, see Dressel 1906, 403. The findspot of the cipollino columns is northeast of the Pantheon, in the Vicolo della Spada d’Orlando, between the Via dei Pastini, and the Piazza Capranica. Questioning the 1.7 m measurements of the cipollino column visible in the Vicolo della Spada d’Orlands, see Caronna 1972, 328, n. 9.

⁹⁰⁷ Bruno 1988, 298.

reconstruction of the temple, though it is rarely noted that Theodore Mommsen unequivocally identified the medallion as a fake.⁹⁰⁸ With a portrait of Hadrian on the obverse, the reverse of the bronze medallion depicts what is believed to be a representation of the Temple of Diva Matidia and the legend DIVA MATIDIA SOCRUI, highlighting Matidia's lifetime status as Hadrian's mother-in-law.⁹⁰⁹

If the cipollino column stumps belong to the Temple of Matidia then the coin, bearing a number of distinctive features, must abbreviate the number of columns on the façade.

Dominating the image is the central triangular pediment of the temple supported by only two columns, between which is a disproportionately large seated female figure. Flanking the temple are two aediculae containing statues of undiscernable form mounted on pedestals and what Dressel identifies as the Basilicas of Matidia and Marciana forming symmetrical projecting wings from the temple, an identification with which Boatwright concurs suggesting that the Basilicas were two-story porticoes along the long side of the Temple's temenos.⁹¹⁰

A fragment of the Forma Urbis showing a temple within an incomplete porticus on an east-west orientation may supply one additional clue (**Fig. 6.30**). If Rodriguez-Almeida is correct to identify Fragment 36b as belonging to the Temple of Diva Matidia then it is reasonable to conclude that the temple was peripteral, surrounded by an ample portico, and probably octastyle.⁹¹¹ Mary Boatwright observes that the entrance to the complex was likely to be on the

⁹⁰⁸ Refuting Mommsen's arguments, see Coarelli and Luisanna 1980, 21. Arguments against the authenticity of the coin include the S-C on the reverse, a designation not used for imperial bronze medallions but used on coins, which did not have the wide border reserved for medallions.

⁹⁰⁹ Dressel 1906, 21. The obverse legend: IMP CAESAR TRAIAN HADRIANUS AUG P M TR P COS III, dates the issue to 119-121 (Dressel 1906, 59, n. 74).

⁹¹⁰ Boatwright 1987, 61. The suggestion by R. Paribeni that the Basilica of Marciana should be dated to Trajan's reign has now been discounted in favor of the interpretation that they are part of a unified complex (Boatwright 1987). On the Basilica of Marciana and Matidia, see Paribeni 1926-1927, vol. 2, 58; Rodríguez Almeida 1993.

⁹¹¹ On the Forma Urbis, see Rodríguez Almeida 1993, 127-129; followed by Rodríguez Almeida 1981.

north side of the in the same direction of the Pantheon and facing the Via Recta, which was a major artery, but the east-west orientation of the portico combined makes it more likely that it was oriented on an east-west axis with the Hadrianeum.⁹¹²

Looking to the Present Past: Julio-Claudian and Flavian Divi

While expanding the scope of the imperial past represented by the *divi*, the evidence also suggests that Hadrian diverted resources to sustaining the Julio-Claudian and Flavian *divi*. On a sestertius dated to 125-129, Hadrian consciously evokes Divus Julius (**Fig. 31**).⁹¹³ On the reverse is an image of Hadrian standing togate on a speaker's platform abutting the Temple of Divus Julius. Holding a scroll and addressing a small group of men crowding the front of the speaker's platform, Hadrian's oversized figure is framed by the proportionately small façade of the Temple of Divus Julius and the balustrade erected along the edge of the platform. Grunow notes his ambiguous position: Hadrian's close physical association to the Temple of Divus Julius suggests the figure's status as a cult statue, yet the actively listening crowd assures the viewer that Hadrian is a protagonist in the scene. Such ambiguity may allude to the emperor's controlling position within the state cult and to his potential status as a *divus* after death.⁹¹⁴ While the coin is not well-preserved enough to discern from it details of the architectural sculpture and does not provide reliable evidence for the appearance of the temple, which was not distyle, the structure retains the telltale formal elements of the temple: stairway, frontal orientation, and columnar façade. The building is identifiable as the Temple of Divus Julius based on the three ship's prows

⁹¹² Coarelli and Luisanna 1980, 265, 61.

⁹¹³ With a crowd of 3 citizens: *RIC* II no. 639. With a crowd of 8 citizens: *RIC* II no. 640.

⁹¹⁴ Davies 2000, 102-3. Cf. Sumi who suggests that the depiction may be of a contio (Grunow 2002, 121).

embedded in the speaker's platform and would have further recalled Augustus' construction of the Temple of Divus Julius in honor of his own adoptive, deified father.

The depiction of Hadrian standing majestically before the Temple of Divus Julius has been associated with Hadrian's eulogy of Plotina, an image that would have recalled previous eulogies such as that of Tiberius for Augustus famously delivered approximately 107 years earlier.⁹¹⁵ Another theory places the speech depicted on the coin after Hadrian's return from his first imperial journey to Britannia, Mauretania, Greece, and Sicily.⁹¹⁶ If this is the case, Hadrian's return to Rome and to the temple of the first *divus*, the cult of which centered in Rome and was associated with Augustus, the Empire's divine founder, would have sent a fitting message of Rome's security and continued favor of the gods. In addition, regardless of the address that Hadrian chose to immortalize on coins showing him poised majestically in front of the Temple of Divus Julius, the decision to use the image of the temple in this way indicates Hadrian's continued belief in the religiously and politically charged cult of Divus Julius.

Noting how unusual it was for an emperor to produce numismatic depictions of temples that they were not responsible for constructing, completing, restoring, or rededicating, Boatwright further suggests that Hadrian restored the Temple of Divus Julius. If Hadrian restored the Temple of Divus Julius, the gesture should be understood in light of his preoccupation with an Augustan revival and renewal also evidenced by Hadrian's restoration of the Forum of Augustus, which substantially maintained the original appearance and program.⁹¹⁷

Epigraphic evidence attests to the continued prominence of the cults of Divus Claudius and of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus. One inscription found near the Mausoleum of Hadrian

⁹¹⁵ See, e.g., Sumi 2011, 223-4.

⁹¹⁶ Temporini 1978, 161-75.

⁹¹⁷ Boatwright 1987, 96, 102-3.

dated from between 110-120 was part of a monument set up in honor of the charioteer Avilius Terres to commemorate his victory in games conducted either on the birthday of Claudius or the anniversary of the dedication of the Temple of Divus Claudius.⁹¹⁸ Second, as part of Hadrian's general reconfiguration of the central Campus Martius with the rebuilding of the Pantheon and construction of the Temple of Diva Matidia and basilicas of Matidia and Marciana, Hadrian also renovated the Porticus Divorum (**Fig. 6.32**). Two inscriptions describe the sensational dedication sponsored by Hadrian and accompanied by a show of 1835 pairs of gladiators in the Circus.⁹¹⁹ Concentration on the restoration and new construction of other buildings associated with the veneration of earlier *divi*, including the Pantheon and the Divorum, incorporated the new Temple of Divus Trajan and Temple of Diva Matidia into this longstanding tradition.⁹²⁰ Hadrian's conspicuous restoration of the Porticus Divorum dedicated in 126 further indicates that Hadrian's reverence for his imperial predecessors was not limited to Divus Trajan and Divus Nerva.

The *Divi* and Roma Aeterna

With the consecration of the Temple of Venus and Roma precinct on 21 April 121, early work on Hadrian's monumental complex on the Velia would also have coincided with work on the Temple of Divus Trajan, the Temple of Diva Matidia, and the Pantheon.⁹²¹ Cassius Dio states that Hadrian was responsible for the design and, famously, even had Apollodorus of Damascus

⁹¹⁸ Gordon 1964, no. 173A, CIL. 6.37834a, and c-g. Lines 31 and 47 both refer to the 'Natale divi claudi'. Another part of the inscription includes a list of horses that competed in the games.

⁹¹⁹ Degrassi 1963, 202-3, no. 13.1: [. . . Imp. Caesar Traianus Hadri]anus Aug(ustus) Munu[s]/ [edidit . . . t]emplum Divoru[m]/ [. . . dedicavit, ob quam] causam in circo/ [. . . munus editu]m et consumm[at(um)]/ . . . (paribus) MDCCCXXXV] (. . . the Emperor Hadrian produced a show of gladiators . . . the Templum Divorum . . . he dedicated, for which reason in the Circus . . . the show of gladiators was produced and brought to perfection 1835 pairs of gladiators).

⁹²⁰ On Hadrian's restoration of the Porticus Divorum, see Ziolkowski 1999, 58, 32.

⁹²¹ Brick stamps suggest that work well under way on the Velia in 123 and 124 and Hadrian moved the Colossus of Nero to make more room for the Temple in 128 (Mellor 1981, 1022).

executed for criticizing it.⁹²² Whether Cassius Dio exaggerates or not, it is clear that Hadrian was personally involved in the conception of the Temple of Venus and Roma and that it should be considered within the larger context of his building program in Rome. Hadrian may have commemorated construction of the Temple of Venus Rome in a series of sestertii and medallions dated to after 132 representing a decastyle temple and accompanied by the SC or EX SC and SPQR legend in the exergue (**Fig. 6.33**).⁹²³ Though the temple is not identified on the coin, the Temple of Venus and Roma is the only securely attested decastyle temple in Rome at this time, and similar coins issued under Antoninus Pius bear the legend ROMAE AETERNAE or VENERI FELICI, indicating completion of the temple under Antoninus Pius.⁹²⁴

With a plan that was unique for a state temple in the city of Rome, the Temple of Venus and Roma was decastyle, pseudodipteral, and with a tetrastyle in antis interior pronaos at either end of its back-to-back double cella (**Fig. 6.34**). The enormous podium 145 m long by 100 m wide mirrored the terrace of the Temple of Divus Claudius on the Caelian Hill south of the Flavian Amphitheater. Unlike the Temple of Divus Claudius, however, the Temple of Venus and Roma filled much of the terrace. Built atop a continuous seven-step crepidoma, the twenty by ten column temple was the only decastyle temple in Rome at the time of its construction. Dimensions of approximately 105 m by 48 m exceeded any other temple in the city.⁹²⁵ The goddess Roma Aeterna faced west toward the Roman Forum while the goddess Venus faced east in the direction of the Flavian Amphitheater.⁹²⁶ Porticoes extending the length of the long sides of the podium flanked the temple while visitors gained access to the podium via lateral stairways

⁹²² Cass. Dio 69.4.

⁹²³ *RIC* II no. 783.

⁹²⁴ Boatwright 1987, 123.

⁹²⁵ On the history of the Temple of Venus and Roma, see Cassatella 1999, 122.

⁹²⁶ Prud. *c. Sym.* 1.217.

on the short sides. The *in situ* remains of the semi-domed cellae and the rest of the superstructure date to the reign of Maxentius who restored the temple after its destruction by a fire in 307.⁹²⁷

Choices in design and material would have encouraged viewers to make visual associations between the Temple of Venus and Roma and other prominent Hadrianic buildings. Colored stone monoliths were prominent: grey granite monoliths in the cases of the Temple of Venus and Roma, the Temple of Divus Trajan, and the Pantheon, and cippolino for the Temple of Diva Matidia. Interior embellishment including internal colonnades in the Temple of Venus and Roma and the Temple of Divus Trajan, and opus sectile paving in the Temple of Venus and Roma and the Pantheon, created sumptuous interior environments. Finally, flanking or surrounding porticoes defined the temenos of each of these Hadrianic temples.

Aspects of Venus and Roma that were the subject of veneration are significant: Venus Felix, Venus the bringer of good fortune, and Roma Aeterna, eternal Rome. By the time of Hadrian's reign Roma had long been elevated into a goddess, particularly in temples built in the provinces and dedicated to Roma and Augustus.⁹²⁸ In addition to Roma's connection to the emperor in the provinces, in the Greek east Roma was also associated with Aion, a divinity who signified the infinity of time, often represented by the elliptical ring of the zodiac.⁹²⁹ It is in connection with the Temple of Venus and Roma that ideas of the eternity of the emperor and of the Empire vividly merged in the public realm.

The ideology presented on coins of the Flavians associating total eternity embodied in the figure of Aeternitas holding busts of Sol and Luna with the emperors became crystallized in the architecture and cult of the city emphasizing the religious connotation of Roma Aeterna. Also at

⁹²⁷ Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 40.

⁹²⁸ On temples dedicated to Roma and Augustus, see Hänlein-Schäfer 1985.

⁹²⁹ On Roma and Aion, see Mellor 1981, 1018-9.

this time Roma was conceived in her new identity as a goddess for the Empire as whole, as well as for the city of Rome.⁹³⁰ In order to build the massive platform for the Temple of Venus and Rome Hadrian moved the Colossus of Sol, formerly on the Velia on axis between the Flavian Amphitheater and the Roman Forum. So important was the idea of total eternity to Hadrianic ideology, according to the author of the *Augustan Histories*, Hadrian planned to have a companion colossus for Sol created in the guise of the Moon.⁹³¹ Leaving no doubt of the connection between Roma Aeterna and existing ideas of total eternity, coin issues of Hadrian bear figures of Roma and of Aeternitas holding either the sun and crescent moon or Sol and Luna (**Figs. 6.35 and 6.36**).⁹³² Moreover, many examples survive of Hadrianic issues bearing the crescent moon with one or more stars and with or without a small globe below (**Fig. 6.37**).⁹³³ It is tempting to see in these astral clusters a specific group of *divi*; however, without any legend or iconographic hint, the coins would more likely have invoked a general notion of cosmic eternity and *imperium sine fine*, with Hadrian on the obverse as its divinely-ordained ruler.⁹³⁴

Ideas of cyclical renewal first underscored by the association of the phoenix with Divus Trajan early in Hadrian's reign, seem to have coalesced around the cult of Roma Aeterna. Boatwright observes that the location of the Temple of Venus and Roma reinforced the concept of Rome's eternal renewal, a theme also invoked in controversial issues with an obverse legend of HADRIANUS AUG P P REN, in which the REN has been variously interpreted as a form of

⁹³⁰ Mols 2003, 463-4.

⁹³¹ *SHA Had.* 19, 12-16.

⁹³² Roma holding the crescent moon and sun: *RIC* II no. 263c; *BMCRE* III no. 701. Aeternitas holding Sol and Luna: see, e.g., *RIC* II no. 38; *RIC II* no. 48; *RIC* II no. 81; *RIC* II no. 114. *RIC* II no. 115.

⁹³³ Crescent and one star: *RIC* II no. 200; *BMCRE* III no. 457. Crescent, one star, and globe: *RIC* II no. 201. Crescent and seven stars: *RIC* II no 202; *BMCRE* III no. 464.

⁹³⁴ *RIC* II no. 328.

renascor, to be born again, or *renovatio*, a renewal or transformation.⁹³⁵ Considering a rebirth or renewal necessarily provokes contemplation of what came before. As with the Trajanic restoration series in which the coins of the *divi* were marked as restored objects, explicit references under Hadrian to Romulus as Rome's first founder and Rome's rebirth or regeneration, dictated a comparison between the old and the new.⁹³⁶ Conspicuous images of Romulus carrying the *spolia opima* on the roof of the Temple of Divus Augustus and in the Forum of Augustus further recalled the founder of the Empire.

Coins commemorating the cult of Venus Felix, thought to confer military success as the patroness of triumphant generals as well as the goddess of fecundity and prosperity, embodied Rome's continued success guided by the gods. In one example the cult image of Venus Felix sits in a high-backed throne holding a spear and winged Amor and wearing a long robe and diadem (**Fig. 6.38**).⁹³⁷ In a parallel image, the cult statue of Roma is seated on a curule chair, holding a spear and Palladium, and wearing a long robe and helmet; a new iconography referring to a hopeful future and differing from the Julio-Claudian Roma, which was typically seated on a pile of weapons (**Fig. 6.39**).⁹³⁸ As Boatwright appropriately observes, the association of the two goddesses stresses the connection between the triumphant general and the divine origins of Rome. During the Roman Empire, however, *triumphatores* were exclusively emperors, or on rare occasion imperial family members, and had become synonymous with the imperial office. Significantly, she points out that this gesture extolled Rome's traditions rather than an individual

⁹³⁵ On the designation REN as a form of *renascor*, see *RIC* II no. 335.

⁹³⁶ ROMULO CONDITORI: *RIC* II no. 266 with reverse of Romulus advancing holding spear and trophy.

⁹³⁷ See, e.g., *RIC* II no. 280c; *BMCRE* III no. 751.

⁹³⁸ See, e.g. *RIC* II no. 265. On the iconography of Roma under Hadrian, see Boatwright 1987, 131; Mellor 1981, 1016-7.

dynasty, but, more importantly, it exalted the divinely-ordained destiny of the Roman people lead by the emperor.⁹³⁹

Conclusion

Hadrian was certainly aware of the need to establish a dynastic legacy, of which the Temples to Divus Trajan and to Diva Matidia were one aspect. Numerous inscriptions explicitly delineate Hadrian's lineage in terms of his divine father, Divus Trajan, and his divine grandfather, Divus Nerva. For example, boundary cippi identified Hadrian as the grandson of Divus Nerva and son of Divus Trajan.⁹⁴⁰ Hadrian's construction of his own mausoleum approached by the Pons Aelius in a then-remote and relatively inaccessible part of Rome across the Tiber, was undoubtedly looking to the Mausoleum of Augustus located in the northern Campus Martius as a precedent. Like Augustus, Hadrian intended his dynastic successors and imperial family members to be buried beside him, emphasizing the establishment of the Aelian dynasty arranged through adoption.⁹⁴¹ The many occupants of the Mausoleum of Hadrian are attested by inscriptions: Sabina, L. Aelius, Antoninus Pius, Faustina the Elder and her three children T. Aurelius Antoninus, T. Aelius Aurelius, and Domitia Faustina, Commodus, and a number of the Severans including Julia Domna, Septimius Severus, Caracalla, and Geta.⁹⁴²

Surpassing this dynastic message in frequency and intensity, however, were the multiplicity of conceptions promoting the inextricably linked eternity of emperor and Empire.

For Robert Etienne, the development of a Roman Empire understood by its citizens in terms of

⁹³⁹ Boatwright 1987, 132.

⁹⁴⁰ Gordon 1964 no. 178: IMP(eratore) CAESARE DIVI TRAIANI PARTHICI F(ilio)/DIVI NERVAE NEPOTE TRAIANO HADRIANO.

⁹⁴¹ Boatwright 1987, 178; D'Ambra 2010, 291.

⁹⁴² *CIL* 6.984-96. On the burial of L. Aelius Verus, see *SHA Ver.* 11.1. On imperial funerary epigraphs, see Mols 2003, 462.

cosmic eternity was the result of developments in the second century and concretization of the cult of Roma Aeterna. The seeds of this idea, however, originated with the early imperial cults of the *divi*, Divus Julius and Divus Augustus, of which second century developments were a logical evolution.

CHAPTER 7

THE ANTONINES: CONSISTENCY AND COMMEMORATION (138-192)

Introduction

The second century saw a series of comparatively smooth transitions in imperial power under the Antonine emperors. Like Trajan, Hadrian adopted an heir before his death indicating the extent of the lesson of 68-69; a break in continuity could cause a civil war.⁹⁴³ Hadrian's first chosen heir, Lucius Aelius Caesar died in 138, leading to Hadrian's adoption of Aurelius Antoninus, a middle aged senator, on 25 February 138. In order to secure another level of succession, as a condition of the adoption Hadrian required Antoninus to adopt Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.⁹⁴⁴ The *Feriale Duranum* records that the day on which Antoninus Pius died, 7 March 161, is the same as the *dies imperii* for Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.⁹⁴⁵ Even before the untimely death of Lucius Verus in 169, after skirmishes with the Marcomanni along the Danube, Marcus Aurelius had elevated his son Commodus to the title of *princeps iuventutis* after Commodus assumed the *toga virilis* at the age of fourteen on 7 July 175.⁹⁴⁶

Although not to the extent under Hadrian, Antoninus Pius continued to underscore the eternity of Empire, not only through his completion of the Temple of Venus and Roma, but also via coin issues commemorating the dedication of the temple and the cult statue of Roma Aeterna within it. A series of coin reverses with the legend ROMAE AETERNAE SC bear an image either of the decastyle temple, or Roma holding the Palladium and seated on a throne beside

⁹⁴³ Hammond 1956, 95-6

⁹⁴⁴ It is likely that Marcus Aurelius was elevated to the position of successor between 5 December 138 and 1 July 139 when Marcus Aurelius married Antoninus' daughter, Faustina the Younger.

⁹⁴⁵ Fink, Hoey and Snyder 1940. SHA *Marc.* 7.6.

⁹⁴⁶ On the transitions of power under the Antonines, see Hammond 1956, 95-106.

which rests a shield (Figs. 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3).⁹⁴⁷ Aeternitas and Providentia Deorum issues were among the earliest coins of Antoninus Pius issued shortly after his accession in 138, suggesting yet again that visual imagery highlighting the continuity of the Roman Empire was desirable in the period of uncertainty that inevitably followed a transition of power.⁹⁴⁸ In his masterful examination of Roman architecture in the Antonine age, Edmund Thomas has concluded that during this period monumental works of architecture, of which the most emblematic were temples, were intended to encourage a belief in the stability and unity of the Empire.⁹⁴⁹ Consistent with precedent, each deceased Antonine emperor until Commodus was deified by his successor and venerated in a temple in Rome. By adapting Flavian experiments in commemorating deified emperors outside of their temples, the Antonines expanded the presence of their *divi* in the Roman landscape without violating cultic and mnemonic standards and expectations.

Hadrianeum

Though the first five emperors of the second century, Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius, are usually characterized as the five good emperors, it is rarely noted that the fate of Hadrian's memory in the period immediately after his death was uncertain. Numerous sources claim that Hadrian died hated by the people.⁹⁵⁰ If Antoninus Pius had not insisted that Hadrian be deified, the author of Hadrian's biography in the *Augustan Histories*

⁹⁴⁷ Roma Aeternae: *RIC* III no. 621. Temple of Venus and Roma: *RIC* III nos. 622, 664.

⁹⁴⁸ Aeternitas: *RIC* III no. 18, reverse with Aeternitas standing by an altar holding a globe; *RIC* III no. 61A, reverse legend AETERNITAS, with the personification standing left holding a globe and scepter. Providentia Deorum: *RIC* III no. 59, with the legend PROVIDENTIA DOERUM and winged thunderbolt on the reverse.

⁹⁴⁹ Thomas 2007, 161 ff.

⁹⁵⁰ See e.g., Dio. Cass. 69.23.2; SHA *Had.* 35.7, 24.3-5; SHA *Pius.* 2.4-6.

recounts, Hadrian's memory may have suffered a less desirable fate.⁹⁵¹ At stake in this dispute, Flowers argues, was the independence of the Senate and their power to define memory and commemoration, without which the emperor had no reason to prioritize his relationship with the Senate.⁹⁵² Flowers views the refusal of Antoninus Pius to build his own image on the denigration of his predecessor as imposing dynastic genealogy at the expense of the Senate's show of independence.⁹⁵³ For Flowers, the loss of the dispute signaled complete defeat, however, the fact that there was a dispute at all, that Antoninus Pius did not have *carte blanche* to deify Hadrian without the consensus of the Senate, indicates that the memory of the deified emperor still provided an avenue for discussion and debate.

While the Senate may have been vehemently opposed to Hadrian's deification, it acknowledged the virtue of *pietas* in Antoninus by officially granting him the name Pius, a cognomen with undertones of Augustan and Virgilian virtue linked to cultivation of the memory of his adoptive father.⁹⁵⁴ Antoninus Pius built a temple for Divus Hadrian at Puteoli instead of a tomb, and he established a priesthood, sodales and a quinquennial contest for Divus Hadrian.⁹⁵⁵ Antoninus Pius alone was responsible for transporting Hadrian's remains back to Rome for burial. Like Caligula who carefully timed the dedication of the Temple of Divus Augustus to coincide with the centenary of Augustus' birth, Antoninus Pius scheduled the dedication of the Hadrianeum on 17 March 145, the same day that his heir, Marcus Aurelius, accepted the toga *virilis*.⁹⁵⁶ Thus, the temporal significance of the dedication day, combined with the cardinal

⁹⁵¹ SHA *Had.* 27; SHA *Pius* 5.

⁹⁵² Flower 2006, 272-4.

⁹⁵³ Flower 2006, 274.

⁹⁵⁴ Flower 2006, 274.

⁹⁵⁵ Sapelli 1999, 8.

⁹⁵⁶ SHA *Pius* 8.2; SHA *Ver.* 3.2.

orientation of the Hadrianeum likely echoing that of the Temple of Diva Matidia, combined to further Antonine dynastic associations of the central Campus Martius that Hadrian had begun during this reign.⁹⁵⁷ Yet within the evolving dynastic topography of the Campus Martius, the Hadrianeum was a monument unto itself, shielded from view behind a surrounding portico, likely accessible through a monumental arch facing the Via Lata/Flaminia.

Though Antoninus Pius successfully insisted on the deification of Hadrian, he seems to have shied away from extensive coin commemoration of his deified adoptive father. In addition, unlike the Hadrianic coins of Divus Trajan that stressed Hadrian's succession and the transferal of powers from Trajan, the rare Divus Hadrian coins of Antoninus Pius celebrate only Hadrian's apotheosis. On the two types that commemorate Divus Hadrian the reverses bear the CONSECratio legend: in one example accompanying an eagle with its wings at its side, standing on a globe, an emblem that emphasizes Roman world dominion, and the other example with a flying eagle bearing Hadrian skyward (**Fig. 7.4**).⁹⁵⁸ On some level, however, Antoninus Pius must have encouraged the conception of his divine lineage, reflected in the public realm in a dedication from 138 by the clerks of the armory to Antoninus Pius as son of Divus Hadrian, grandson of Divus Trajan, and great-grandson of Divus Nerva.⁹⁵⁹ While the evident ambivalence of Antoninus Pius toward Divus Hadrian as dynastic predecessor of dubitable value to his legitimacy rendered the need for extensive commemoration of his apotheosis unnecessary, the monumental complex dedicated to Divus Hadrian in a prominent position along the Via Lata/Flaminia attests to the need for the new god.

⁹⁵⁷ Boatwright 2010, 170-2.

⁹⁵⁸ Eagle standing on a globe: *RIC* III no. 389b. Eagle flying skyward bearing Hadrian on its back: *RIC* III no. 389a.

⁹⁵⁹ Gordon 1964, no. 198: (Imp Caesari Divi Hadriani Aug Filio Divi Traiani Parthici Nep Divi Nervae Pronepoti Tito Aelio Hadriano Antonino Aug Pio).

Architecture

Based on brick stamps found under the foundation of the north side of the Hadrianeum, construction on the temple began under Antoninus Pius, a fact corroborated by a lead pipe confirming Antoninus Pius as patron.⁹⁶⁰ Undoubtedly influenced by the Temple of Venus and Roma, which Antoninus Pius was responsible for completing, the Hadrianeum was predominantly Greek in plan with a peripteral colonnade and a location in the center of a surrounding peristyle; however, it retained a raised podium, columnar façade, and frontal emphasis via a broad stairway approach (**Fig. 7.5**).⁹⁶¹ Though the Hadrianeum, at 27 m by 45 m was smaller than the Temple of Venus and Roma, the peripteral plan, colonnaded temple precinct, and other correspondences in materials suggested a visual association between the two buildings: both were composed of a superstructure in Proconnesian marble and peperino combined with a travertine podium.⁹⁶² In the Corinthian order, the eight by thirteen external columns were an order of 50 Roman feet. Eleven columns of the north colonnade have been preserved, originally embedded in the wall of the old Roman Stock Exchange and now renovated as the Camera di Commercio, Industria, Artigianato, e Agricoltura di Roma. Several of the original eight rows of travertine ashlar that constituted the podium are also still visible from the Piazza di Pietra.

⁹⁶⁰ See e.g. *CIL* 15.1; 15.161; 15.186; 15.1068; 15.7029. Cf. Chausson (2001, 356-7) who suggests, based on the topographical correlation of the Hadrianeum to the complex of Matidia and Marciana, and the fact that Sabina died before him, that Hadrian may have started construction on the Hadrianeum before his death with the intention of dedicating it to Sabina.

⁹⁶¹ Other 'Greek' elements of the architectural design include columns that incline slightly toward the cella, and the peculiar entasis of the column shafts (Jones 1999, 137-8).

⁹⁶² On connections between the Temple of Venus and Roma and the Hadrianeum, see Stamper 2005, 212.

The architrave consists of two decorative fasciae and a convex frieze. The cornice is articulated by rectangular brackets and coffers adorned with rosettes, topped by a sima with palmettes and lion head spouts. While the external walls of the cella were built of peperino ashlar, the interior boasted a number of decorative embellishments: a peripteral, engaged interior order 36 Roman feet high supported the coffered and barrel vaulted ceiling of the cella (**Fig. 7.6**).⁹⁶³ The interior walls also had a richly decorated entablature with convex frieze sculpted with candelabra and acanthus spirals.

Numerous fragmentary remains of the portico surrounding the temple allow a tentative reconstruction of its basic dimensions at approximately 90 by 100 meters.⁹⁶⁴ Since the mid-1600's excavators have recovered peperino blocks or sections of peperino walls from the areas near Via dei Bergamaschi and Palazzo Cini. Architectural remains including fragments of fluted giallo antico columns, a Corinthian capital, and other architectonic elements attributed to the portico were recovered from the same areas.⁹⁶⁵

Reliefs of 'Provinces' and Trophies

Twenty-two reliefs of geographic or ethnic personifications from the Hadrianeum survive, all in Proconnesian marble and with the same approximate dimensions of 1.9 m wide, 2.1 m high, 0.85 m deep.⁹⁶⁶ All are standing females with their heads turned slightly to the right or left and their weight either on the right or left leg. Tentative identifications of geographic or

⁹⁶³ Cipollone 1996. See also, Stamper 2005, 213-4.

⁹⁶⁴ Cipollone 1996.

⁹⁶⁵ For a complete description of the excavations and discoveries related to the portico of the Hadrianeum, see Claridge 1999, 120-1.

⁹⁶⁶ For a catalog including all of the complete and fragmentary reliefs, see Sapelli 1999, 27-82.

ethnic identities include Scythia, Parthia, Phrygia, an eastern province, Germania, Judaea, Thrace, Egypt, Moesia, Achaia, Dacia, Gallia, Hispania, Libya, and Mauretania.⁹⁶⁷

In addition to pose, the female figures also vary in dress and attributes. Some of the figures wear male dress and carry weapons suggesting particular identifications. For example, the figure identified as Scythia wears a particular type of baggy trousers (*braccae*), a short tunic and mantle fastened by a fibula, and short sword known as a *gladius hispanicus* (**Fig. 7.7**).

Another figure wearing the same baggy trousers and identified as Phrygia, is distinguished by the short chiton of the Amazonian type belted at the waist, a mantle bound by a round fibula at the shoulder, the soft, conical cap typical of Phrygia, and a double axe (of which the head is restored but the handle is original) (**Fig. 7.8**). Others wear female dress and hold weapons, such as the figure presumed to be Thrace, wearing a long, ankle-length tunic in the Amazonian style, a fringed mantle bound at one shoulder, and holding a short sword with a curved blade (**Fig. 7.9**)

The dress of some figures are highly individualized; Hispania wears a short sleeve, calf-length tunic covering her pants, and a breastplate with elaborate ornamentation including stars, volutes, and vegetal motifs, and a three-level pteryges with images of lions (**Fig. 7.10**). Others seem to wear more generic female dress. For example, the figure identified as Libya wears a long sleeved tunic tied under the breasts and extending down to the ankles, below which is visible the

⁹⁶⁷ Scythia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 1, 28-31, Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6753. Parthia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 3, 32-4, Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6757. Phrygia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 5, 35-9, Naples, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. 6763. Eastern province: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 6, 40-3, Rome, Palazzo Farnese, vestibule over the main cortile. Germania: Sapelli 1999, 44, Rome, Villa Doria Pamphili, Casino del Belrespiro. Judaea: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 8, 45-7, Rome, Villa Doria Pamphili, Casino del Belrespiro. Thrace: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 9, 48-50, Rome Museo Nazionale Romano in Palazzo Massimo alle Terme, inv. 428496. Egypt: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 10, 52-5, Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano in Palazzo Massimo alle Terme, inv. 428497. Moesia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 12, 57-8, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 761. Achaia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 13, 58-9, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 756. Dacia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 15, 61, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 763. Gallia: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 17, 63, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 765. Hispania: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 19, 64-5, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 767. Libya: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 20, 66-7, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 755. Mauretania: Sapelli 1999, cat. no. 21, 68-9, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 768.

hem of her pants (**Fig. 7.11**). Germania also wears heavy drapery, consisting of a large chiton that extends down to the feet and is bound by a thin belt under the breasts, and a mantle that wraps around the shoulders and falls between the arms and the body (**Fig. 7.12**).

Ten trophy ensembles of arms and armor also survive. Carved in low relief, the trophy slabs are about 2.33 m wide, 1.87 m high, and 0.59 m deep. There are four basic variations in the surviving examples: a tunic with a dragon; a lance inclined to the left with cuirass and to the right a lance and standard; an oval shield crossed with a hexagonal shield decorated with hatchet and sword; an oval shield and hexagonal shield decorated with a palmette and hatchet, and a sword to right, and two lances to left (**Figs. 7.13 and 7.14**).⁹⁶⁸

Based on style alone the Hadrianeum reliefs have been alternatively dated early in the reign of Antoninus Pius, during the years of the Hadrianeum's construction, or later in his reign in the 150s.⁹⁶⁹ With find spots in the area between the north side of the temple and northern colonnade of the surrounding peristyle, the original context of the reliefs depicting geographic and ethnic personifications has long puzzled scholars (**Fig. 7.15**).⁹⁷⁰ Speculation on their location within the Hadrianeum complex has included almost all of the possible options. For Polito, who points out that schematized representations of the trophy ensembles has diverted attention from them, the reliefs adorned the high podium of the Hadrianeum (**Fig. 7.16**).⁹⁷¹ Yet, cuttings on the podium indicating marble slab revetments exclude the possibility that the reliefs encircled the

⁹⁶⁸ See, e.g., trophy relief with tunic and dragon: Sapelli 1999, 62, cat. no. 16, Rome, Museo Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 764, 2.33 m wide, 1.97 m high, 0.59 m deep. Trophy relief with oval shield, hexagonal shield, hatchet, swords: Sapelli 1999, 64, cat. no. 18, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 766, 2.33 m wide, 1.97 m high, 0.59 m deep. Cuirass, spear, vexillum: Sapelli 1999, 60, cat. no. 14, Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 762, 2.01 m wide, 1.35 m tall, 0.59 m deep.

⁹⁶⁹ Arguing for an earlier date, see Boatwright 2010, 173; and for the later range, see Sapelli 1999, 22-3.

⁹⁷⁰ On the find spots of the reliefs, see Claridge 1999, 117-9.

⁹⁷¹ Polito 1998, 198-9.

podium.⁹⁷² A location near ground level also fails to take into account the very deep carving that suggests the reliefs were intended to be viewed from a distance.⁹⁷³

A placement of the reliefs in the interior attic of the cella, as advocated by Toynbee, M. Cipollone, and Anna Maria Pais is unlikely because the proportions of the internal order are too low to accommodate the reliefs, and there are too many reliefs for the number of internal columns (at least eighteen reliefs survive while the interior could accommodate at most sixteen reliefs).⁹⁷⁴ Most recently Claridge places the geographic personifications alternating with the trophy reliefs on the attic of the peristyle demarcating the temple's precinct, a theory by no means certain but gaining traction (**Fig. 7.17**).⁹⁷⁵ While the peristyle attic theory addresses a number of controversial issues, Claridge acknowledges that the question of how and when these reliefs, most of which were found unbroken on the ground, were removed from their original location must remain unanswered.

Diagram of Imperial Eternity

One of the earliest scholars to comment on the ideology of the province reliefs from the Hadrianeum was Jocelyn Toynbee. Her purpose was to explore the complicated relationship between what she considered predominantly Greek threads in Roman art and visual production under Hadrian. Toynbee provided a meticulous survey of the Hadrianic coin series of imperial provinces that commemorated Hadrian's extensive travels and the benefits that he conferred,

⁹⁷² On theories related to the podium advanced by Lanciani, Vespignani and Petersen in the late 1800s, see Claridge 1999, 121-2.

⁹⁷³ Chiaroscuro work and deep relief suggest that the figures were mounted up high. In addition, the upper area of the relief is not worked smoothly (Presicce 1999, 99).

⁹⁷⁴ Smith 1988, fn. 76, 76. Advocating for placement in the cella, Toynbee 1967, 154-5; Cipollone 1978-1979; Pais 1979. On the dimensions of the interior order, see Passarelli 1940, 130.

⁹⁷⁵ Claridge 1999, 121-5. Followed by, e.g., Presicce 1999; Hughes 2009.

including classical personifications, and *Adventus*, *Restitutor*, and *Exercitus* types invoking twenty-five provinces throughout the Empire.⁹⁷⁶ Hadrianic *Orbis Terrarum* types, depicting the emperor as the ruler of the inhabited world, and restorer and benefactor of the peoples and cities of the universal Roman Empire, provided valuable ideological context for the province series. On the reverse of *Orbis Terrarum* types Hadrian stands with his arm outstretched and raising up a kneeling turreted female figure holding a globe representing the *oikoumene*, the inhabited world (**Fig. 7.18**).⁹⁷⁷ Toynbee views the coins as an expression of a Hadrianic imperial ideology placing Rome at the center of the *oikoumene*, an idea that originated with Alexander the Great and was later embraced by Augustus.⁹⁷⁸ Representations of the provinces on Hadrianic coins officially expressed Hadrian's conception of the relationship between the provinces of the Empire and Rome, conceived as the center.

Though commissioned under Antoninus Pius after Hadrian's death, for Toynbee the province reliefs of the Hadrianeum are a phenomenon connected ideologically to the Hadrianic coin series of the provinces. The province reliefs similarly express an idea of Empire originating with the Greek *oikoumene*, as indicated in part by the Greek idealized female personifications intended to symbolize through dress, attributes, or posture, the individual provinces or ethnicities represented in the reliefs; as opposed to Roman-type personifications of provinces that presented the figure of a single typical inhabitant.⁹⁷⁹ As Smith points out, Toynbee was not aware of the

⁹⁷⁶ The 'provinces', some of which are cities or districts, includes Achaia, Aegyptos and Nilus, Africa, Alexandria, Arabia, Asia, Bithynia, Britannia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Dacia, Gallia, Germania, Hispania, Italia and Tiberis, Judaea, Libya, Macedonia, Mauretania, Moesia, Nicomedia, Noricum, Phrygia, Sicilia, and Thracia (Toynbee 1967, 24-130). See also, Strack 1953, 139-66.

⁹⁷⁷ *RIC* II no. 594b. Toynbee 1967, 24.

⁹⁷⁸ Toynbee 1967, 1-6. On the *oikoumene* in Augustan ideology, see, e.g., Smith 1988; Kleiner and Buxton 2008.

⁹⁷⁹ These Roman-type personifications were intended to embody in human form the prevailing idea of the particular location called up in the minds of contemporaries, as opposed to the idealized personifications as more static symbols of place (Toynbee 1967, 8).

ethne reliefs of the Sebasteion, discovered in Aphrodisias in the late 1970s and early 1980s.⁹⁸⁰ Situated along a processional way within a Sanctuary dedicated to Aphrodite Prometor and the Julio-Claudian emperors, the Sebasteion reliefs were in a vastly different context than the province reliefs of the Hadrianeum. Yet, similarities in general character and iconographic conception between the two sets of reliefs, including frontal orientation and draped female figures distinguished primarily by pose, dress, and attributes, defy Toynbee's Roman/Greek distinction. Smith finds the origins for the Augustan and Hadrianic personifications not only in the Hellenistic concept of the *oikoumene*, but also in the Roman triumph, in particular the conquered foreigners paraded in chains, and images of conquered Dacians from the Forum of Trajan.⁹⁸¹

Although the province reliefs associated with the Hadrianeum are usually characterized as the expression of a gentler imperial ideal, one in which the personifications are willing participants peacefully integrated and even elevated into the Roman Empire, it is difficult to fully divorce provincial status from military associations and conquest. For example, as the parade of conquered people in a triumph was intended to provide a visual catalog of conquest, the series of statues carried in Augustus' funeral procession similarly represented "all of the *ethne* acquired by Augustus."⁹⁸²

Smith notes the ambiguity inherent in the relief provinces from the Hadrianeum, alternating with reliefs of trophy ensembles of foreign arms that injected associations of conquest and victory where none were justified based on the life of Hadrian venerated in the Hadrianeum

⁹⁸⁰ On similarities and differences between the Augustan reliefs and the Hadrianeum reliefs, see Smith 1988, 74-8.

⁹⁸¹ On late Republican and early imperial precedents for group representations of geographic personifications, including the fourteen nations in Pompey's Theater (Pliny *NH* 36.41; Suet. *Ner.* 46), the Augustan Porticus Ad Nationes (Serv. *Ad Aen.* 8.721; Pliny *NH* 36.39), and the images of *ethne* carried in procession in Augustus' funeral (Dio Cass. 56.34.2, Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.4), see Smith 1988, 71-5.

⁹⁸² Dio Cass. 56.34.2.

as Divus Hadrian.⁹⁸³ Reliefs of provinces in the Hadrianeum, Smith reasons, were not a revival of a classical mode as argued by Toynbee; rather, they were a continuation of an Augustan tradition presenting personifications as collections of peoples added to the empire that began in the Porticus Ad Nationes, the Sebasteion in Aphrodisias, and Augustus' funerary procession.⁹⁸⁴ Supporting Smith is the observation of Jessica Hughes that the likely configuration of the trophy and personification reliefs in the attic of the peristyle reflected the practice of mounting enemy spoils, suggesting that the nations themselves were conquered booty.⁹⁸⁵ Moreover, the personifications are not all peaceful representatives of foreign lands; some are warriors wearing the typical armor and bearing the arms characteristic of their homelands.

Reliefs that may have embellished a monumental arch articulating the entrance to the Hadrianeum, further complicate the image of benign Empire usually advocated for the geographic and ethnic personifications. Two controversial reliefs have been attributed to the remains of an arch located near the Via Lata/Flaminia at the later Piazza Sciarra that may have provided access from the Via Lata/Flaminia to the Hadrianeum complex.⁹⁸⁶ Depicting a barbarian embassy consisting of a kneeling man and a standing boy supplicating the togate Lucius Verus, the relief in the Torlonia collection implies the complete dependence of a conquered people on the clemency of the Roman emperor (**Fig. 7.19**).⁹⁸⁷ The Torlonia relief may have been paired with the Hadrianic Adventus relief, originally found in Piazza Sciarra near the Hadrianeum and now in the grand staircase of the Palazzo Conservatori, showing Hadrian

⁹⁸³ Smith 1988, 77.

⁹⁸⁴ Smith 1988, 76.

⁹⁸⁵ Hughes 2009, 8.

⁹⁸⁶ Castagnoli 1942; Palombi 1993, 112. *Cf.* For a full bibliography, and on the orientation of the newly discovered foundations as oblique, and not related, to the Hadrianeum, see Boatwright 2010, 174-7.

⁹⁸⁷ The head of Hadrian is completely restored. On the relief in the Museo Torlonia, Rome, see Scott-Ryberg 1955, 64, n.11; Nista 1999, 110-1.

entering Rome, perhaps from the Jewish War in 134, welcomed by a personification of the Roman people and the goddess Roma, with whom he engages in the *dextrarum iunctio* gesture.

While Smith and Toynbee's theory that the reliefs of provinces from the Hadrianeum expressed a concept of *oikoumene* that placed Rome at the center of the inhabited world is convincing, in light of iconographic and mnemonic trends in other temples to *divi* that lack specific biographical references, it is unlikely that the province reliefs were intended as a revisionist strategy aimed at suggesting a catalog of fictional conquests countering Hadrian's non-military record. With an understanding that the temples to *divi* were less about the history of the emperor honored, and more about the eternity of Empire and imperial office of which the deceased emperor was one component, a more nuanced interpretation of the reliefs is possible. When viewed in terms of imperial history, the reliefs represented an inventory of the Roman world that theoretically encompassed all imperial conquests, the care of which, the *cura imperii*, continued under Hadrian, and his successor, Antoninus Pius.⁹⁸⁸

Spatial dynamics of the reliefs should further inform our understanding of them. Although the original context of display remains controversial, all theories, whether on the podium, interior of the temple, or adorning the surrounding peristyle, have the reliefs encircling the cult statue. Configuring the geographic and ethnic personifications in a complete circuit around the Hadrianeum, with the cult image of Divus Hadrian at its center, created a monumental diagram of imperial eternity, evoking the idea of total eternity encompassing past, present, and future. As ancient sources described, eternity could be conceived as a point in the center equally present to all points on a circle around it representing worldly time.⁹⁸⁹ Divus

⁹⁸⁸ Presicce 1999, 99-100.

⁹⁸⁹ See Ch. 2, 52.

Hadrian as the embodiment of imperial eternity at the center of the complex is ever present to all components of the Empire surrounding the god.

The Sebasteion in Aphrodisias offered a view of the Empire that Smith notes “by the sheer numbers and impressive unfamiliarity of the names” suggested that it was coterminous with the ends of the earth. The serial presentation of geographic personifications in the Hadrianeum accomplished a comparable ideological goal; however, the spatial dynamics of the site elaborated on the conception presented in the Sebasteion, which viewers experienced in a linear fashion as they processed from the entrance of the complex along the dual porticos flanking the processional way toward the temple, their route precisely reversed as they exited the complex (**Fig. 7.20**).⁹⁹⁰ If the Hadrianeum reliefs were located in the attic of the colonnade they would have formed a three hundred and sixty degree circuit. As viewers progressed around the temple looking outward and upward at the peristyle attic, they would have moved in a seemingly endless circular route around the Hadrianeum taking in the reliefs.

Although differentiated by pose, dress, and attributes, the geographic and ethnic personifications are of identical shape and size within identical relief frames, imposing an unnatural uniformity on the figures and on the components of Empire. Claudio Presicce highlighted similarities among the figures in the Hadrianeum, in which the individual geographic entities represent interchangeable elements that are together homogenous.⁹⁹¹ Just as precise identification of each figure escapes us today, Jessica Hughes argues that precision also would have eluded the ancient viewer leading to a visual emphasis more on the connections among the

⁹⁹⁰ Smith 1988, 51-3.

⁹⁹¹ Presicce 1999, 96.

reliefs rather than the distinctions.⁹⁹² Hughes raises the possibility that the distinctions might be the result of a study in artistic diversity rather than a strategy to provide a comprehensive ethnic inventory.⁹⁹³ In other words, through diversity the figures suggested the breadth of the Roman Empire, but may not have meticulously catalogued it. Taking into account the viewing distance, it is likely that after viewing a few dozen personifications, distinctions among them became blurred. If so, a viewer may not even realize when she progresses far enough to arrive back on the same side of the Hadrianeum that she began, encouraging the perception that the provinces are indefinite in number. Craning one's neck to view the reliefs may have further contributed to this disorienting effect.

Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina: A Return to the Beginning

The *Historia Augusta* records that after the death of Faustina the Elder in late 140, the Senate founded an alimentary program in her name, and awarded her games, a temple and priestesses, statues of silver and gold, and statues to be erected in all the circuses.⁹⁹⁴ Celebration of Diva Faustina in coin issues, after her death and throughout the reign of Antoninus Pius, was extensive, far exceeding that of Divus Hadrian (or any other *divus* or *diva* to date).⁹⁹⁵ Clare Rowan astutely suggests that although Hadrian's unpopularity and the unpopular nature of the decision to deify him meant that an emphasis on Antoninus Pius' adoptive father was not

⁹⁹² One of the biggest differences between the province images on the coins, and the geographic personifications in the reliefs, Hughes notes, is the lack of identifying inscriptions on the reliefs that might have further contributed to the viewer's inability to identify all of the personifications (Hughes 2009, 1-2, 8). *Cf.* Sapelli, who assumes that the name of the personification would have been painted (Sapelli, 1999, 16).

⁹⁹³ Hughes 2009, 14.

⁹⁹⁴ SHA *Pius* 6.7, 8.1-2.

⁹⁹⁵ Rowan's hoard analysis has revealed that, of the total coins issued by Antoninus Pius in the hoards, coins in honor of Divus Hadrian constituted 4.5% of aureii, 9% of denarii, and 22% of the aes. In contrast, Diva Faustina's coins constituted 22.5% of aureii, and 30% of denarii, and 22% of aes (Rowan 2012, 991-3).

desirable, Faustina provided an excellent alternative with which to emphasize imperial divinity.⁹⁹⁶

In the dozens of coin types celebrating Diva Faustina there is a clear emphasis on the Temple of Diva Faustina, *aeternitas*, and *consecratio*. Coins depicting the Temple of Diva Faustina show a hexastyle temple with unidentifiable pediment sculpture, acroterial sculpture of Victories at either corner of the roof, a quadriga or biga at the apex, a conspicuous raised cult image of Diva Faustina, and a balustrade or fence across the bottom of the broad stairway entry (**Fig. 7.21**).⁹⁹⁷ Variations, including one with the reverse legend DEDICATIO AEDIS, specifically commemorate the dedication of the Temple of Diva Faustina and show the temple without the cult statue (**Fig. 7.22**).⁹⁹⁸ In yet another variation the ashlar masonry and closed door of the cella are visible through the hexastyle pronaos.⁹⁹⁹

Copious Diva Faustina issues with the legend AETERNITAS on the reverse generally bear iconography relating the eternity of Diva Faustina to imperial power, such as female figures of Aeternitas holding a scepter, globe and scepter, or the radiate phoenix (**Fig. 7.23**).¹⁰⁰⁰ Coin reverses combining sidereal imagery with AETERNITAS, such as a single eight-rayed star or Aeternitas holding a globe and raising a starred mantel over her head, attest that the celestial understanding of the *divi* continued to be a priority under Antoninus Pius (**Figs. 7.24 and 7.25**).¹⁰⁰¹ Finally, Consecratio issues bearing peacocks highlight Faustina's change in ontological status to Diva Faustina; in the visual repertoire of empresses the peacock had become

⁹⁹⁶ Rowan 2012, 995-6.

⁹⁹⁷ See, e.g., *RIC* III nos. 343, 354, 396.

⁹⁹⁸ *RIC* III no. 388.

⁹⁹⁹ *RIC* III no. 406A.

¹⁰⁰⁰ E.g., Aeternitas holding a scepter: *RIC* III no. 345; Aeternitas holding a phoenix: *RIC* III no. 347; Aeternitas holding a globe and scepter: *RIC* III no. 350.

¹⁰⁰¹ Eight rayed star: *RIC* III no. 355. Aeternitas with starred mantle: *RIC* III no. 1006.

one of the vehicles of apotheosis on which a deified empress could ascend to the heavens (**Fig. 7.26**).¹⁰⁰²

Having been incorporated into the Church of San Miranda in Lorenzo as early as the seventh century or as late as the eleventh century, the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina is remarkably well preserved (**Fig. 7.27**). The hexastyle colonnade of the three column-deep, prostyle temple, situated on the northern side of the Sacred Way at the entrance to the Roman Forum, faces south toward the Regia (**Fig. 7.28**). At just 22 m wide by 32 m long the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina is considerably smaller than the Hadrianeum, perhaps due to the constraints of the site, a location that allowed a direct visual connection with the imperial residence on the Palatine, possibly emphasizing the familial link between the temple as a memorial and the family home.¹⁰⁰³ Differences between the Hadrianeum, which Antoninus Pius dedicated in 145, and the Temple of Diva Faustina, begun by Antoninus Pius in 141, are striking: the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina has a very high podium of peperino in opus quadratum, was built in an extremely confined space as a solitary building rather than part of a larger complex, and has a hexastyle, prostyle pronaos rather than a pseudodipteral plan. In other words, the Italic style of the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius contrasts with the Greek style of the Hadrianeum, itself reminiscent of the Temple of Venus and Roma.¹⁰⁰⁴

A staircase of twenty-one steps with a rectangular structure in the center and a balustrade across the front, led up to the Temple of Divus Antoninus and Diva Faustina from the Sacred Way. Alternatively identified as a pulvinar or an altar, the cement core of the rectangular element

¹⁰⁰² See e.g., *RIC* III no. 384. Cf. *RIC* III no. 387, bearing an eagle.

¹⁰⁰³ Thomas 2007, 188.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Boatwright makes a similar observation noting that the same imperial quarries must have been providing stone for both temples being built at the same time (Boatwright 2010, 177-8).

survives in the middle of the staircase.¹⁰⁰⁵ Flanking the staircase were pedestals supporting statues; a popular location for the erection of statues of Romans honored for their services to Rome and the imperial court. For example, in 176 the Senate dedicated a statue to T. Pomponius Proculus Vitrasius Pollius ‘in pronao aedis divi Pii’, and another in 176-180 to M. Bassaeus Rufus.¹⁰⁰⁶

The monolithic cipollino columns from Carystos in Euboea, with white marble Corinthian capitals, constituting an order just under 50 Roman feet, would have dominated the façade of the temple and evoked the cipollino columns that adorned the Temple of Diva Matidia. Edmund Thomas notes that the combination of new materials with the temple in the traditional Etruscan and Roman style would have been striking to viewers.¹⁰⁰⁷ Sections of the surviving frieze still *in situ* on the long sides of the temple display antithetical griffins flanking candelabra and sacrificial vessels, and interspersed with acanthus scrolls; highly appropriate symbols of religious piety (**Fig. 7.29**). At least one inscription from 213-216 attests to the recurring activity of the Sodales Antoniniani at the temple.¹⁰⁰⁸

Though Boatwright notes that the senatorial involvement in the temple and decree of honors by the Senate in honor of Diva Faustina as evidenced by the architrave inscription was extraordinary, as demonstrated herein the Senate was consistently and conspicuously involved in the decrees of deification and implementation of divine honors.¹⁰⁰⁹ A statue of Antoninus Pius dedicated at the temple would have suggested to viewers the inevitable deification of Antoninus

¹⁰⁰⁵ Altar: see, e.g., Caronna 2001. Pulvinar: see, e.g., Thomas 2007, 187.

¹⁰⁰⁶ T. Pomponius: *CIL* 6.1540. M. Bassaeus Rufus: *CIL* 6.1599.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Thomas 2007, 187-8.

¹⁰⁰⁸ *CIL* 6.2001.

¹⁰⁰⁹ *SHA Pius* 6.7. Pensabene 1996, 178.

Pius and his eventual incorporation as Divus Antoninus Pius in the temple.¹⁰¹⁰ The architrave inscription records the first dedication of the temple to Diva Faustina, while an inscription on the frieze added later reflects the rededication of the temple to Divus Antoninus Pius: DIVO ANTONINO ET / DIVAE FAUSTINAE EX S C ('to the Divine Antoninus and Divine Faustina from by decree of the Senate').¹⁰¹¹ Echoing the inscription on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus across the Roman Forum, this inscription records the names of the gods in the temple and underscores the public participation in the project 'by decree of the Senate'. Also similar, the Antonine inscription lacks mention of any other patron or imperial successor, dynastic reference, lifetime titles of Antoninus Pius, or other chronological marker, thereby encouraging the perception of the cult's antiquity and its public, as opposed to dynastic, patronage.¹⁰¹²

None of the controversy that accompanied Hadrian's deification tarnished the memory of Antoninus Pius immediately after his death:

Upon his death Antoninus was pronounced divine by the Senate. Everyone competed to praise his piety, clemency, intelligence, and upright life. He was voted all of the honors which were ever bestowed on the best emperors before him, and was awarded a flamen-priest, games, a temple, and a priesthood to serve the temple. Practically alone of all the emperors Antoninus lived his personal life without shedding the blood of either country man or foreign foe, and he is deservedly compared to Numa, whose prosperity, piety, tranquility, and religious rites he always maintained.¹⁰¹³

¹⁰¹⁰ *CIL* 6.1002.

¹⁰¹¹ *CIL* 6.1005.

¹⁰¹² For a discussion of the inscription on the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, see above 158.

¹⁰¹³ *SHA Pius* 13.3-4: (*A senatu divus est appellatus cunctis certatim adnitentibus, cum omnes eius pietatem, clementiam, ingenium, sanctimoniam laudarent. Decreti etiam sunt omnes honores, qui optimis principibus ante delati sunt. Meruit et flaminem et circenses et templum et sodales Antoninianos solusque omnium prope principum prorsus [sine] civili sanguine et hostili, quantum ad se ipsum pertinet, vixit et qui rite comparatur Numae, cuius felicitatem pietatemque et securitatem cerimoniasque semper obtinuit.*)

As Antoninus Pius had commemorated Diva Faustina, Marcus Aurelius extensively commemorated the deification of Antoninus Pius in coin issues, many of which Marcus Aurelius issued in connection with rededication of the Temple of Diva Faustina in honor of her deified husband. Consecratio issues bore the eagle perched on a globe or an altar, or an image of the funeral pyre; other issues displayed monuments erected to commemorate the god such as the Column of Antoninus Pius or a square altar (**Figs. 7.30**).¹⁰¹⁴

P. Pensabene persuasively argues that the iconographic, architectural, and topographic specifics of the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius are characterized by three programmatic choices: a return to the traditional Italic-Roman plan, location at the entrance to the Roman Forum, and the sculpture including cult statues, acroteria of Victories, and the frieze with griffins and candelabra. As a unified whole, Pensabene continues, the function of the temple was to exalt the dynasty and celebrate the apotheosis of its members.¹⁰¹⁵ Although the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius undoubtedly reflected positively on the Antonine dynasty, the temple was not an overtly or even primarily dynastic monument; surviving evidence does not suggest that there was any reference, overt or otherwise, in image or inscription, to any other members of the family or even to the family name. Admittedly, a temple to a *divus* overtly foregrounds the apotheosis of the once living emperor now housed as a god in the temple, and in that respect may be considered to celebrate the apotheosis by providing a sacred site for ongoing veneration and ritual in favor of the god; however it is suggested here that the Antonines creatively designed other monumental means of celebrating apotheosis through the permanent structures erected in the Campus Martius near the sites of the funeral pyres, as discussed below. The Temple of Divus

¹⁰¹⁴ CONSECRATIO with eagle on globe: *RIC* III nos. 1262, 1263. CONSECRATIO with eagle on altar: *RIC* III no. 430. CONSECRATIO with ustrina: *RIC* III no. 1266. Reverse with DIVO PIO S C and Column of Antoninus Pius: *RIC* III no. 1269. Reverse with DIVO PIO S C and square altar: *RIC* III no. 1272.

¹⁰¹⁵ Pensabene 1996.

Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina should be understood, rather, in terms of the conspicuous and often-promoted restoration of the Temple of Divus Augustus also completed under Antoninus Pius.

Restoration of the Temple of Divus Augustus: Renewing and Reinforcing the Imperial Past

Antoninus Pius restored the Temple of Divus Augustus commemorating the restoration with multiple coins issues beginning in 158 and continuing throughout his reign.¹⁰¹⁶ Though the coins presented some variation, the images of the octastyle temple with extensive pedimental sculpture, a quadriga at the apex, and opposing acroterial statue groups of Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius on one side of the roof, and Romulus carrying the *spolia opima* on the other, were remarkably consistent (**Figs. 7.31 and 7.32**). Differing from the image of the Temple of Divus Augustus displayed on coins of Caligula in one important respect, the image of the restored temple on coins of Antoninus Pius prominently displayed seated cult statues of Divus Augustus and Diva Livia. Though Caligula no longer stands before Divus Augustus poised for the slaughter as in the Caligula coins, the image of the temple on Antonine coins may have also emphasized ritual conducted at the temple. Depictions of temples with conspicuously visible cult statues likely reminded viewers of festal days when temple doors were left open so that Romans could see inside the temple and so that the god could witness the sacrifice at the altar in front of the temple.¹⁰¹⁷ Stewart notes that the corresponding depictions of cult images in the coins of Antoninus Pius showing the Temple of Divus Augustus and the Temple of Diva Faustina associate the images visually; both show the temple with cult statues elevated above prominent ground lines or bases. This convention for displaying cult statues within the temples, he

¹⁰¹⁶ See, e.g., *RIC* III nos. 143, 272a, 284, 290a, 755, 787, 1004, 1013, 1017.

¹⁰¹⁷ Zanker 1997, 179; Stewart 2003, 210.

conjectures, may have been intentionally ambiguous to suggest cult statues *or* divine epiphanies.¹⁰¹⁸

Antoninus Pius drew additional attention to the restoration of the Temple of Divus Augustus by issuing a series of aurei evoking the iconography of the temple's pediment and acroteria during the years leading up to completion of the project. Bearing images almost identical to the acroteria sculpture, aurei from between 140 and 144 show Romulus bareheaded and moving forward carrying the *spolia opima*, and Aeneas advancing, carrying Anchises on his shoulder and holding Ascanius by the hand (Fig. 7.33).¹⁰¹⁹ On another coin Mars appears in the context of Rome's foundation myths; naked and holding a spear as he descends toward a sleeping Rhea Silvia (Fig. 7.34).¹⁰²⁰

As a demonstration of the way in which the past and present have the capacity to support each other in mutual dialogue, through the seemingly simple act of restoring the Temple of Divus Augustus, along with the corresponding commemorative coin series, Antoninus Pius reinforced the *aeternitas*, or timelessness, of Divus Augustus in the present. The restoration declared continuity with the first emperor and underlined the prominence of conventional classical architecture in the hierarchy of monumental forms in Rome.¹⁰²¹ Mnemonic reinforcement, however, decontextualizes information as it preserves it by bringing original associations into the present without accompanying contexts.¹⁰²² Thus, any Julio-Claudian dynastic associations of Divus Augustus still relevant more than one hundred years after dedication of the temple, were further blurred by the integration of the temple into the Antonine

¹⁰¹⁸ Stewart 2003, 211.

¹⁰¹⁹ Romulus: *RIC* III no. 90. Aeneas, Anchises, Ascanius: *RIC* III no. 92.

¹⁰²⁰ *RIC* III nos. 99, 694a.

¹⁰²¹ Thomas 2007, 35.

¹⁰²² Fentress and Wickham 1992, 79.

building program. Moreover, restoring and celebrating the Temple of Divus Augustus secured the status of Divus Augustus in the hierarchy of state gods, as well as that of all the *divi*; renewal of the building could be regarded as a practical commitment not only by Antoninus Pius, but also by the Roman administration, towards maintaining the religious order of which Divus Augustus was a part.¹⁰²³

By associating himself with the restored Temple of Divus Augustus, Antoninus Pius altered the historical course of the monument and positioned himself as the most recent in a long line of emperors who demonstrated loyalty and filial piety to their illustrious predecessors.¹⁰²⁴ Details in Tacitus describing the destruction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus in 69 demonstrate how the mental conception of a temple encompassed the accumulation of its history.¹⁰²⁵ Tacitus identifies the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus for readers not through its appearance, but through its history:

This shrine, founded after due auspices by our ancestors as a pledge of empire . . . this was the shrine that the mad fury of emperors destroyed ! . . . King Tarquinius Priscus vowed it in the war with the Sabines, laid its foundations rather to match his hope of future greatness than in accord with what the fortunes of the Roman people, still moderate, could supply. Later it was begun by Servius Tullius and carried on by Tarquinius Superbus, the glory of completion reserved for liberty, dedicated by Horatius Pulvillus in his second consulship after expulsion of the kings, rebuilt on same spot in the consulship of Lucius Scipio and Gaius Norbanus. Lutatius Catulus dedicated it in 69 BC. This was the temple that was burned.¹⁰²⁶

¹⁰²³ Barrett 1993, 238.

¹⁰²⁴ On restoration and its memory effects on the temple as a historical monument, see Orlin 2007.

¹⁰²⁵ Tac. *Hist.* 3.

¹⁰²⁶ Tac. *Hist.* 3.72: (*Id facinus post conditam urbem luctuosissimum foedissimumque rei publicae populi Romani accidit, nullo externo hoste, propitiis, si per mores nostros liceret, deis, sedem Iovis Optimi Maximi auspiciato a maioribus pignus imperii conditam, quam non Porsenna dedita urbe neque Galli capta temerare potuissent, furore principum excindi . . . voverat Tarquinius Priscus rex bello Sabino, ieceratque fundamenta spe magis futurae magnitudinis quam quo modicae adhuc populi Romani res sufficerent. mox Servius Tullius sociorum studio, dein Tarquinius Superbus capta Suessa Pometia hostium spoliis extruxere. sed gloria operis libertati reservata: pulsus regibus Horatius Pulvillus iterum consul dedicavit ea magnificentia quam immensae postea populi Romani opes ornarent potius quam auferent. isdem rursus vestigiis situm est, postquam interiecto quadringentorum quindecim*

There is a tendency to emphasize elements of the past that are consistent with, or viewed as prefiguring, one's present identity.¹⁰²⁷ Perhaps most importantly, Antoninus Pius' restoration of the Temple of Divus Augustus was in sense prospective as it would have prefigured his own deification and possibly that of his successors. Certainly, the restoration would have provided a direct ideological link to the topographically proximate Temple of Diva Faustina on the other side of the Roman Forum, a link encouraged by the prominent cult images of Diva Faustina and Diva Livia on the coins commemorating their respective temples. Antoninus Pius highlighted the formal, topographical, and ideological connection between the two temples to demonstrate that the Temple of Diva Faustina followed the precedent set by the temple to the first deified emperor; a temple that primarily functioned as a dynamic cult site, constructing the god within as an eternal god of the Roman state pantheon, and only secondarily, reflected on the dynasty of which the historical emperor had once been a part.

Commemoration of the *Divi* Under the Antonines

The Antonine emperors were the first since Domitian to monumentalize commemoration of the *divi* in contexts outside of their temples, particularly under Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. This section notes a few prominent examples: the Apotheosis of Sabina Relief, Column of Antoninus Pius, Column of Marcus Aurelius, and consecration monuments of the Antonines in the Campus Martius. A brief analysis of the mnemonic and topographic context of Antonine commemoration of deification reveals that the Antonines learned a valuable lesson

annorum spatio L. Scipione C. Norbano consulibus flagraverat. curam victor Sulla suscepit, neque tamen dedicavit: hoc solum felicitati eius negatum. Lutatii Catuli nomen inter tanta Caesarum opera usque ad Vitellium mansit. ea tunc aedes cremabatur).

¹⁰²⁷ Zerubavel 2003, 52.

from the Flavians: while it was permissible to commemorate a *divus* in the context of a retrospective or funerary monument such as the Arch of Titus, mnemonic disjunction prevented the incorporation of funerary function or retrospective memorials into the context of religious veneration, as Domitian attempted with the Temple of the Gens Flavia. Building on the precedent of the Arch of Titus, the Antonines expanded commemoration of the *divi*, all while maintaining their cults in accordance with established precedent.

Haeckl may be correct when she argues that it was in response to the narrowly defined dynastic tomb that the Antonine emperors of the second century elaborated the architectural articulation of the process of imperial consecration into a new system of tripartite funerary commemoration consisting of an ustrina, honorific column without the burial chamber, and a temple to each new Antonine *divus*.¹⁰²⁸ The temples of the Antonine *divi*, however, were not part of the retrospective commemoration embodied in the consecration monuments and column monuments. The Hadrianeum was separated from the ‘funerary’ zone north of the Via Recta and incorporated into a group of temples on an entirely different orientation; the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Divus Faustina was on the edge of the Roman Forum; and while the location of the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius remains unknown there is good reason to believe, as discussed below, that it was not associated with the Column of Marcus Aurelius as has been traditionally assumed.

It is also important to note that Marcus Aurelius was the first emperor for whom the temple of his deified predecessor was already complete, albeit dedicated to Diva Faustina. Though Marcus Aurelius extensively commemorated his deified father on coins and rededicated the Temple of Diva Faustina to Divus Antoninus Pius, it is plausible that rededication of an

¹⁰²⁸ Haeckl 1996, 24.

existing temple was insufficient for Marcus Aurelius to demonstrate his *pietas*, especially as compared to the extraordinary piety for which Antoninus Pius was known. Remembrance of the apotheosis itself through the permanent monuments erected in the Campus Martius gave Marcus Aurelius the opportunity to publicly and permanently demonstrate his *pietas* while emphasizing the celestial and eternal nature of Diva Faustina and Divus Antoninus Pius in monumental form in a context not directly connected to cult veneration.

Apotheosis of Sabina Relief

After the Arch of Titus and the arresting image of Divus Titus flying on an eagle's back, the commemoration of deification in monumental form (as opposed to veneration of the *divi* in temples dedicated to the gods or commemoration of them on coin images) all but disappeared until the Apotheosis of Sabina Relief.¹⁰²⁹ Found in a fifth century arch spanning the Via Lata/Flaminia north of the Ara Pacis that was made up of a number of reused reliefs including an Adlocutio relief of Hadrian, the original location of the Apotheosis of Sabina relief remains controversial. The Apotheosis and Adlocutio reliefs are believed to be from the same monument in the Campus Martius, one associated either with the funeral of Sabina, such as a funerary altar or column monument near her funeral pyre, or with the arch at the entrance to the Hadrianeum.¹⁰³⁰ As evident from this range of interpretations, the date of the reliefs, during the final years of Hadrian's reign or early in the reign of Antoninus Pius, is similarly controversial.

¹⁰²⁹ Apotheosis of Sabina Relief: Palazzo dei Conservatori Museum, main staircase, from the Arco di Portogallo on the Via del Corso, inv. MC1213, 295 cm. Restored: ashlar masonry, flames, stone under the youth's elbow, head and right arm of Hadrian, head of attendant. For a summary of arguments concerning a late Hadrianic or early Antonine date, see Etienne 1986, 449-50.

¹⁰³⁰ For a summary of the debates over the date of the reliefs and the specific event depicted in the Adlocutio relief, see Bonanno 1976, 108-9. VanderLeest concludes that although the reliefs belonged to the same monument, they were not necessarily directly related, and he interprets the Adlocutio relief as the funeral laudation of L. Aelius Verus rather than of Sabina (VanderLeest 1995).

The main elements of the Apotheosis relief survive despite heavy restoration of elements including the low-relief ashlar masonry funerary pyre, and flames that are unprecedented in any other representation of apotheosis in ancient art (**Fig. 7.35**). Sabina reclining on the back of a female figure brandishing a torch and with her outspread wings in flight, dominates the upper half of the relief. Below are three male figures. One togate male figure stands behind the seated figure of an emperor, the identity of which is probably Hadrian but the head and hand in the relief are restored, while a third male, draped only from the waist down and usually identified as a personification of the Campus Martius, reclines with his back to the viewer.¹⁰³¹

Also for the first time in official art since the Flavians, the Apotheosis of Sabina relief commemorates the moment of Sabina's ascent to the heavens, the theoretical instant in which her ontological state transformed from a mortal to a goddess, a moment also explicitly memorialized in an aureus of Hadrian with a reverse image depicting Sabina on the back of an eagle (**Fig. 7.36**).¹⁰³² As noted above, this renewed interest in the transformation in state during Hadrian's reign, was reflected in the coins of Diva Marciana and Diva Matidia that similarly bore the CONSECratio legend on the reverse.

Column of Antoninus Pius

Erected in the Campus Martius to Divus Antoninus Pius by his sons Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus in honor of their deified father after his death in 161, the Column of Antoninus Pius was a red granite monolith mounted on the column base that is displayed today in the Cortile della Pinacoteca in the Vatican Palace.¹⁰³³ With relief sculptures on three sides, the

¹⁰³¹ Doubting the traditional identification of the personification, see, e.g., Boatwright 1985, 497.

¹⁰³² *RIC* II no. 418b. .

¹⁰³³ *CIL* 6.1004: (Divo Antonino Aug. Pio / Antoninus Augustus et / Verus Augustus filii).

images on the column base celebrated the imperial funeral of Antoninus Pius and the apotheosis of Antoninus Pius and Faustina.¹⁰³⁴ The apotheosis scene was central, depicting Antoninus Pius and Faustina ascending to the heavens on the back of a winged male figure usually identified as Aeternitas (**Fig. 7.37**).¹⁰³⁵ Identified by the obelisk associated with him, a figure of the Campus Martius reclines in the lower left of the composition, across from a figure of Roma on the right, seated on arms and dressed in Amazonian garb. A subsidiary scene of a funerary *decursio* depicts soldiers and cavalrymen in the act of circumambulating the funeral pyre (**Fig. 7.38**).¹⁰³⁶

For the first time coins commemorated a monumental dedication to a *divus* other than a temple by presenting the Column of Antoninus Pius; one reverse depicting the column has the legend in the dative, DIVO PIO.¹⁰³⁷ The image of the column shows an unadorned shaft surmounted by a statue of Antoninus Pius, and resting on a high base surrounded by a metal fence or grate.

Column of Marcus Aurelius

Still visible along the modern day Via Corso in Rome, the Column of Marcus Aurelius was commissioned by Commodus shortly after the death of Marcus Aurelius in 180. Davies has convincingly argued that the column was not a triumphal monument erected after the early Marcomannic campaigns; rather it was a retrospective monument with a funerary function.¹⁰³⁸ Without the original inscription it is difficult to know whether the column was dedicated to

¹⁰³⁴ See Boatwright 2010, 186-94. On the Column of Antoninus Pius as an imperial accession monument, see Davies 2000.

¹⁰³⁵ Cf. Davies who interprets the winged male figure as Aion, equivalent to 'life' or 'vital force' (2000, 100-102).

¹⁰³⁶ On the *decursio* and the scene on the Column of Antoninus Pius, see Davies 1997, 57-8.

¹⁰³⁷ *RIC* III No. 1269.

¹⁰³⁸ Davies 2000, 165.

Divus Marcus Aurelius; however, the inscription of Adrastus, the Column's caretaker, identifies it as "the hundred foot column of the [deified] Marcus and Faustina."¹⁰³⁹ Later authors also list the Column as one of the honors accorded to Divus Marcus Aurelius by the Senate and People of Rome.¹⁰⁴⁰ A helical relief spiraling up the one hundred foot column is devoted to the Marcomannic Wars that began in 166-167. Mounted on an unusually tall pedestal of approximately 10.5 m, the column would have been highly visible from the Via Lata/Flaminia. For passersby the triumphal military nature of the column commemorating Marcus Aurelius' divinely assisted victories would have been readily apparent (**Fig. 7.39**). Reliefs from the eastern side of the pediment, though no longer surviving, prominently displayed heaps of armor flanking the door, and a frieze of enemy soldiers submitting to Marcus Aurelius on the battlefield.¹⁰⁴¹

"Arae Consecrationis" and the Antonine Dynastic Complex

Commemoration of the site of imperial ustrinae, funeral pyres on which the remains of a dead emperor or member of the imperial family was consecrated, through construction of a consecration memorial, further reflected a desire to concretize the memory of apotheosis.¹⁰⁴²

'Arae consecrationis' is a modern term used to refer to a permanent monument that was typically erected on the site of an ustrina, the ephemeral monument also commemorated under the Antonines in coin images.¹⁰⁴³

¹⁰³⁹ *CIL* 6.1585a, lines 5-6.

¹⁰⁴⁰ *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 16.15.

¹⁰⁴¹ Boatwright 2010, 191-4.

¹⁰⁴² 'Consecration memorial' is the term used by Boatwright (1985). These monuments have also been interpreted as consecration altars but there is insufficient evidence to suggest that any such ongoing sacrificial ritual as would be expected at an altar occurred at these monuments. On the commemorative altar complex theory, see Frischer 1982-1983; Danti 1993.

¹⁰⁴³ Describing the cremation of the body, see *Cass. Dio* 56.42; 75.4.2-5; 77.15.3-4.

Representation of the ustrina of Antoninus Pius on coins gives some idea of its form (Figs. 7.40 and 7.41).¹⁰⁴⁴ The lowest of the four tiers was garlanded, as was typical of monuments on festal days, while the middle two tiers were composed of arched niches containing full-length standing sculptures with one arm at the side and one arm raised. In the middle of the second tier a doorway indicates an entrance to the structure.¹⁰⁴⁵ Adorning the top level of the ustrina was a quadriga, likely bearing an image of Antoninus Pius, flanked by two torches. If Eve D'Ambra is correct that the sculptural program of the ustrina would have included images of the deceased emperor in various dress and roles such as togate, head covered as a priest, cuirassed as a general, and holding scrolls as an administrator, then depictions of the emperor in his lifetime roles would have had a retrospective outlook appropriate to a funeral monument.¹⁰⁴⁶ Following this mnemonic strategy, D'Ambra also argues for paintings depicting battles, ceremonial events, or other career milestones.

As Herodian describes, the funeral pyre is the structure around which funeral rites such as the *decursiones funebres*, a ritual in which priests, soldiers, chariots with actors wearing masks of famous Roman generals and emperors, and equestrians circled the funeral pyre in a counterclockwise direction, was carried out.¹⁰⁴⁷ D'Ambra emphasizes the central role of the ustrina as an ephemeral monument in funerary ritual and a focus of procession and rites, one that would have been imprinted in the public memory long after the ustrina disappeared through the recollection of the ceremony that marked the change of state of the emperor who left behind

¹⁰⁴⁴ *RIC* III nos. 438 and 1262. The consistency in the images of funeral pyres suggests that although numismatic conventions abbreviated the image, the representation emphasized the elements that were most recognizable and most characteristic to the form (D'Ambra 2010, 291).

¹⁰⁴⁵ Ancient sources describe garlands, gold-embroidered drapery swags, statues and paintings, and a quadriga or biga on the top of the monument (Cassius Dio 75.5.4; Her. 4.2.7).

¹⁰⁴⁶ D'Ambra 2010, 298.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Writing about the funeral of Septimius Severus, Her. 4.2.20. On the *decursio*, see Davies 1997; D'Ambra 2010, 298.

clouds of scented perfumes as he became a *divus*.¹⁰⁴⁸ Images of the funeral pyre and ascension to the heavens traced the flight path of the deceased emphasizing the celestial nature of the new god and recalling the citizen's role in the extraordinary events by witnessing the apotheosis at the funeral.

As opposed to the ephemeral nature of the imperial *ustrinae*, the consecration monument erected after the funeral and apotheosis of the emperor remained permanently in the Roman urban landscape. Taking the same basic form, the consecration monuments of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius are the best preserved: each consists of a central altar surrounded by two concentric square enclosures with openings for access to the inner precinct (**Fig. 7.42**)¹⁰⁴⁹ Although the consecration monuments were originally identified as imperial *ustrinae* in the late nineteenth century, Boatwright has refuted this identification reasoning that an *ustrina* would have been destroyed in the conflagration ending the imperial consecration ceremony.¹⁰⁵⁰ The consecration monument discovered near the Via degli Uffici del Vicatio has been identified with Antoninus Pius because of its proximity to, and orientation with, the Column of Antoninus Pius with which it formed a unified complex.¹⁰⁵¹ The outer enclosure consisting of cippi joined by metal grates is 30 m long per side, while the inner enclosure of peperino is 23 m long per side.¹⁰⁵² A second complex, generally associated with Marcus Aurelius and discovered during work in Palazzo Montecitorio, has an outer enclosure 24.45 m square formed by pilasters and an iron gate, and central altar complex 10.5 m square. The theory that these structures are altar

¹⁰⁴⁸ D'Ambra 2010.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Summarizing the evidence for these complexes, see Danti 1993. Because of the circumstantial nature of the evidence, Boatwright appropriately cautions against attributing either of the ceremonial monuments to a specific dedicant (1985, 189).

¹⁰⁵⁰ Boatwright concedes that these monuments commemorate the spot where the emperors were cremated (Boatwright 1985).

¹⁰⁵¹ The openings to the inner precinct face the Column of Antoninus Pius.

¹⁰⁵² See Boatwright 1985, 493-7; Danti 1993.

complexes derives from sculptural fragments now in the Museo Nazionale Romana that appear to have come from an altar of the type in the interior of the Ara Pacis.¹⁰⁵³

Imperial consecration monuments have been characterized as part of the Antonine dynastic complex dominating the Campus Martius from the time of Hadrian's reign.¹⁰⁵⁴ While the concentration of monuments to the Antonines in the Campus Martius is striking, their confinement to appropriate zones is rarely noted (**Fig. 7.43**). By the middle of the second century the Campus Martius was a large district in Rome encompassing distinct topographical associations. With the reconstruction of the Pantheon and the two large temple complexes of Diva Matidia and Divus Hadrian enclosed within their individual porticos, the area to the east of Nero's baths assumed a specifically sacral character associated with the Roman state cult.

Hadrian also systematized the northern part of the Campus Martius by raising the ground level two to three meters and paving the area stretching from the Tiber across to the Ara Pacis.¹⁰⁵⁵ Location of the imperial *ustrinae* and the subsequent consecration monuments seems to have been confined to an area south of the newly paved boundary laid out by Hadrian, north of the Via Recta, and west of the Via Lata/Flaminia, an area long associated with imperial funerals. Despite the association of the altars and columns with the change in the ontological status of the emperor from human to divine, construction of the Columns of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius in close proximity to the consecration monuments rather than in the vicinity of their temples, seems to suggest that the altars and column monuments were relegated to the funerary zone of the Campus Martius based on their primarily retrospective commemorative function.

¹⁰⁵³ For the different positions on this controversial theory, see Danti 1993.

¹⁰⁵⁴ See, e.g., Davies 2000, 166-70; Chausson 2001, 356.

¹⁰⁵⁵ On Hadrian's systematization of the Campus Martius, see, e.g., Wiseman 1993, 224; Boatwright 2010, 186-7.

Conclusion: Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius

Literary sources attest that Commodus dedicated a temple to Divus Marcus Aurelius after the emperor's death in 161.¹⁰⁵⁶ As expected, Commodus memorialized the deification of Marcus Aurelius on coins bearing iconography that follows the precedents set by the other Antonine emperors. Numerous coins reverses with the CONSECratio legend underscore the connection between imperial power and the *divi* with the eagle in various contexts such as standing on a globe or a garlanded altar, and holding a scepter (Figs 7.44 and 7.45).¹⁰⁵⁷

Regionary catalogs indicate a location in Region IX and, based on marble fragments found in the area of Palazzo Montecitorio that have been tenuously linked to the Temple of Marcus Aurelius, and the topographical relationship between the Temple of Divus Trajan and the Column of Trajan, some have assumed that the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius was in the vicinity of the Column of Marcus Aurelius.¹⁰⁵⁸ Regionary Catalogues clearly list a 'templum Antonini et columnam' with the 'Pantheum' and 'Basilicam Neptuni, Matidies, Marciani'.¹⁰⁵⁹

A Severan inscription further confuses the issue of the temple's location. Adrastus, a freedman who was in charge of the caretakers for the Column of Marcus Aurelius, asked Septimius Severus for a house near the monument, an honor recorded in two fragmentary inscriptions found near Palazzo Montecitorio.¹⁰⁶⁰ The house of Adrastus was discovered about sixty meters west of the Column of Marcus Aurelius; however, as Boatwright points out, the

¹⁰⁵⁶ SHA *Aur.* 18; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 16.

¹⁰⁵⁷ CONSECratio with eagle standing on a globe: *RIC* III no. 263. Eagle holding a scepter in its claws: *RIC* III no. 268. Eagle standing on garlanded altar: *RIC* III no. 272.

¹⁰⁵⁸ See, e.g., de Caprariis 1996.

¹⁰⁵⁹ See Chausson 2001, 366. Chausson also suggests that Divus Marcus Aurelius may have been venerated in the Hadrianeum or the Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina. Though this is certainly possibly no evidence has emerged to support this idea.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Inscription from the door jamb of the house: *CIL* 6.1585b. Plaque likely on the outer wall of the house: *CIL* 6.1585a. The inscriptions are fully published in Daguet-Gagey 1998; Chausson 2001, 371-5.

inscription indicates that Adrastus asked to build his house ‘behind the column’ (pos<[<] colu[mnam]) for the purpose of better performing his job.¹⁰⁶¹ If the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius were west of the Column of Marcus Aurelius, the only open area large enough and available at the time, she reasons, then Adrastus would have built his caretaker’s house on the far side of the temple, which would have made no sense in light of the caretaker’s stated purpose. Thus, Boatwright concludes that the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius was not in the area of the column.¹⁰⁶² Even if the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius was somewhere in the vicinity of the Column of Marcus Aurelius, their relationship with one another, whether in the same or independent complexes, is similarly unknown.

¹⁰⁶¹ The fragmentary lines 3 and 4 of CIL 6.1585b have been restored: ([ut rectius fungar officio meo]) (Boatwright 2010, 192-193).

¹⁰⁶² Boatwright 2010, 192-3. Boatwright also cites the functional nature of the environment and the lack of grandeur in the small caretaker’s house built of wood and tile, which would have been right next to the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius if it were in this area. *Cf.* Chausson, who concludes, based on the same evidence, that sixty meters is sufficient room to build a temple, that the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius could have been in the area west of the Column, and that the Temple of Divus Marcus Aurelius would have been near the Column of Marcus Aurelius to copy the configuration in Trajan’s forum (Chausson 2001, 371-5).

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS: ACCUMULATION AND INSCRIPTION

Impact of Accumulation

Having presented the scant evidence for the last temple dedicated to a deified emperor in Rome, it is worth considering the impact of the temples to the deified emperors as they accumulated over time.¹⁰⁶³ The cumulative nature of collective memory, in which new social and symbolic structures are superimposed on old ones, is important both for the memory of each individual emperor as a god as well as for the understanding of the deified emperors as a group.¹⁰⁶⁴ In terms of encoding in the human brain for purposes of semantic memory, Tulving has observed that continuity of inputs does not seem to be an important determinant of the structure of the mental thesaurus. Inputs, in this case new deified emperors incorporated into the urban and religious landscape of Rome, even widely separated in time may become closely related when they are coded into semantic memory through conceptual similarity.¹⁰⁶⁵

As demonstrated, after the dedication of a temple and initial sacrifice each temple had a long memory history that could include commemoration on coins, recurring annual sacrifices and festivals on the *dies natalis*, addition of a goddess to receive veneration in the temple, use as a site for speeches and meetings, location of commemorative statuary, restoration and rededication, and invocation in various contexts in literary works. By understanding the later

¹⁰⁶³ Coin evidence suggests that Maxentius dedicated a temple in memory of his son Romulus, who died in 309; however, it does not appear that the temple in honor of Romulus was ever part of the Roman state cult. The temple dedicated to Romulus has been identified with a circular brick structure on the east side of the Sacra Via between the Temple of Divus Antoninus and Diva Faustina and the Basilica of Constantine. This identification is no longer accepted. See Papi 1995.

¹⁰⁶⁴ See e.g. Schwartz 2000, 301.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Tulving 1972, 397.

history of the temple and cult we are better able to understand how the Romans incorporated the ahistorical, eternal *divi* into the historical system of commemoration and memorialization.

Viewing the temples as a group highlights their similarities and competition among them, both of which were essential to a nuanced understanding of the way they functioned. A mnemohistory of the temples brings to the fore the delicate negotiation in which emperors were constantly engaged, between differentiating themselves from their predecessors and incorporating themselves into the ongoing tradition of imperial rule, a process through which emperors simultaneously aligned themselves with the past and made claims to exceed the greatness of their predecessors.

Earlier temples and cults to the *divi* presented multiple avenues through which later emperors could articulate nuanced messages. In a very general sense, it seems monuments that commemorated lifetime achievements including particular battles or benefactions, primarily functioned to differentiate emperors. For example, though both Augustus and Trajan participated in triumphs for spectacular victories in Actium and Dacia respectively, the triumphal glory embodied by the insistent ideology of the Forum of Trajan claimed to surpass the triumphal glories of all that came before.

The temples to the deified emperors on the other hand, despite variations in topographical context, size, and sculptural and decorative embellishment, decreased distinctions among *divi* by emphasizing a purposeful and constructed similarity among the dead emperors that was not present in monuments to lifetime emperors.¹⁰⁶⁶ By assimilating the past of the historical emperors, conflating them all into the category of ‘gods of the Roman state pantheon’, the temples ironed out their historical differences, a process furthered by the passage of time as

¹⁰⁶⁶ Rappaport 1999.

people who experienced a particular period in history died and first-hand knowledge of an earlier emperor faded. Moreover, all of the temples to the deified emperors maintained the essentially recognizable aspects of Roman temple form establishing that veneration of the god within was an essential part of maintaining the *pax deorum*.

Accumulation of temples may be considered a physical testament, a sort of index of the strength and endurance of the Empire, in a mechanism akin to the way in which for Halbwachs, the permanence and interior appearance of a home imposes on the group a comforting image of its own continuity.¹⁰⁶⁷ In other words, more *divi* meant the existence of a longer and stronger Empire. As a group the temples seem to have answered Vitruvius' call that buildings should correspond to the grandeur of Roman history and be a memorial to future ages.¹⁰⁶⁸

Inscribing the City

Physical accumulation of temples in the city, eleven over the course of approximately two hundred years, demonstrates how Roman memory was mapped onto the urban landscape (**Fig. 8.1**). If, as Aldo Rossi famously asserts, “One can say that the city itself is the collective memory of its people, and like memory it is associated with objects and places,” then the shifting form of the city can provide significant clues about the shifting memories of its citizens and the collective mental life of its inhabitants.¹⁰⁶⁹ Catharine Edwards has described Rome as a “storehouse of Roman memories”, including images, buildings, and texts that recalled and promoted Rome's past.¹⁰⁷⁰ Buildings effect both a physical transformation in the cityscape as

¹⁰⁶⁷ Halbwachs and Coser 1992.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Vit. *De Arch.* 1.3.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Rossi 1982, 130. On the reciprocal relationship between memory and urban space, see e.g. Lynch 1960; Cancik 1985-1986; Rosenfeld 2000; Gowing 2005, 132-58.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Edwards 1996, 119.

well as a transformation in the collective mental life of its inhabitants. The observations of Hölkeskamp with respect to the mnemonic significance of Rome's urban space in the Republican period hold true in the Imperial period: “. . . we may view the city of Rome in the middle and late Republic as a ‘stage of history’ in a double sense of the term, as an urban space where important events took place and remembrance of these events, ‘historical’ and ‘mythical’, was staged in a permanent scenery or landscape of memory.”¹⁰⁷¹

It has been suggested here that in each temple and cult to a deified emperor the personal history and personality of the historical emperor were dissolved in favor of his inclusion in the totality of Roman religious remembrance, and, over time, into an idealized group of emperors that included only those that Romans chose to represent what it meant to be an emperor.¹⁰⁷²

While monuments such as the Parthian Arch of Augustus or the Columns of Trajan, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius prompted recall of triumphal acts and heroic deeds, temples to the deified emperors recalled and anticipated the eternal glory of the divinely favored Roman Empire through its deified rulers.¹⁰⁷³ At the end of the second century the Parthian Arch, for example, remained as a historical monument from an earlier epoch of the imperial period; however, the Temple of Divus Augustus was a dynamic ‘present’ and future cult structure relevant to the continuing prosperity of the Roman state. There was no single mode of remembering a Roman emperor; rather within the Roman urban landscape there were myriad ways, modes, and media of preservation that coexisted.

As noted above the temples were related epigraphically; each temple for which evidence of the inscription survives, including the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus and

¹⁰⁷¹ Hölkeskamp 2006, 258.

¹⁰⁷² Hekster notes that under Trajan deified emperors were beginning to be considered as a set (2008).

¹⁰⁷³ On the city as a work of art, as a set of pictorial images and theatrical sites set action as stimuli for recollection, see Boyer 1994, 33-4.

Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Faustina, indicates that the name of the *divus* would have been prominently displayed on the façade architrave. Their formal similarities also allowed them to be read together as an interrelated group linked by their connection to the concept of the emperor. At any given time during the imperial period a mental snapshot of Rome containing the temples to the deified emperors would have revealed a synchronic, non-sequential history of the imperial past as crystalized in the Roman collective memory; a ‘timeless memory world’ in which all of the past good emperors were eternally present in the city of Rome.¹⁰⁷⁴ Following Gowing who asserts that the Roman past wholly defined the present, this snapshot of select imperial history would have contributed to the contemporary understanding of the imperial office.¹⁰⁷⁵ Each new temple in the landscape represented a new phase of the Empire translated into spatial terms. This comprehensive view of the city at a specific time and place is encapsulated in the statement of Aelius Aristides writing in the middle to late second century, “If one has beheld the city itself and the boundaries of the city, one can no longer be amazed that the entire civilized world is ruled by one so great.”¹⁰⁷⁶

In an interesting contradiction, the existence of more temples to *divi* also implies the passage of time: the more emperors deified necessarily means that more years and imperial reigns of historical emperors have passed, even though the specific historical context of those emperors is not at the forefront. In viewing the past, however, Lowenthal has theorized that accumulations of time have a curious capacity to surpass the dissolution of that time yielding sums greater than their parts.¹⁰⁷⁷ In this specific context the imperial past, as an accumulation of

¹⁰⁷⁴ Flower uses the phrase ‘timeless memory world’, to describe the parade of ancestors at the aristocratic funeral all together acting together in the present (Flower 2010, 5).

¹⁰⁷⁵ Gowing 2005, 2.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Ael. Aris. *Ad Rom.* 9.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Lowenthal 1985, 59-60.

deified emperors, was appreciated less for the sake of individual emperors than for their role in the group that brought the Roman Empire into the present.¹⁰⁷⁸

Formal, ritual, and iconographic similarities among the temples and cults of *divi* would have rendered the deified emperors more or less equal in the realm of Roman state religion conflating them in time. Articulating the way in which religious groups recall certain remembrances on viewing specific locations, buildings, or objects, Halbwachs explains “He believes on entering a church, cemetery, or other consecrated place that he will recover a mental state he has experienced many times . . . he will re-establish, in addition to their visible community, a common thought and remembrance formed and maintained there through the ages.”¹⁰⁷⁹

Transformation of space, as Rossi elaborates, is always conditioned by whatever material realities oppose it. The transformation of the city of Rome into the capital of an eternal Empire defined in part by its deified emperors, responds to the material realities of change and cyclical decline.¹⁰⁸⁰ The temples to the deified emperors would have represented the Empire as uninterrupted and enduring despite the change in individual emperors through the physical embodiment of Tacitus’s statement, “Statesmen are mortal, the state eternal.”¹⁰⁸¹ The enduring presence of the temples in the cityscape provided permanence in response to an Empire that was always evolving in the face of constantly negotiated changes in power.

Grunow speaks of a metatopography that contextualizes representations of buildings: “by putting the image of one monument with all its historical and symbolic associations into the

¹⁰⁷⁸ Lowenthal 1985, 61.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Halbwachs and Coser 1992.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Grunow 2002.

¹⁰⁸¹ Tac. *Ann.* 3.4.

context of another monument was a powerful iconographic tool.” Though Grunow focuses on representations of different buildings combined in a single scene whether on a coin or a relief, a similar concept may be applied to mental representations of the city. A Rome in which one temple to a *divus* marks the urban landscape presents a very different mental image than a city in which eleven spectacular buildings and images dominate the cityscape. A new temple to a *divi* changed the context and understanding of earlier temples and their gods; it was a different situation to be one of two *divi* venerated in state temples and one of eight *divi* venerated in state temples. During the imperial period nine of twenty new temples in the city of Rome were dedicated to deified emperors. This new concentration, however, did not reduce the importance of the ‘traditional’ gods, but incorporated the *divi* into the existing fabric of the Roman religious topography.

Lawrence and Smith emphasize the uniquely reciprocal relationship of Rome and its *Fasti*, noting that the whole city served as a spatial calendar because of the nature of the *Feriale*, marking the festivals that represent processions and sacrifices in, through, and around the city.¹⁰⁸² With each addition of a temple to a *divi* was a corresponding addition of festal days on the calendar. In a parallel phenomenon, as discussed in Chapter 2, with each new temple to a *divus* came a new day marked out on the *Fasti* to celebrate the *dies natalis* of the temple and venerate the god. As the temples altered the physical space of the city, they also altered the temporal framework of religious veneration. They did so in a specific way, however, that did not reflect the original temporal significance of the historical emperor. Despite the widely varying lengths of time that each emperor had ruled, on the calendar, with few exceptions, they each occupy the same amount of time.

¹⁰⁸² Lawrence and Smith 1995-1996, 140.

Centrality of Rome

As more than one scholar has appropriately emphasized, there was not one imperial cult, but many cults throughout the Roman Empire, to the living emperor and to the deified emperors, that differed in many respects including their sponsors, participants, form, and emphasis.¹⁰⁸³ Cults to the deified emperors in Rome were unique in the proliferation of ‘imperial cults’ throughout the Roman Empire in that they were established by decree of the Senate as part of the official religion of the Roman state responsible for maintaining the *pax deorum*. The number of temple foundations to deified emperors represented new ways of conceptualizing the relationship between place and the traditions of Rome by relating Rome to the cosmic order.¹⁰⁸⁴ Practical necessities of Roman state religion administered in Rome probably required that the temples to the deified emperors be in Rome; however, their presence in the city also signified Rome’s centrality in an Empire that became increasingly fragmented as it grew, requiring imperial attention and administrative resources in the provinces rather than the center. Temples and cults of the *divi* reminded inhabitants of, and visitors to, the city of Rome of the traditions that set Rome apart from the other cities of the Empire.¹⁰⁸⁵

Despite Herodian’s famous assertion, “Where the emperor is, there is Rome”, there is also some truth to the statement that where the *divi* were remembered, there is Rome.¹⁰⁸⁶ Recognizing the ideological correlation between the city of Rome and place of burial, Augustus’ efforts to win public opinion to his cause against Marc Antony included accusations that Marc

¹⁰⁸³ On imperial cults in the provinces, see e.g. Yegül 1982; Price 1984; Fishwick 1987; Fishwick and Small 1996; Gradel 2002; Brodd and Reed 2011.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Beard, North and Price 1998, 256-60.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Boyer 1994, 30.

¹⁰⁸⁶ See Smith 1956, 56.

Antony planned to be buried in Egyptian soil rather than in Rome, further evidence that Marc Antony had sided with the Cleopatra. While this requirement did not apply to the average Roman, burial in the city of Rome was the norm for a Roman emperor. Even if the emperor died overseas, their remains were brought back to Rome as expeditiously as possible for burial.

As Halbwachs writes, “When a group is introduced into a part of space, it transforms it to its image, but at the same time, it yields and adapts itself to certain material things which resist it. It encloses itself in the framework that it has constructed.”¹⁰⁸⁷ The image of imperial Rome was one permeated, topographically and ritually by the cults of *divi*. As Romans traversed the cityscape, they experienced the insistent presence of the temples to *divi* that prompted identification with the Romans’ that worshipped at their altars for the benefit of all. Annual recurring events within this spatial framework served to further focus, in discrete temporal increments, a more intense awareness of past, present, and future. Even when, on a daily basis, the collective is dispersed and no ritual occurred at the temples the buildings remained, enduring in their significance.

The temples to the deified emperors signified the necessity of the emperor’s presence in the capital. As the *caput mundi*, Rome required its ruler. Ceremonial and cultic elaboration of a divinity specifically associated with an absent emperor’s return to Rome attests to its importance. The Senate dedicated an Altar to Fortuna Redux, the aspect of Fortuna that originally ensured the return of soldiers from war and came to be connected to the return of the emperor, on 15 December 19 BCE near the Porta Capena where Augustus entered Rome upon his return from Syria.¹⁰⁸⁸ Fasti of the Julio-Claudian period record games in honor of Divus Augustus and

¹⁰⁸⁷ Grunow 2002.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Cass. Dio 44.10.3. On the altar of Fortuna Redux, see Coarelli 1995.

Fortuna Redux on October 5.¹⁰⁸⁹ Later, Domitian built a temple in the Campus Martius to Fortuna Redux after his entry into the city in 93 and successful completion of the war in Germany.¹⁰⁹⁰

That the exit of the emperor from the city and his reentry into the city were closely linked in imperial ideology is demonstrated by the panel reliefs of Marcus Aurelius created for one or two monuments commemorating the victories of Marcus Aurelius over the Germans and Sarmatians, now displayed in the Museo Conservatori of the Capitoline Museum and on the Arch of Constantine.¹⁰⁹¹ Of the eight panels on the Arch of the Constantine, one depicts a profectio and one an adventus, both popular motifs in imperial art. Both types of scenes convey the significance of the emperor's physical presence in the city by depicting the ritualization of his return and departure, acknowledging the Roman gods that protected the emperor when he was away from the city.

In the adventus scene of Marcus Aurelius the emperor, accompanied by the bearded and cuirassed Mars and Victory and greeted by Roma wearing a helmet and shield, enters the city in front of a prominent temple and arch filling out the upper half of the composition. Identified as a Temple of Fortuna Redux, the monument underscores the emperor's return to Rome with the support of the gods.¹⁰⁹² A similar arch in the profectio scene topped by elephants identifies the urban setting of the profectio with that in the adventus scene. In the profectio scene the Genius of

¹⁰⁸⁹ See, e.g., the *Fasti Amiternini*, Degrassi 1963, 195

¹⁰⁹⁰ Mart. *Epig.* 8.65. On the temple of Fortuna Redux, see Coarelli 1995.

¹⁰⁹¹ On debates over the attribution of the panels to one or two monuments, concluding based on details of technique and portraits of Pompeianus, that the panels belong to two monuments, see Scott-Ryberg 1967, 84-93.

¹⁰⁹² Identification as Temple of Fortuna Redux, Scott-Ryberg 1967, 28-37; followed by Coarelli 1995.

the Senate accompanies Marcus Aurelius as he passes the personification of the Via Flaminica leaning on a wheel and embarks on military campaigns to the north.¹⁰⁹³

The temples to the deified emperors were iconic landmarks that symbolized the city of Rome as the center of the empire for the benefit of the citizens of Rome and the emperor. That the Senate decreed the temples and, with the people, dedicated them to the *divi* in Rome, declared the city's importance and reminded the emperor of his responsibilities to the capital. As the Empire expanded geographically and more senators and elites, and even emperors, came from families outside of the old Roman elite, Rome's monopoly over state temples to *divi* sustained over 200 years conveyed the city's prestige as the center of the Roman world. Rome, as the home of its eternal *divi*, was at the center of, and at all times present to, the Empire that rotated geographically and conceptually around it.

¹⁰⁹³ On the *profectio* and *adventus* scenes of Marcus Aurelius, see Scott-Ryberg 1967, 28-37.

FIGURE LIST

Figure 1.1. Temple of Divus Julius, reconstruction drawing.

Image: Stamper 2005, 109.

Figure 1.2. Temple of Divus Augustus, reverse, sestertius of Caligula, *RIC I*² no. 44, 39-40 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/caligula/RIC_0044.jpg.

Figure 1.3. Civil wars, denarius, *RIC I*² no. 116, 69-69 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/Civil_Wars/RIC_0116.jpg.

Figure 1.4. Forma Urbis, Temple of Divus Claudius.

Image: Rodríguez Almeida 1981, frag. 4b, pp. 26-7, pl. 2; 5a, pp. 26-7, 65-9, pl. 2; 5b, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5c, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5dg, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5e, pp. 26-7, pl. 2; 5f, pp. 26-7, 65, pl. 2; 5h, pp. 26-7, pl. 2.

Figure 1.5. Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, Roman Forum, *in situ* frieze.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 1.6. Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina, Roman Forum.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 1.7. Temple of Divus Hadrian, Giambattista Piranesi, *Le antichità Romane*, t. 1, tav. XIII.

Image: Sapelli 1999, 12.

Figure 2.1. Plan of the eastern end of the Roman Forum.

Image: Rich 1998.

Figure 2.2. Octavian, Temple of Divus Julius, denarius, *RSC I* no. 90; *BMCRE I* no. 32 36 BCE.

Image: www.wildwinds.com.

Figure 2.3. Sculptural frieze of the Temple of Divus Julius.

Image: Squarciapino 1957.

Figure 2.4. Underside of projecting geison block of the Temple of Divus Julius.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 2.5. Cement core of the podium of the Temple of Divus Julius in the Roman Forum.

Image: http://www.flickr.com/photos/roger_ulrich/5778558243/.

Figure 2.6. Temple of Divus Julius, reverse, sestertius of Hadrian, *RIC II* no. 638, 124-128 CE.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 2.7. Republican Rostra, obverse of denarius of Q. Lollius Palicanus, *RRC* no. 473/1, 45 BCE.

Image: <http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s0465.html>.

Figure 2.8. Reconstructed plan of the Temple of Divus Julius.
Image: Stamper 2005, 100.

Figure 2.9. “Algiers relief” from Carthage, Julio-Claudian dedication.
Image: Photograph after Zanker 1988, 197, Fig. 151.

Figure 2.10. Plan of the Forum of Augustus, sculptural program.
Image: Zanker 1988, 194, Fig. 149.

Figure 2.11. Map of area between Roman Forum and the Velabrum, including the Basilica Julia.
Image: *LTUR* IV: Fig. 62 (plan of F. Astolfi e F. Guidobaldi (da F. Astolfi, F. Guidobaldi, A., A. Pronti, ArchCl 30 (1978), 106 fig. 9).

Figure 2.12. Temple of Divus Augustus, sestertius of Caligula, *RIC I*² no. 44, 39-40 CE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/caligula/RIC_0044.jpg.

Figure 2.13. Seated image of Divus Augustus, dupondius of Caligula, *RIC I*² no. 56, 37-41 CE.
Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 2.14. Seated image of Divus Augustus in elephant quadriga, sestertius of Tiberius, *RIC I*² no. 62.
Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 2.15. Temple of Concordia, Tiberian restoration, sestertius, *RIC I*² no. 61.
Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 2.16. Temple of Jupiter Maximus on a Republican coin of Petillius, moneyer.
Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 2.17. Squeeze of altar inscription dedicated to the AETERNO DEO I[OVI].
Image: Gordon 1958, no. 35, pl. 21b (Museo Nazionale Romana Inv. No. 72743).

Figure 2.18. Belvedere Altar, apotheosis of Divus Julius scene. Rome, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano, inv. 1115, h. 95 cm.
Image: Zanker 1998, 223, Fig. 177.

Figure 2.19. Comet of Divus Julius, denarius of Augustus, *RIC I*² no. 37a, 19-18 BCE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear/s0484.html#RIC_0037a.

Figure 2.20. Divus Augustus Pater series with lightning bolt, Tiberius, *RIC I*² no. 83, 34-37 CE.
Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1791.html#RIC_0083\[tib\]](http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1791.html#RIC_0083[tib]).

Figure 2.21. Divus Augustus between two stars, Caligula, denarius, *RIC I*² no. 2, 37 CE.
Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1808.html#RIC_0002.

Figure 2.22. Temple of Divus Augustus, sestertius of Caligula, *RIC I*² no. 44, 39-40 CE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/caligula/RIC_0044.jpg.

Figure 2.23. Wall painting of Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius from Pompeii.
Image: Eric R. Varner.

Figure 2.24. Wall painting of Romulus carrying the spolia opima from Pompeii.
Image: Eric R. Varner.

Figure 2.25. Apollo sacrificing, Augustus, denarius, *RIC I*² no. 366.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0366.jpg.

Figure 2.26. South frieze of the Ara Pacis.

Figure 2.27. Mosaic of a sacrifice in the barracks of the vigiles in Ostia Antica, bringing the steer to the altar.
Image: Author photo.

Figure 2.28. Mosaic of a sacrifice in the barracks of the vigiles in Ostia Antica, slaughter.
Image: Author photo.

Figure 2.29. Fragment of *Fasti dei Viae dei Serpenti*, September 17, date of senatorial decree to deify Augustus.
Image: Degrassi 1963, pl. lxvii.

Figure 2.30. *Fasti Amiternini*.
Image: Degrassi 1963, pl. lxii.

Figure 2.31. Triumphal route.
Image: La Rocca 2008.

Figure 2.32. Parthian Arch, Augustus, denarius, *RIC I*² no. 132, 18-17 CE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0132.jpg.

Figure 2.33. Clipeus Virtutis from Arles.
Image: Cooley 2009, 267.

Figure 2.34. Belvedere Altar, clipeus scene. Rome, Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Profano, inv. 1115, h. 95 cm.

Figure 2.35. Reconstruction of a statue niche from the Forum of Augustus with statue, elogium, and tituli.
Image: Zanker 1988, 212, Fig. 164.

Figure 2.36. Octavian, dupondius, *RIC I*² no. 620, c. 38 CE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RPC_0620.1.jpg.

Figure 2.37. Octavian, denarius, *RIC I*² no. 254b, c. 32-39 CE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/imp/octavian/RIC_0254b.5.jpg.

Figure 2.38. Reconstruction view of the Temple of Divus Julius and Parthian Arch, Digital Roman Forum Project, University of California Los Angeles.
Image: http://dlib.etc.ucla.edu/projects/Forum/reconstructions/IuliusDivusAedes_1/introduction.

Figure 2.39. Reconstruction of the two phases of the podium with inscriptions found near the Meta Sudans in Rome.
Image: Kragelund 2007, 29 (drawing by M. Cante, reproduced from Panella 1996).

Figure 3.1. Claudius, dupondius, *RIC I*² no. 101, c. 42-43 CE.
Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 3.2. Statue of Diva Drusilla from the theater in Caere.
Image: Wood 1995, 470.

Figure 3.3. Caligula, sestertius, *RIC I*² no. 33.
Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1800.html#RIC_0033.

Figure 3.4. Map of Rome after the fire of 64 CE.
Image: von Hesberg 2011, 109 (H.-J. Beste and M. Schützenberger).

Figure 3.5. Rusticated arcades under the Church of San Giovanni e Paolo.
Image: Author photo.

Figure 3.6. Plan of the terrace supporting the Temple of Divus Claudius.
Image: Colini 1944, pl. 6.

Figure 3.7. Forma Urbis fragments attributed to the Temple of Divus Claudius.
Image: Colini 1944.

Figure 3.8. Reconstruction of Temple of Divus Claudius, nymphaeum, and surrounding gardens from the Oppian Hill.
Image: Viscogliosi 2011, 157 (Progetto Katatexilux 2011).

Figure 3.9. Plan of Temple of Divus Claudius, temple terrace, and nymphaeum along the Via Claudia.
Image: Carandini, Bruno, and Fraioli 2001, 151 (reconstruction by D. Bruno, G. Fatucci, D. Filippi, F. Fraioli; drawings by D. Bruno, F. Fraioli).

Figure 3.10. Nero, aureus, *RIC I*² no. 44, 64-65 CE.
Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1926.html#RIC_0044.

Figure 3.11. Nero, *RIC II* no. 4, aureus, 54-55 CE.

Image: [http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2051.html#RIC_04\[nero\]](http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2051.html#RIC_04[nero]).

Figure 3.12. Nero, *RIC* II no. 6, aureus, 54-55 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/nero/RIC_0006.jpg.

Figure 3.13. Inscription recording sacrifices of Arval Brethren in 59-60.

Image: Gordon 1958, 107-8, no. 111, pl. 48b.

Figure 3.14. Agrippina Orans. Body: Musei Capitolini, Central Montemartini, inv. 1882. Head: restored with a copy of the head in Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, inv. 753. H: 210 cm.

Image: Molteson 2007, p. 124, fig. 1.

Figure 3.15. Civil wars, denarius, *RIC* I² no. 94, 68-69 CE.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/Civil_Wars/RIC_94\[augustus\]-r.jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/Civil_Wars/RIC_94[augustus]-r.jpg).

Figure 3.16. Civil wars, denarius, *RIC* I² no. 116, 68-69 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/Civil_Wars/RIC_0116.jpg.

Figure 3.17. Galba, denarius, *RIC* I² no. 13, 68 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/galba/RIC_0013.jpg.

Figure 4.1. Titus, as, *RIC* II no. 360, 80-81 CE.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/vespasian/RIC_0380\[titus\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/vespasian/RIC_0380[titus].jpg).

Figure 4.2. Vespasian, aureus, *RIC* II no. 838, 76 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/vespasian/RIC_0838.jpg.

Figure 4.3. Titus, as, *RIC* II no. 219, 80-81 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/titus/RIC_0219.jpg.

Figure 4.4. Vespasian, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 131, 71 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2342.html#RIC_0131.

Figure 4.5. Vespasian, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 221, 71 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2343.html#RIC_0221.

Figure 4.6. Vespasian, denarius, *RIC* II no. 1340, 69-70 CE.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 4.7. Domitian, aureus, *RIC* II no. 147, 82-83 CE.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 4.8. In situ remains of Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 4.9. Plan of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.

Image: Stamper 2005, 161 (after De Angeli 1992).

Figure 4.10. Plan of the Roman Forum.

Image: Claridge, A. 1998 *Rome: An Oxford Archaeological Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Figure 4.11. Elevation drawing of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus.

Image: Stamper 2005, 160 (after De Angeli 1992).

Figure 4.12. Corinthian capitals and in situ frieze of Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 4.13. Entablature block of Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the Tabularium.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 4.14. Augustus, denarius, *RIC* I² no. 410.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1595.html#RIC_0410.

Figure 4.15. Detail, galerus apicato, frieze of Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the Tabularium.

Image: De Angeli 1992, 95, fig. 92.

Figure 4.16. Julio-Claudian relief fragment. Rome, Villa Medici. Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum of Augustus, sacrifice.

Image: Zanker 1988, 105, Fig. 86.

Figure 4.17. Sacrifice scene on the silver Boscoreale cup, Tiberian.

Image: Zanker 1988, 115, Fig. 93.

Figure 4.18. Detail, urceus, frieze of Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the Tabularium.

Image: De Angeli 1992, 94, fig. 89.

Figure 4.19. Detail, patera with head of Zeus Ammon, frieze of Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus in the Tabularium.

Image: De Angeli 1992, 94, fig. 91.

Figure 4.20. Figural capital, Victory, from the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus.

Image: De Angeli 1992, 132.

Figure 4.21. Coarelli plan of the Roman Forum marking out sightlines and axes from the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Divus Titus, and the Equus Domitiani.

Image: Coarelli 2009.

Figure 4.22. Reconstruction of Portico of the Dei Consenti from the podium of the Temple of Divus Vespasian and Titus.

Image: Digital Roman Forum Project, UCLA,

http://dlib.etc.ucla.edu/projects/Forum/reconstructions/PorticusDeorumConsentium_1.

Figure 4.23. Tiberius, sestertius, *RIC I*² 49, 22-23 CE.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1782.html#RIC_0049\[tib\]](http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s1782.html#RIC_0049[tib]).

Figure 4.24. Titus, sestertius, *RIC II* 403, 80-81 CE.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0403\[titus\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/augustus/RIC_0403[titus].jpg).

Figure 4.25. Titus, as, *RIC II* 432, 80-81 CE.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2591.html#RIC_0432\[titus\]](http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s2591.html#RIC_0432[titus]).

Figure 4.26. Arch of Titus.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 4.27. Triumph relief from inner bay of the Arch of Titus.

Image: Hölscher 2009, 49.

Figure 4.28. Apotheosis of Titus relief from the Arch of Titus.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 4.29. Campus Martius, Forma Urbis overlay of modern streets, including the DIVORUM.

Image: Rodríguez Almeida 1981.

Figure 4.30. Domitian, denarius, *RIC II* no. 154, 88-96 CE.

Image: <http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/domitian/i.html>.

Figure 4.31. Temple of the Gens Flavia (?). Domitian, sestertius, *BMCRE II* no. 229.

Image: Davies 2000, 27, Fig. 17.

Figure 4.32. Plan of the Quirinal.

Image: Capanna 2008, 173, fig. 1.

Figure 4.33. Reconstruction of the Temple of the Gens Flavia.

Image: Capanna 2008, 178, fig. 3.

Figure 4.34. Torso of male figure leaning against the trunk of a palm tree, Temple of the Gens Flavia. Museo Nazionale Romano inv. 310252.

Image: <http://lw.lsa.umich.edu/kelsey/galleries/Exhibits/Empire2/objects/hartwig.html>.

Figure 4.35. Relief fragment of flamen in front of the Temple of Quirinus, Temple of the Gens Flavia. Museo Nazionale Romano inv. 310251.

Image: Davies 2000, 154, Fig. 103 (Photo: Museo Nazionale Romano, Archivio Fotografico Neg. 407133).

Figure 4.36. Portrait of Vespasian wearing the corona civica, Temple of the Gens Flavia. Kelsey Museum inv. 2430.

Image: <http://lw.lsa.umich.edu/kelsey/galleries/Exhibits/Empire2/objects/kelsey.html>.

Figure 4.37: Reconstruction drawing by Rita Paris incorporating select Hartwig-Kelsey fragments into a scene of a sacrificial procession.

Image: Paris 1994.

Figure 5.1. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 726, 115 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/trajan/RIC_0726.jpg.

Figure 5.2. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 815.

Image: Komnick 2001, pl. 26, Type 54.0.

Figure 5.3. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 820.

Image: Komnick 2001, Pl. 26, Type 57.0.

Figure 5.4. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 823a.

Image: Komnick 2001, Pl. 26, Type 61.0.

Figure 5.5. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 829.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/vespasian/RIC_0829\[trajan\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/vespasian/RIC_0829[trajan].jpg).

Figure 5.6. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 833.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/titus/RIC_0833\[trajan\]L.jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/titus/RIC_0833[trajan]L.jpg).

Figure 5.7. Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 836.

Image: Komnick 2001, Pl. 27, Type 74.0.

Figure 5.8.

Left: Octavian (Augustus), 38 B.CE, Cohen 3.

Center: Trajan, aureus, *RIC* II no. 815.

Image: Komnick 2001, Pl. 26, Type 54.0.

Right: Claudius, aureus, *RIC* I² no. 9.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/claudius/RIC_0009.jpg.

Figure 5.9. Galba, *RIC* II no. 485, 68 CE.

Image: www.britishmuseum.org.

Figure 5.10. Forum of Augustus, artist's reconstruction of portrait gallery with central image of Aeneas, his father Anchises, and his son Ascanius.

Image: http://en.mercatiditraiano.it/sede/area_archeologica/foro_di_augusto/le_esedre.

Figure 5.11. Axonometric drawing of the Forum of Trajan.
Image: Packer 1997.

Figure 5.12. Imago clipeata portrait fragment of Agrippina the Elder/Trajan's mother (?).
Image: Packer 1997, no. 191, fig. 58.

Figure 5.13. Imago clipeata portrait fragment of Nerva.
Image: Packer 1997, no. 190, fig. 5.

Figure 5.14. Reconstruction of imago clipeata portrait of Julius Caesar from the Forum of Trajan.

Image: Trunk 2010, 67, Abb. 7c.

Figure 5.15. Reconstruction of the west colonnade of the Forum of Trajan with imago clipeatae mounted at the attic level.

Image: Packer 1997.

Figure 5.16. Aeternitas holding busts of Sol and Luna, Trajan, *RIC* II no. 91.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/trajan/RIC_0091.1.jpg.

Figure 5.17.

(a) Top: Anaglypha Traiani panel.

Image: Author photo.

(b) Bottom: Anaglypha Traiani panel.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 6.1. Divus Trajan handing the globe to Hadrian, denarius, *RIC* II no. 2, 117 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0002c.jpg.

Figure 6.2. Hadrian, denarius, *RIC* II no. 3, 117 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0003c.jpg.

Figure 6.3. Divus Trajan and Diva Plotina on reverse of aureus of Hadrian, *RIC* II no. 232b, 134-138 CE.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 6.4. Hadrian, aureus, 117-118 CE, *RIC* II no. 24.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0024b.jpg.

Figure 6.5. Hadrian, aureus, 117-118 CE, *RIC* II no. 28.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 6.6. Hadrian, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 589.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0589b.jpg.

Figure 6.7. Forum of Trajan plan.

Image: Stamper 2005, 178.

Figure 6.8. Forma Urbis fragments in the area of the Basilica Ulpia and the Greek and Latin libraries.

Image: Packer 2003, fig. 10.

Figure 6.9. Meneghini plan proposing that the Temple of Divus Trajan is located at the south end of the Forum of Trajan.

Image: Stamper 2005, 177.

Figure 6.10. Meneghini's reconstruction of a propylon north of the Column of Trajan precinct.

Image: Meneghini 1998, 139, fig. 9.

Figure 6.11. Reconstructed view of zone north of the Greek and Latin libraries (J. Burge and J. Packer).

Image: Packer 2003, fig. 26.

Figure 6.12. New reconstruction (section and elevation of the Temple of Divus Trajan) of the area north of the Column of Trajan.

Image: Cavallero 2011, 52.

Figure 6.13. Reconstructed plan of area north of precinct of Column of Trajan and elevation of the view from the precinct looking north toward the Temple of Divus Trajan.

Image: Cavallero 2011, 53.

Figure 6.14. Trajan, sestertius, 104-111 CE, *RIC* II no. 575.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/trajan/RIC_0575_Sest.jpg.

Figure 6.15. Trajan, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 577.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/trajan/RIC_0577,Sestertius.1.jpg.

Figure 6.16. Conjectural section/elevation of the Temple of Divus Trajan (J. Burge).

Image: Packer 2003, 121, fig. 14.

Figure 6.17. Prospective representation of cult statue of Divus Trajan. Hadrian, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 627, 118 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s3887.html#RIC_0627b.

Figure 6.18. View of Column of Trajan from the western axis.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 6.19. Scene from Column of Trajan on axis with the Temple of Divus Trajan, victory inscribing a shield.

Figure 6.20. Column of Trajan, base with reliefs of arms and armor and lower five levels of helical frieze.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 6.21. Plan of the Campus Martius.

Image: Coarelli 1980, 268, fig. 118.

Figure 6.22. Pantheon.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 6.23. Reconstruction of the Pantheon pediment.

Image: Stamper 2005, 195.

Figure 6.24. Spherical geometry of the Pantheon.

Image: Hannah and Magli 2011, 488.

Figure 6.25. View of sunlight from the oculus inside the Pantheon.

Image: Hannah and Magli 2011, 493.

Figure 6.26. Pantheon interior on April 21 with sunlight focused on the entrance.

Image: Hannah and Magli 2011, 495.

Figure 6.27. Trajan, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 748, c. 112 CE.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s3332.html#RIC_0748.

Figure 6.28. Hadrian, denarius, *RIC* II no. 751.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/matidia/RIC_0751.jpg.

Figure 6.29. Trajan, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 749, c. 112-113 CE.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s3333.html#RIC_0749.

Figure 6.30. Forma Urbis fragment showing the Temple of Matidia.

Image: Rodríguez Almeida 1981, pl. 27.

Figure 6.31. Temple of Divus Julius, sestertius of Hadrian, *RIC* II no. 640, 124-128 CE.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 6.32. Forma Urbis plan of Campus Martius showing relationship between the Porticus Divorum and the Pantheon.

Image: Rodríguez Almeida 1981.

Figure 6.33. Temple of Venus and Roma under Hadrian (?), sestertius, Hadrian, *RIC* II no. 783.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s3649.html#RIC_0783.

Figure 6.34. Plan of Temple of Venus and Roma after reconstruction of Maxentius.

Image: LTUR IV, fig. 67.

Figure 6.35. Roma Aeterna holding moon and sun, aureus of Hadrian, *RIC* II no. 263c, *BMCRE* no. 701, 134-138 CE.

Image: www.britishmuseum.org.

Figure 6.36. Aeternitas holding Sol and Luna, denarius of Hadrian, *RIC* II no. 48, 118 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0048.jpg.

Figure 6.37. Hadrian, denarius, *RIC* II no. 202. Obv: HADRIANUS AUGUSTUS, Hadrian laureate. Rev: COS III, crescent moon with seven stars.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s3485.html#RIC_0202.

Figure 6.38. Cult statue of Venus (?). Hadrian, aureus, *RIC* II no. 280, c. 134-138 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0280.jpg.

Figure 6.39. Seated cult statue of Roma Aeterna (?), Hadrian, denarius, *RIC* II no. 265, c. 136 CE.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/hadrian/RIC_0265.jpg.

Figure 7.1. Antoninus Pius, sestertius, *RIC* III no. 621.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_0621.jpg.

Figure 7.2. Antoninus Pius, sestertius, *RIC* III no. 622.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4212.html#RIC_0622.

Figure 7.3. Antoninus Pius, dupondius, *RIC* III no. 664.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4282.html#RIC_0664.

Figure 7.4. Antoninus Pius, denarius, *RIC* III no. 389B 139 C.E.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 7.5. Plan of Hadrianeum.

Image: Stamper 2005, 110.

Figure 7.6. Hadrianeum, plan and section of the temple and cella.

Image: Sapelli 1999, 21.

Figure 7.7. Hadrianeum, plinth with personification (Scythia?), Naples, Museo Archaeologico Nazionale, inv. 6753.

Image: Sapelli 1999, 29.

Figure 7.8. Hadrianeum, plinth with personification (Phyrgia?), Naples, Museo Archaeologico Nazionale, inv. 6763.

Image: Sapelli 1999, 37.

Figure 7.9. Hadrianeum, plinth with personification (Thrace?), Rome, Museo Nazionale Romano in Palazzo Massimo alle Terme, inv. 428496.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 49.

Figure 7.10. Hadrianeum, plinth with personification (Hispania?), Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 767.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 65.

Figure 7.11. Hadrianeum, plinth with personification (Libya?), Rome, Musei Capitolini, Palazzo dei Conservatori, inv. 755.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 67.

Figure 7.12. Hadrianeum, plinth with personification (Germania?), Rome, Villa Doria Pamphili, Casino del Belrespiro.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 46.

Figure 7.13. Hadrianeum, trophy relief with tunic and dragon.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 62 cat. no. 16.

Figure 7.14. Hadrianeum, trophy relief with oval and hexagonal shield, hatchet, swords.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 64, cat. no. 18.

Figure 7.15. Findspots of Hadrianeum province reliefs.
Image: Sapelli 1999, 118.

Figure 7.16. Hypothetical location of the province and trophy reliefs of the Hadrianeum on the temple podium.
Image: Claridge 1999, 123.

Figure 7.17. Hypothetical location of the province and trophy reliefs of the Hadrianeum on the attic of the surrounding porticos.
Image: Claridge 1999, 125.

Figure 7.18. Hadrian, sestertius, *RIC* II no. 594b, 122-125 C.E.
Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 7.19. Barbarian embassy relief in the Villa Torlonia.

Figure 7.20. Plan of the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias.
Image: Smith 1998, 52.

Figure 7.21. Antoninus Pius, denarius, *RIC* III no. 343, 150 C.E.
Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/faustina_I/RIC_0343.8.jpg.

Figure 7.22. Antoninus Pius, denarius, *RIC* III no. 388.
Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4596.html#RIC_0388.

Figure 7.23. Antoninus Pius, denarius, *RIC* III no. 350a.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4575.html#RIC_0350a.

Figure 7.24. Antoninus Pius, denarius, *RIC* III no. 355, 142 C.E.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4580.html#RIC_0355.

Figure 7.25. Antoninus Pius, sestertius, *RIC* III no. 1106, after 146 C.E.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4610.html#RIC_1106.

Figure 7.26. Antoninus Pius, denarius, *RIC* III, no. 384.

Image: http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/sear5/s4594.html#RIC_0384.

Figure 7.27. Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina, Church of San Miranda in Lorenzo.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 7.28. Plan, Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina.

Image: Stamper 2005, 217.

Figure 7.29. Temple of Divus Antoninus Pius and Diva Faustina, frieze.

Image: Stamper 2005, 218.

Figure 7.30. Marcus Aurelius, sestertius, *RIC* III no. 1262, 162 C.E.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_1262\[aurelius\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_1262[aurelius].jpg).

Figure 7.31. Antoninus Pius, sestertius, *RIC* III no. 787, 145-161 C.E.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_0787.jpg.

Figure 7.32. Antoninus Pius, sestertius, *RIC* III no. 1004, 159 C.E.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_1004.jpg.

Figure 7.33. Antoninus Pius, aureus, *RIC* III no. 90, 140-144 C.E.

Image: http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_0090.jpg.

Figure 7.34. Antoninus Pius, *RIC* III no. 694a.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 7.35. Apotheosis of Sabina relief, Palazzo dei Conservatori Museum, main staircase, inv. MC1213.

Image:

http://en.museicapitolini.org/collezioni/percorsi_per_temi/opere_celebri/rilievo_dall_arco_di_po_rto_gallo_apoteosi_di_sabina.

Figure 7.36. Hadrian, aureus, *RIC* II no. 418b, 138-139 C.E.

Image: www.coinarchives.com.

Figure 7.37. Apotheosis scene from the base of the Column of Antoninus Pius. Cortile della Pinacoteca, Vatican Palace.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 7.38. Decursio scene from the base of the Column of Antoninus Pius. Cortile della Pinacoteca, Vatican Palace.

Image: Author photo.

Figure 7.39. Reconstructed base of Column of Marcus Aurelius.

Image: Boatwright 2010, Fig. 6.16.

Figure 7.40. Marcus Aurelius, denarius, *RIC* III no. 438, 161 C.E.

Image: [http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_0438\[aurelius\].4.jpg](http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_0438[aurelius].4.jpg).

Figure 7.41. Marcus Aurelius, sesterius, *RIC* III no. 1266, 162 C.E.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_1266\[aurelius\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/antoninus_pius/RIC_1266[aurelius].jpg).

Figure 7.42. Site Plan of the “Ustrina of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius.

Image: Boatwright 1985, Fig. III.8.

Figure 7.43. Map of the Campus Martius including Temple of Diva Matidia, Basilicas of Marciana and Matidia, Temple of Divus Hadrian, and consecration altars of Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius.

Image: Coarelli 1980.

Figure 7.44. Commodus, denarius, *RIC* III no. 272, 180 C.E.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/marcus_aurelius/RIC_0272\[commodus\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/marcus_aurelius/RIC_0272[commodus].jpg).

Figure 7.45. Commodus, denarius, *RIC* III no. 273.

Image: [http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/marcus_aurelius/RIC_0273\[commodus\].jpg](http://wildwinds.com/coins/ric/marcus_aurelius/RIC_0273[commodus].jpg).

Figure 8.1. Map of Rome with temples to *divi*.

Image: Gradel 2002.

ABBREVIATIONS

- BMCRE I* Mattingly, H. 1976. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* Volume I. Augustus to Vitellius. London: The Trustees of the British Museum.
- BMCRE II* Mattingly, H. 1966. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* Volume II. Vespasian to Domitian. London: The Trustees of the British Museum.
- BMCRE III* Mattingly, H. 1966. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* Volume III. Nerva to Hadrian. London: The Trustees of the British Museum.
- BMCRE IV* Mattingly, H. 1966. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* Volume IV. Antoninus Pius to Commodus. London: The Trustees of the British Museum.
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.*
- LTUR I* Steinby, E.M., ed. 1993. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* I. A-C. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- LTUR II* Steinby, E.M., ed. 1995. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* II. D-G. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- LTUR III* Steinby, E.M., ed. 1996. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* III. H-O. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- LTUR IV* Steinby, E.M., ed. 1999. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* IV. P-S. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- LTUR V* Steinby, E.M., ed. 1999. *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae* V. T-Z. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- RIC I*² *Roman Imperial Coinage* I². From 31 BC to AD 69 Augustus to Vitellius. Rev. ed. C.H.V. Sutherland 1984.
- RIC II* *Roman Imperial Coinage* II. *Vespasian to Hadrian*. H. Mattingly and E.A. Sydenham 1926.
- RIC III* *Roman Imperial Coinage* III. *Antoninus Pius to Commodus*. H.A. Mattingly and E.A. Sydenham 1930.
- RSC I* Seaby, H.A. 1978. *Roman Silver Coins: The Republic to Augustus* Vol. 1. 3rd ed. London: Numismatic Fine Arts Intl.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alcock, S.E. 2002. *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscapes, Monuments, and Memories*, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Alföldy, G. 1992. Studi sull'Epigraphia Augustea e Tiberiana di Roma. *Vetera* 8:39-58.
- Alston, R. 2008. History and Memory in the Construction of Identity in the Second Century. In *Role Models in the Roman World: identity and Assimilation*, edited by S. Bell and I.L. Hansen. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press:147-59.
- Anderson, J.C. 1983. A Topographical Tradition in Fourth Century Chronicles: Domitian's Building Program. *Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 32:93-105.
- Arena, P. 2009. The Pompa Circensis and the Domus Augusta (1st-2nd century A.D.). In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5-7, 2007)*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner and C. Witschel. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill:77-94.
- Assmann, A. 2004. *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis an der Milleniumsschwelle: Krise und Zukunft der Bildung*. Konstanz: UVK, Univ.-Verl. Konstanz.
- Assmann, J. 1992. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis. Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck.
- . 1997. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2006. *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Essays*. Translated by R. Livingston. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Atkin, A. 2005. Peirce On the Index and Indexical Reference. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 41:161-88.
- Barnier, A.J., and J. Sutton. 2008. From Individual to Collective Memory: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives. *The Journal Memory* 16:177-83.
- Barrett, J.C. 1993. Chronologies of Remembrance: The Interpretation of Some Roman Inscriptions. *World Archaeology* 25 (2):236-47.
- Bäuml, K.-H. 2002. Semantic Generation Can Cause Episodic Forgetting. *Psychological Science* 13:356-60.

- Beard, M. 1985. Writing and Ritual: A Study of Diversity and Expansion in the Arval Acta. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 53:114-62.
- . 1987. A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 213:1-15.
- . 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Beard, M., J.A. North, and S.R.F. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennett, J. 1997. *Trajan Optimus Princeps: A Life and Times*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bickerman, E.J. 1973. Consecratio. In *Le Culte des Souverains dans l'Empire Romain. 7 Exposés Suivis de Discussions*, edited by E.J. Bickerman and W. den Boer: Genève Fondation Hardt:1-26.
- Boatwright, M.T. 1985. The "Ara Ditis-Ustrinum of Hadrian" in the Western Campus Martius and other Problematic Roman Ustrina. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89 (3):485-97.
- . 1987. *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2010. Antonine Rome. Security in the Homeland. In *The Emperor and Rome. Space, Representation, and Ritual*, edited by B.C. Ewald and C.F. Noreña. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:169-97.
- Bodel, J. 1997. Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 10:5-35.
- Bonanno, A. 1976. *Portraits and Other Heads on Roman Historical Relief Up to the Age of Septimius Severus*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Bosworth, B. 1999. Augustus, the "Res Gestae" and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis. *Journal of Roman Studies* 89:1-18.
- Boyer, C. 1994. *The City of Collective Memory, Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Brainerd, C.J., and V.F. Reyna. 1990. Gist is the Grist: Fuzzy-Trace Theory and the New Intuitionism. *Developmental Review* 10:3-47.

- . 1992. Explaining 'Memory Free' Reasoning. *Psychological Science* 3:332-9.
- Brodd, J., and J.L. Reed, eds. 2011. *Rome and Religion: A Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue on the Imperial Cult*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Brown, D.F. 1940. *The Temples of Rome as Coin Types*. Boston: The American Numismatic Society.
- Bruno, M. 1988. Su un Fusto Colossale di Cipollino Sopra le Cave di Kylindroi nel Distretto di Myloi. In *Marmi Antichi II. Cave e Technica di Lavorazione Provenienze e Distribuzione*, edited by P. Pensabene. Rome: L'Erma Di Bretschneider.
- Brunt, P.A. 1977. Lex de Imperio Vespasiani. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 67:95-116.
- Burrell, B. 2012. Colored Columns and Cult of the Emperors in Rome. Paper read at 2012 ASMOSIA Conference, 21-26 May, at Rome, Italy.
- Buttrey, T.V. 1972. Vespasian as Moneyer. *The Numismatic Chronicle* 12:89-109.
- . 1976. Vespasian's Consecratio and the Numismatic Evidence. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 25:449-57.
- Buzzetti, C. 1993. Claudius, Divus, Templum. *LTUR* I:277-8.
- Cancik, H. 1985-1986. Rome as Sacred Landscape: Varro and the End of Republican Religion in Rome. *Visible Religion: Annual for Religious Iconography* IV-V Approaches to Iconography:250-165.
- Candilio, D. 1995. Terme di Diocleziano. Indagini nell'Aula Ottagona. In *Archeologia Laziale, 12. Dodicesimo Incontro di Studio del Comitato per l'Archeologia Laziale*. Roma:193-202.
- Carandini, A., D. Bruno, and F. Fraioli. 2011. Gli Atri Odiosi di un Re Crudele. In *Nerone*, edited by M.A. Tomei and R. Rea. Milano: Mandadori Electa:136-51.
- Caronna, E.L. 1972. Roma. Rinvenimenti in Piazza Capranica 78. *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità* 26:398-403.
- . 2001. Ancora sulla Cosiddetta Ara del Tempio di Antonino e Faustina. *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia Rendiconti* 12:93-113.
- Cassatella, A. 1999. Venus et Roma, Aedes, Templum. *LTUR* V:121-3.

Castagnoli, F. 1942. Due Archi Trionfali della Via Flaminia Presso Piazza Sciarra. *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 70:57-82.

Cavallero, F. 2011. Il Tempio dei Divi Traiano e Plotina. *Archeologia Viva* 30 (149):48-54.

Champlin, E. 2011. Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins. *Journal of Roman Studies* 101:73-99.

Charlesworth, M.P. 1936. Providentia and Aeternitas. *The Harvard Theological Review* 29 (2):107-32.

———. 1937. Flaviana. *Journal of Roman Studies* 27:54-62.

Chausson, F. 2001. Deuil Dynastique et Topographie Urbaine dans la Rome Antonine, 2. Temples des Divi et des Divae de la Dynastie Antonine. In *Rome, les Césars et la Ville aux Deux Premiers Siècles de Notre Ère*, edited by N. Belayche. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes:343-95.

Cipollone, M. 1978-1979. Le Province dell'Hadrianeum: un Tema dell'Ideologia Imperiale Romana. *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università degli Studi di Perugia* 16:41-7.

———. 1996. Hadrianus, Divus, Templum; Hadrianeum. *LTUR* III:7-8.

Claridge, A. 1993. Hadrian's Column of Trajan. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 6 (5-22).

———. 1999. L'Hadrianeum in Campo Marzio: Storia del Rinvenimenti e Topographia Antica nell'Area di Piazza di Pietra. In *Provinciae Fideles: Il Fregio del Tempio di Adriano in Campo Marzio*, edited by M. Sapelli and A. Claridge. Milan: Electa:117-26.

———. 2007. Hadrian's Lost Temple of Trajan. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 20:54-94.

Climo, J., and M. Cattell. 2002. Introduction. In *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by J. Climo and M. Cattell. Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press:1-36.

Coarelli, F. 1995. Divorum, Porticus, Templum. *LTUR* II:19-20.

———. 1995. Fortuna Redux, Ara. *LTUR* II:275.

———. 1995. Fortuna Redux, Templum. *LTUR* II:275-6.

———. 1995. Gens Flavia, Templum. *LTUR* II:368-9.

- . 1995. Graecostadium. *LTUR* II:372.
- . 1996. Hercules Victor, Aedes (ad Portam Trigeminam). *LTUR* III:22-3.
- . 1999. Saturnus, Aedes. *LTUR* IV:234-6.
- Coarelli, F., and U. Luisanna. 1980. *Guida Archeologica di Roma*. 3 ed. Milano: A. Mondadori.
- Colini, A.M. 1944. *Storia e Topografia del Celio nell'Antichità*. Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana.
- Confino, A. 1997. Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method. *American Historical Review* 102:1386-404.
- Connerton, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Conway, M.A. 2007. Remembering: A Process and a State. In *Science of Memory: Concepts*, edited by H.R. Roediger III, Y. Dudai and S.M. Fitzpatrick. Oxford: Oxford University Press:??
- Cooley, A. 2000. The Life Cycle of Inscriptions. In *The Afterlife of Inscriptions: Reusing, Rediscovering, Reinventing & Revitalizing Ancient Inscriptions*, edited by A. Cooley. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London:1-20.
- . 2009. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cooley, C.H. 1992. *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
- Cooper, T. 1999. Forgetting Rome and the Voice of Piranesi's 'Speaking Ruins'. In *The Art of Forgetting*, edited by A. Forty and S. Kuchler. New York: Berg:107-26.
- Cox, S.E. 2006. Rome Restored: The Themes of Pax and Restitutio Under Vespasian and Titus, Columbia University.
- Craik, I.M. 2007. Encoding: A Cognitive Perspective. In *Science of Memory: Concepts*, edited by H.R. Roediger III, Y. Dudai and S.M. Fitzpatrick. Oxford: Oxford University Press:129-35.

- Crawford, S. 2007. Collecting, Defacing, Reinscribing (and Otherwise Performing) Memory in the Ancient World. In *Negotiating the Past in the Past: Identity, Memory, and Landscape in Archaeological Research*, edited by N. Yoffee. Tucson: University of Arizona Press:10-42.
- Cubitt, G., and A. Warren. 2000. Introduction. In *Heroic Reputations and Exemplary Lives*, edited by G. Cubitt and A. Warren. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press:1-21.
- Cumont, F. 1896. L'Éternité des Empereurs Romains. *Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuses* 1:435-52.
- D'Ambra, E. 2010. The Imperial Funeral Pyre as a Work of Ephemeral Architecture. In *The Emperor and Rome. Space, Representation, and Ritual*, edited by B.C. Ewald and C.F. Norena. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:289-308.
- Dabrowa, E. 1996. The Origin of the "Templum Gentis Flaviae": A Hypothesis. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 41:153-61.
- Daguet-Gagey, A. 1998. Adrastus et la Colonne Antonine. L'Administration des Travaux Publics à Rome en 193 ap. J.C. *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Antiquité* 110:893-915.
- Danti, A. 1993. "Arae Consecrationis". *LTUR* I:75-6.
- Danziger, D., and N. Purcell. 2005. *Hadrian's Empire: When Rome Ruled the World*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Darwall-Smith, R. 1996. *Emperors and Architecture: A Study of Flavian Rome, Collection Latomus*. Bruxelles: Latomus.
- Davies, P. 1997. The Politics of Perpetuation: Trajan's Column and the Art of Commemoration. *American Journal of Archaeology* 101:41-65.
- . 2000. *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. "What Worse than Nero, What Better than his Baths?": "Damnatio Memoriae" and Roman Architecture. In *From Caligula to Constantine: Tyranny and Transformation in Roman Portraiture*, edited by E.R. Varner. Atlanta, Georgia: Michael C. Carlos Museum:27-44.
- Davies, P., D. Hemsoll, and M.W. Jones. 1987. The Pantheon. Triumph of Rome or Triumph of Compromise? *Art History* 10:133-53.

- De Angeli, S. 1992. *Templum Divi Vespasiani, Lavori e Studi di Archeologia*. Rome: De Luca Edizioni d'Arte.
- . 1996. Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Capitolinus, Aedes (Fasi Tardo-Repubblicane e di Età Imperiale). *LTUR* III:148-53.
- . 1999. Vespasianus, Divus, Templum. *LTUR* V:124-5.
- de Caprariis, F. 1996. Marcus, Divus, Templum. *LTUR* III:212.
- de Fine Licht, K. 1968. *The Rotunda in Rome. A Study of Hadrian's Pantheon*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Degrassi, A. 1963. *Inscriptiones Italiae Academiae Italicae Consociatae Ediderunt/ Vol. 13. Fasti et Elogi. Fasc. 2, [Text], Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani. Acced Ferialia, Menologia Rustica, Parapegmata*. Roma: Libreria Dello Stato.
- DeJong, J., and O. Hekster. 2008. Damnation, Deification, Commemoration. In *Un Discours en Images de la Condamnation de Mémoire*, edited by S. Benoist and A. Daguët-Gagey. Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d'Histoire:79-96.
- Derks, T. 1998. *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideas and Values in Roman Gaul, Amsterdam Archaeological Studies*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Donald, M. 2001. *A Mind So Rare: The Evolution of Human Consciousness*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Dressel, H. 1906. Der Matidiatempel auf einem Medaillon des Hadriani. In *Corolla Numismatica: Numismatic Essays in Honour of Barclay V. Head*. London: Oxford University Press:16-28.
- Drinkwater, J. 2007. The Principate: Lifebelt or Millstone Around the Neck of the Empire. In *Crises and the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop of the International Network, Impact of Empire*, edited by O. Hekster, G. de Kleijn and D. Slootjes. Boston: Brill:67-74.
- Dupont, F. 1989. The Emperor God's Other Body. In *Fragments for a History of the Human Body*, edited by M. Feher, R. Naddaff and N. Tazi. New York: Zone:396-419.
- Elsner, J. 1996. Image and Ritual: Reflections on the Religious Appreciation of Classical Art. *The Classical Quarterly* 46 (2):515-31.

- Esdaille, K.A. 1911. The Apex or Tutulus in Roman Art. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 1:212-26.
- Etienne, R. 1986. Aeternitas Augusti, Aeternitas Imperii. In *Les Grandes Figures Religieuses, Fonctionnement Pratique et Symbolique dans l'Antiquité* Paris: Belles Lettres:445-54.
- Everitt, A. 2009. *Hadrian and the Triumph of Rome*. New York: Random House.
- Favro, D.G. 1996. *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fears, J.R. 1977. *Princeps a Diis Electus: The Divine Election of the Emperor as a Political Concept at Rome, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*. Rome: American Academy.
- . 1981. The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.17.2:828-948.
- . 1981. The Theology of Victory at Rome. Approaches and Problems. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.17.2:736-826.
- Feeney, D.C. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fentress, J., and C. Wickham. 1992. *Social Memory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ferroni, A.M. 1993. Concordia, Aedes. *LTUR* I:316-20.
- Fink, R.O., A.S. Hoey, and W.F. Snyder. 1940. *The Feriale Duranum*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fishwick, D. 1987. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol. II, 1, Etudes Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain; Religions in the Graeco-Roman World*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill.
- . 1990. Prudentius and the Cult of Divus Augustus. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 39 (4):475-86.
- . 1992. On the Temple of Divus "Augustus". *Phoenix* 46 (3):232-55.
- . 2002. The Deification of Claudius. *The Classical Quarterly* 52 (1):341-9.

- Fishwick, D., and A. Small, eds. 1996. *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity. Papers Presented at a Conference held in the University of Alberta on April 13-15, 1994, Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplementary Series, no. 17.* Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology.
- Flaig, E. 2010. How the Emperor Nero Lost Acceptance in Rome. In *The Emperor and Rome: Space, Representation, and Ritual*, edited by B.C. Ewald and C.F. Noreña. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:175-288.
- Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2006. *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- . 2010. *Roman Republics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Frischer, B. 1982-1983. Monumenta Honoris Virtutisque Causa. *Bullettino della Commissione archeologica Comunale di Roma* 73:51-86.
- Gagé, J. 1930. Romulus-Augustus. *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* 47:138-81.
- . 1936. Le "Templum Urbis" et les Origines de l'Idée de Renovatio. *Mélanges Franz Cumont, Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 4:151-87.
- Galinier, M. 2007. *La Colonne Trajane et les Forums Impériaux.* Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 2005. Introduction. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:1-12.
- Gazda, E. 1995. Roman Sculpture and the Ethos of Emulation: Reconsidering Repetition. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 97:121-56.
- Gazda, E. 1996. Discovery, Dispersion, Detection, Reunion: The Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments Between Rome and Ann Arbor. In *Images of Empire: Flavian Fragments in Rome and Ann Arbor Rejoined*, edited by E.K. Gazda, A.E. Haeckl and R. Paris. Rome, Ann Arbor: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma:5-10.
- Gedi, N., and Y. Elam. 1996. Collective Memory - What Is It? *History and Memory* 8:30-50.

- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geiger, J. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. Boston: Brill.
- Gell, A. 1992. *The Anthropology of Time: Cultural Constructions of Temporal Maps and Images, Explorations in Anthropology*. Oxford, Providence: Berg.
- Gesche, H. 1978. Die Divinisierung der römischen Kaiser in ihrer Funktion als Herrschaftslegitimation. *Chiron* 8:377-90.
- Gordon, A. 1958. *Album of Dated Latin inscriptions: Rome and the Neighborhood. I, Augustus to Nerva*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1964. *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions: Rome and the Neighborhood, A. D. 100-199. II, Text*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gordon, R. 1990. From Republic to Principate: Priesthood, Religion, Ideology. In *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Beard and J.A. North. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press:177-98.
- Goud, T., E. 1996. The Sources of Josephus' Antiquities 19. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 45:472-82.
- Gowing, A. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007. Agrippina, Flaminica of Divus Claudius. In *Agrippina Minor Life and Afterlife. Liv og eftermaele*, edited by M. Moltesen and A.M. Nielsen. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek:67-70.
- . 2008. Ritual, Death, and Divinity: Titulature in Imperial Epitaphs. In *Religion and Society: Rituals, Resources and Identity in the Ancient Graeco-Roman World, BOMOS-Conferences 2002-2005*, edited by H. Rasmussen, A. Rasmussen and S. William. Rome: Quasar:55-60.
- Granger, J.D. 2003. *Nerva and the Roman Succession Crisis of AD 96-99*. New York: Routledge.
- Grant, M. 1950. *Roman Anniversary Issues: An Exploratory Study of the Numismatic and Medalllic Commemoration of Anniversary Years 49 B.C.-A.D. 375*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Grether, G. 1939. *The Divinity of Women in the Roman Imperial Families, 27-235 A.D.*, Cornell University.
- . 1946. Livia and the Roman Imperial Cult. *The American Journal of Philology* 67 (3):222-52.
- Gros, P. 1976. *Aurea Templa: Recherches sur l'Architecture Religieuse de Rome à l'Èpoque d'Auguste*. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Grunow, M.D. 2002. *Architectural Images in Roman State Reliefs, Coins, and Medallions: Imperial Ritual, Ideology, and the Topography of Rome*. Ph.D., University of Michigan.
- Guidobaldi, F., and C. Angelelli. 1999. Velabrum. *LTUR* V:102-8.
- Haeckl, A.E. 1996. Dynasty, Cult, Topography, Architecture: The Roman Contexts of the Templum Gentis Flaviae. In *Images of Empire: Flavian Fragments in Rome and Ann Arbor Rejoined*, edited by E.K. Gazda, A.E. Haeckl and R. Paris. Rome, Ann Arbor: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma:11-25.
- . 1996. Fragment <Image: the Hartwig-Kelsey Fragments Rejoined. In *Images of Empire: Flavian Fragments in Rome and Ann Arbor Rejoined*, edited by E.K. Gazda, A.E. Haeckl and R. Paris. Rome, Ann Arbor: Ministero per i Beni Culturali e Ambientali, Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma:26-33.
- Halbwachs, M., and L.A. Coser. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hallett, C.H. 2005. *The Roman Nude: Heroic Portrait Statuary 200 B.C.E. - A.D. 300*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hammond, M. 1956. The Transmission of the Powers of the Roman Emperor from the Death of Nero in A.D. 68 to that of Alexander Severus in A.D. 235. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 25:63-133.
- Hänlein-Schäfer, H. 1985. *Veneratio Augusti: eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers*, *Archaeologica* 39. Rome: G. Bretschneider.
- Hannah, R., and G. Magli. 2011. The Role of the Sun in the Pantheon's Design and Meaning. *Numen* 58:486-513.
- Hardt, M., and A. Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Harris, C.B., H.M. Paterson, and R.I. Kemp. 2008. Collaborative Recall and Collective Memory: What Happens When We Remember Together? *The Journal Memory* 16:213-30.
- Hekster, O. 2003. Coins and Messages: Audience Targeting on Coins of Different Denominations. In *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power: Proceedings of the Third Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C. - A.D. 476), Netherlands Institute in Rome, March 20-23, 2002*, edited by L.d. Blois. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben:20-35.
- Hekster, O. 2009. Honouring Ancestors. The Dynamic of Deification. In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Heidelberg, July 5-7, 2007)*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner and C. Witschel. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill:95-110.
- Henzen, W. 1874/1967. *Acta Fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*. Berolini: G. Reimeri.
- Hetland, L.M. 2007. Dating the Pantheon. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 20:95-112.
- Hill, P.V. 1989. *The Monuments of Ancient Rome as Coin Types*. London: B.A. Seaby.
- Hirst, W., and D. Manier. 2008. Towards a Psychology of Collective Memory. *The Journal Memory* 16:183-200.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 2006. History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic. In *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, edited by N. Rosenstein and R. Mortstein-Marx. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing:478-95.
- Hope, V. 2000. Fighting for Identity: The Funerary Commemoration of Italian Gladiators. In *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy*, edited by A. Cooley. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London:93-113.
- Howgego, C. 1992. The Supply and Use of Money in the Roman World 200 B.C. to A.D. 300. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 82:1-31.
- . 2007. Coinage and Identity in the Roman provinces. In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by C. Howgego, V. Heuchert and A. Burnett. Oxford: Oxford University Press:1-17.
- Hughes, J. 2009. Personifications and the Ancient Viewer: The Case of the Hadrianeum 'Nations'. *Art History* (32):1-20.
- Huyssen, A. 1995. *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia*. New York: Routledge.

- Jones, B.W. 1984. *The Emperor Titus*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- . 1992. *The Emperor Domitian*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, L. 2000. *The Hermeneutics of Sacred Architecture: Experience, Interpretation, Comparison*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press for Harvard University Center for the Study of World Religions.
- Jones, M.W. 1999. L'Ordine Architettonico dell'Hadrianeum: Forma e Norme. In *Provinciae Fideles: Il Fregio del Tempio di Adriano in Campo Marzio*, edited by M. Sapelli and A. Claridge. Milan: Electa:129-39.
- Joost-Gaugier, C.L. 1998. The Iconography of Sacred Space: A Suggested Reading of the Meaning of the Pantheon. *Artibus et Historiae* 19 (38):21-42.
- Kansteiner, W. 2002. Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies. *History and Theory* 41:179-97.
- King, C. 2003. The Organization of Roman Religious Beliefs. *Classical Antiquity* 22:275-312.
- Kleiner, E.E.D., and B. Buxton. 2008. Pledges of Empire: The Ara Pacis and the Donations of Rome. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112:57-89.
- Kleiner, F.S. 1990. An Extraordinary Posthumous Honor for Livia. *Athenaeum* 68:508-14.
- Kockel, V. 1995. Forum Augustum. *LTUR* II:289-95.
- Koepfel, G.M. 1980. Fragments from a Domitianic Monument in Ann Arbor and Rome. *Bulletin, Museums of Art and Archaeology, The University of Michigan* 3:14-29.
- Komnick, H. 2001. *Die Restitutionsmünzen der frühen Kaiserzeit: Aspekte der Kaiserlegitimation*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kragelund, P. 2007. Agrippina's Revenge. In *Agrippina Minor Life and Afterlife. Liv og eftermaele*, edited by M. Moltesen and A.M. Nielsen. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek:27-43.
- . 2010. The Temple and Birthplace of Diva Poppaea. *The Classical Quarterly*:559-68.
- Kubler, G. 1962. *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- La Rocca, E. 1995. Gens Iulia, Ara. *LTUR* II:369-70.
- . 2009. Ritratto Colossale di Tito. In *Divus Vespasianus Il Bimillenario dei Flavio*, edited by F. Coarelli. Rome: Electa:497.
- . 2009. Templum Gentis Flavia. In *Divus Vespasianus: il Bimillenario dei Flavi*, edited by F. Coarelli: Milano:225-32.
- Laurence, R., and C. Smith. 1995-1996. Ritual, Time and Power in Ancient Rome. *The Accordia Research Papers* 6:133-51.
- LeGoff, J. 1996. *History and Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lendon, J.E. 2006. The Legitimacy of the Roman Emperor: Against Weberian Legitimacy and Imperial "Strategies of Legitimation". In *Herrschaftsstrukturen und Herrschaftspraxis: Konzepte, Prinzipien und Strategien der Administration im römischen Kaiserreich*, edited by A. Kolb. Berlin: Akademie Verlag:53-63.
- Levick, B. 1990. *Claudius*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lipka, M. 2009. *Roman Gods: A Conceptual Approach*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lowenthal, D. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, K. 1960. *The Image of the City, Publications of the Joint Center for Urban Studies*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- MacDonald, W.L. 2002. *The Pantheon. Design, Meaning, and Progeny*. Second Edition ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Machado, C. 2006. Building the Past: Monuments and Memory in the Forum Romanum. In *Social and Political Life in Late Antiquity*, edited by W. Bowden, A. Gutteridge and C. Machado. Leiden: Brill:157-94.
- Mattingly, H. 1920. The Restored Coins of Titus, Domitian, and Nerva. *Numismatic Chronicle*:170-207.
- . 1926. The Restored Coins of Trajan. *Numismatic Chronicle* 6:232-78.

- Mattingly, H. 1966a. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum I. Augustus to Vitellius*. London: British Museum.
- . 1966b. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum II. Vespasian to Domitian*. London: British Museum.
- McAlindon, D. 1956. Senatorial Opposition to Claudius and Nero. *The American Journal of Philology* 77:113-32.
- Meadows, A., and J. Williams. 2001. Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 91:27-49.
- Mellor, R. 1981. The Goddess Roma. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.17.2:950-1030.
- Meneghini, R. 1998. L'Architettura del Foro di Traiani Attraverso i Ritrovamenti Archeologici Più Recenti. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung* 105:127-48.
- . 1999. Forum Traiani, Traianus, Divus, Aedes, Addenda. *LTUR* V:258-9.
- . 2001. Il Foro di Traiano. Ricostruzione Architettonica e Analisi Strutturale. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung*:245-68.
- Meskel, L. 2004. *Object Worlds in Ancient Egypt: Material Biographies Past and Present*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Miles, G.B. 1995. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Mols, S. 2003. The Cult of Roma Aeterna in Hadrian's Politics. In *The Representation and Perception of Roman Imperial Power. Proceedings of the Third Workshop of the International Network "Impact of Empire. Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C.-A.D.476"*, edited by L. de Blois, P. Erdkamp, O. Hekster, G. de Kleijn and S. Mols. Amsterdam: Brill:458-65.
- Moltesen, M. 2007. Agrippina Minor in the Montemartini: The Statue Type. In *Agrippina Minor Life and Afterlife. Liv og eftermaele*, edited by M. Moltesen and A.M. Nielsen. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek:123-36.
- Murison, C.L. 2003. M. Cocceius Nerva and the Flavians. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 133:147-57.
- Nedergaard, E. 1993. Arcus Augusti (a. 19 a.C.). *LTUR* I (81-85).

- Nieddu, G. 1993. Dei Consentes, Aedes. *LTUR* II:9-10.
- Nielsen, I. 1993. Castor, Aedes, Templum. *LTUR* I:242-5.
- Nista, L. 1999. La Propaganda Imperiale nell'Arte Ufficiale Adrianea e Antonina. In *Provinciae Fideles: Il Fregio del Tempio di Adriano in Campo Marzio*, edited by M. Sapelli and A. Claridge. Milan: Electa:107-16.
- Nock, A.D. 1930. Σύνναος θεός. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41:1-62.
- Norberg-Schulz, C. 1983. Heidegger's thinking on architecture. *Perspecta* 20:61-8.
- Olick, J.K. 1999. Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. *Sociological Theory* 17:333-48.
- Oliver, J.H. 1949. The Divi of the Hadrianic Period. *The Harvard Theological Review* 42:35-40.
- Orlin, E. 2007. Augustan Religion and the Reshaping of Roman Memory. *Arethusa* 40:73-92.
- Osgood, J. 2011. *Claudius Caesar: Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Packer, J.E. 1997. *The Forum of Trajan in Rome: A Study of the Monuments*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2001. *The Forum of Trajan in Rome: A Study of the Monuments in Brief*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2008. The Column of Trajan, Topographical and Cultural Contexts. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 21:471-8.
- Packer, J.E., and J. Burge. 2003. Templum Divi Traiani Parthici et Plotinae: A Debate with R. Meneghini. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 16:109-36.
- Pais, A.M. 1979. *Il "Podium" del Tempio del Divo Adriano a Piazza di Pietra in Roma*. Roma: BPT Editori.
- Palasmaa, J. 1996. The Geometry of Feeling: A Look at the Phenomenology of Architecture. In *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology 1965-1995*, edited by K. Nesbitt. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press:446-57.
- Palombi, D. 1993. Arcus Divi Veri. *LTUR* I:112.

- Panella, C. 1996. *Meta Sudans I: un'Area Aacra in Palatio e la Valle del Colosseo Prima e Dopo Nerone*, *Archeologia di Roma*. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato.
- Papi, E. 1995. Romulus, Divus, Templum. *LTUR* IV:210-2.
- Paribeni, R. 1926-1927. *Optimus Princeps*. Messina: Principato.
- Paris, R. 1988. Propaganda e Iconografia: Una Lettura del Frontone del Tempio di Quirino sul Frammento del 'Rilievo Hartwig' nel Museo Nazionale Romano. *Bollettino d'Arte* 52:27-38.
- , ed. 1994. *Dono Hartwig: Originali Ricongiunti e Copie tra Roma e Ann Arbor. Ipotesi per il Templum Gentis Flaviae*. Rome: Giunti.
- Passarelli. 1940. Rilievo e Studio di Restituzione dell'Hadrianeum. In *Atti del III Convegno Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura (Roma 9-13 Ottobre 1938)*. Roma: Roma Colombo.
- Patterson, J.R. 1992. The City of Rome: From Republic to Empire. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 92:186-215.
- Pensa, M. 1969-1970. L'Architettura Traiana Attraverso le Emissioni Monetali Coeve. *Atti Centro Studi e Documentazione sull'Italia Romana* 2:235-97.
- Pensabene, P. 1996. Programmi Decorativi e Architettura del Tempio di Antonino e Faustina al Foro Romano. In *Scritti di Antichità in Memoria di Sandro Stucchi, 2. La Tripolitania. L'Italia e l'Occidente.*, edited by L. Bacchielli and M.B. Aravantinos. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider:239-69.
- Perry, E. 2005. *The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Visual Arts of Ancient Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfanner, M. 1983. *Der Titusbogen, Beiträge zur Erschliessung hellenistischer und kaiserzeitlicher Skulptur und Architektur*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Pobjoy, M. 2000. Building Inscriptions in Republic Italy: Euergetism, Responsibility, and Civic Virtue. In *The Epigraphic Landscape of Roman Italy*, edited by A. Cooley. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London:77-92.
- Polito, E. 1998. *Fulgentibus Armis. Introduzione allo Studio dei Fregi d'Armi Antichi*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

- Popkin, M. 2012. *The Triumphal Route in Republican and Imperial Rome: Architecture, Experience, and Memory*, New York University, Institute of Fine Arts.
- Presicce, C.P. 1999. La Rappresentazioni Allegoriche di Popoli e Province nell'Arte Romana Imperiale. In *Provinciae Fideles: Il Fregio del Tempio di Adriano in Campo Marzio*, edited by M. Sapelli and A. Claridge. Milan: Electa:83-105.
- Price, S.R.F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1987. From Noble Funerals to Divine Cult: the Consecration of Roman Emperors. In *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, edited by D. Cannadine and S.R.F. Price. Cambridge: Past and Present Society:56-105.
- Rappaport, R.A. 1999. *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rehak, P. 2001. The Fourth "Flamen" of the Ara Pacis Augustae. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 14 (284-288).
- Rich, J.W. 1998. Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 66:71-128.
- Richard, J.C. 1966. Tombeaux des Empereurs et Temples de 'Divi': Notes sur la Signification Religieuse des Sépultures Impériales à Rome. *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 170:127-42.
- Richardson, L. 1976. The Villa Publica and the Divorum. In *In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel. Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities*, edited by L. Bonfante and H. von Heintze. Mainz: von Zabern:159-72.
- Ricoeur, P. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Roche, P.A. 2002. The Public Image of Trajan's Family. *Classical Philology* 97:41-60.
- Rodríguez Almeida, E. 1981. *Forma Urbis Marmorea. Aggiornamento Generale 1980*. Rome.
- . 1993. Basilica Marciana, Basilica Matidia. *LTUR* I:182.
- Rogers, K.A. 1994. Eternity Has No Duration. *Religious Studies* 30 (1):1-16.

- Rosenfeld, G.D. 2000. *Munich and Memory: Architecture, Monuments, and the Legacy of the Third Reich*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rossi, A. 1982. *The Architecture of the City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Rosso, E. 2009. Testa Colossale del Divus Vespasianus. In *Divus Vespasianus Il Bimillenario dei Flavio*, edited by F. Coarelli. Rome: Electa:495.
- Rowan, C. 2012. Communicating a Consecratio: The Deification Coinage of Faustina I. In *Proceedings of the XIV International Numismatic Congress Glasgow, Vol. 1*, edited by N. Holmes. Glasgow:991-8.
- Rowlands, M. 1993. The Role of Memory in the Transmission of Culture. *World Archaeology* 25:141-51.
- Rubins, D.C. 1995. *Memory in Oral Traditions: The Cognitive Psychology of Epic, Ballads, and Counting-out Rhymes*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salzman, M.R. 1990. *On Roman Time: The Codex-calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sapelli, M. 1999. Rilievi con Province e con Trofei dall'Hadrianeum in Campo Marzo. In *Provinciae Rideles: Il Fregio del Tempio di Adriano in Campo Marzio*, edited by M. Sapelli and A. Claridge. Milan: Electa:11-82.
- Schacter, D.L. 1996. *Searching for Memory: The Brain, the Mind, and the Past*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scheid, J. 2007. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Hauts Faits du Divin Auguste*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Schwartz, B. 1990. The Reconstruction of Abraham Lincoln. In *Collective Remembering*, edited by D. Middleton and D. Edwards. London: Sage Publications:81-107.
- . 2000. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, K. 1925. The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 56:82-105.
- . 1975. *The Imperial Cult Under the Flavians*. New York: Arno Press.

- Scott, R.T. 1999. Vesta, Aedes. *LTUR* V:125-8.
- Scott-Ryberg, I. 1955. *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*. Rome: American Academy in Rome.
- . 1967. *Panel Reliefs of Marcus Aurelius*. New York: Archaeological Institute of America.
- Short, T.L. 2007. *Peirce's Theory of Signs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siebert, A.V. 1999. *Instrumenta Sacra: Untersuchungen zu römischen Opfer-, Kult- und Priestergeräten*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Simon, E. 1986. *Augustus: Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitenwende*. Munich: Hirmer.
- Small, J.P. 1997. *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge.
- Small, J.P., and J. Tatum. 1995. Memory and the Study of Classical Antiquity. *Helios* 22:149-77.
- Smith, E.B. 1956. *Architectural Symbolism of Imperial Rome and the Middle Ages, Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology* 30. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, J.Z. 1987. *To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual, Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Variation: Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1988. Simulacra Gentium: The Ethne from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 78:50-77.
- Squarciapino, M.F. 1957. Il Fregio del Tempio del Divo Giulio. *Lincei Rendiconti Morali* 12:270-84.
- Stamper, J.W. 2005. *The Architecture of Roman Temples: The Republic to the Middle Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stewart, P. 2003. *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strack, P.L. 1931. *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil I*. Stuttgart.

- . 1953. *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts. Teil II.* Stuttgart.
- Sullivan, L.E. 1986. Sound and Senses: Toward a Hermeneutics of Performance. *History of Religions* 26 (1):1-33.
- Sumi, G. 2009. Monuments and Memory: The Aedes Castoris in the Formation of Augustan Ideology. *Classical Quarterly* 59.1:167-86.
- . 2011. Topography and Ideology: Caesar's Monument and the Aedes Divi Iulii in Augustan Rome. *The Classical Quarterly* 61:205-29.
- Talamo, E. 2007. I Ritrovamenti Archeologici sul Celio e la Scoperta della Statue di Agrippina Orante. In *Agrippina Minor Life and Afterlife. Liv og eftermaele*, edited by M. Moltesen and A.M. Nielsen. Copenhagen: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek:95-111.
- Temporini, H. 1978. *Die Frauen am Hofe Trajans. Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Principat.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Terdiman, R. 1993. *Present Past: Modernity and Memory Crisis.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Thomas, E. 2007. *Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, M.L. 2004. (Re)locating Domitian's Horse of Glory: The "Equus Domitiani" and Flavian Urban Design. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 49:21-46.
- Torelli, M. 1987. Culto Imperiale e Spazi Urbani in Età Flavia. Dai Rilievi Hartwig all'Arco di Tito. In *L'Urbs. Espace Urbain et Histoire. Ier Siècle av. J.C.-IIIe Siècle apJ.C. Actes du Colloque International, Rome, 8-12 mai 1985.* Rome: École française de Rome:563-82.
- . 1992. *Typology & Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1999. Plutei Traianei (Anaglypha Traiani). *LTUR* IV:95-6.
- Toynbee, J.M.C. 1967. *The Hadrianic School: A Chapter in the History of Greek Art.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Toynbee, J.M.C., and J.B.W. Perkins. 1950. Peopled Scrolls: A Hellenistic Motif in Imperial Art. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 18:1-43.

- Trunk, M. 2010. Der Caesar Farnese und das Traiansforum. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 61-74.
- Tulving, E. 1972. Episodic and Semantic Memory. In *Organization of Memory*, edited by E. Tulving and W. Donaldson. New York: Academic Press:381-403.
- Turcan, R. 1983. Rome Eternelle et les Conceptions Greco-Romaines de l'Eternite. In *Roma Constantinopoli Mosca: seminario 21 aprile 1981*. Naples: Edizioni scientifiche italiane:7-30.
- . 1998. *The Gods of Ancient Rome: Religion in Everyday Life from Archaic to Imperial Times*. Translated by A. Nevill. Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press.
- . 1998. Templum Divi Claudii. In *Claude de Lyon, Empereur Romain: Actes du Colloque Paris-Nancy-Lyon, Novembre 1992*, edited by Y. Burnand, Y. Le Bohec and J.P. Martin. Paris: Presses de L'Université de Paris-Sorbonne.
- . 2000. Templum Gentis Flaviae. *Journal des Savants*:3-28.
- Ulrich, R. 1984. The Temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum of Caesar in Rome: The Topography, History, Architecture, and Sculptural Program of the Monument, Yale University.
- . 1994. *The Roman Orator and the Sacred State. The Roman "Templum Rostratum"*. Vol. 222, *Latomus*. Brussels: Latomus.
- VanderLeest, J. 1995. Hadrian, Lucius Verus, and the Arco di Portogallo. *Phoenix* 49:319-30.
- Vanggaard, J.H. 1988. *The Flamen: A Study in the History and Sociology of Roman Religion*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Varner, E.R. 2004. *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. Leiden: Brill.
- . forthcoming. Grotesque Aesthetics: Transgression and Transcendence in the Age of Nero.
- Viscogliosi, A. 2011. La Domus Aurea. In *Nerone*, edited by M.A. Tomei and R. Rea. Milano: Mondadori Electa:156-9.
- von Boschung, D., and W. Eck. 1998. Ein Bildnis der Mutter Traians? Zum kolossal Kopf der sogenannten Agrippina Minor vom Traiansforum. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 473-81.

- von Hesberg, H. 1996. Mausoleum Augusti; das Monument. *LTUR* III:234-7.
- . 2011. L'Attività Edilizia a Roma all'Epoca di Nerone. In *Nerone*, edited by M.A. Tomei and R. Rea. Milano: Mondadori Electa:108-17.
- Wagoner, B. 2011. Meaning Construction in Remembering: A Synthesis of Bartlett and Vygotsky. In *Theoretical Psychology: Global Transformations and Challenges*, edited by J. Stenner, J. Cromby, J. Motzkau, J. Yen and Y. Haosheng. Toronto: Captus Press:105-14.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1981. The Emperor and His Virtues. *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 30:298-323.
- . 1987. Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus, and the *Fasti*. In *Homo Viator: classical essays for John Bramble*, edited by M. Whitby, P. Hardie and M. Whitby. Bristol, England: Bristol Classical Press:221-30.
- . 2005. Mutatas Formas: The Augustan Transformation of Roman Knowledge. In *The Cambridge companion to the age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press:55-84.
- . 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, Q. 2008. On the Cultural Constitution of Collective Memory. *The Journal Memory* 16:305-17.
- Wardle, D. 2002. Deus or Divus: The Genesis of Roman Terminology for Deified Emperors and a Philosopher's Contribution. In *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin*, edited by M.T. Griffin, G. Clark and T. Rajak. Oxford: Oxford University Press:181-91.
- . 2005. Unimpeachable Sponsors of Imperial Autocracy, or Augustus' Dream Team (Suetonius Divus Augustus 94.8-9 and Dio Cassius 45.2.2-4). *Antichthon* 39:29-47.
- Waters, K.H. 1969. Traianus Domitiani Continuator. *American Journal of Philology* 90:385-405.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Weiss, H. 1941. An Interpretative Note on a Passage in Plotinus on Eternity and Time (III. 7. 6). *Classical Philology* 36 (3):230-9.
- Wertsch, J.V., and H.R. Roediger III. 2008. Collective Memory: Conceptual Foundations and Theoretical Approaches. *The Journal Memory* 16:318-26.

- White, H., H.A. Coppola, and N. Multunas. 2008. Remembering Others: Using Life Scripts to Access Positive but Not Negative Information. *The American Journal of Psychology* 121:293-318.
- Whittaker, H. 1996. Two Notes on Octavian and the Cult of Divus Julius. *Symbolae Osloenses* 71:87-99.
- Williams, H., ed. 2003. *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies*. New York: Kluwer Academic, Plenum Publishers.
- Winkes, R. 1979. Pliny's Chapter on Roman Funeral Customs in Light of the Clipeatae Imagines (at Villa Oplontis). *American Journal of Archaeology* 83:481-4.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1991. *Flavius Josephus Death of an Emperor Translation and Commentary*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- . 1993. Campus Martialis. *LTUR* I:219-24.
- . 1993. Clivus Capitolinus. *LTUR* I:280-1.
- . 2007. Three Notes on the Triumphal Route. In *Res Bene Gestae: Ricerche di Storia Urbana su Roma Antica in onore di Eva Margareta Steinby*, edited by A. Leone, D. Palombi, S. Walker and E.M. Steinby. Roma: Quasar:445-9.
- Wood, N. 1999. *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*. Oxford New York: Berg.
- Wood, S. 1995. Diva Drusilla Panthea and the Sisters of Caligula. *American Journal of Archaeology* 99:457-82.
- . 2010. Who Was Diva Domitilla? Some Thoughts on the Public Images of the Flavian Women. *American Journal of Archaeology* 114:45-57.
- Yegül, F.K. 1982. A Study in Architectural Iconography. Kaisersaal and the Imperial Cult. *Art Bulletin* 64:7-31.
- Zanker, P. 1970. Das Traiansforum in Rom. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 1970:499-544.
- . 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———. 1997. In Search of the Roman Viewer. In *Interpretation of Architectural Sculpture in Greece and Rome*, edited by D. Buitron Oliver. Washington: National Gallery of Art:179-91.

Zerubavel, E. 2003. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ziolkowski, A. 1992. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context, Saggi di Storia Antica*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

———. 1999. Pantheon. *LTUR* IV:54-61.

———. 2007. Prolegomena to any Future Metaphysics on Agrippa's Pantheon. In *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae. Supplementum VI. Res Bene Gestae. Ricerche di Storia Urbana su Roma Antica in Onore di Eva Margareta Steinby*. Roma:465-76.

FIGURES

[PAGES 362-465 OMITTED]