

## OCTAVIAN AND AUGURY: THE YEARS 30–27 B.C.\*

Augustus mentions his transactions with the Senate in late 28–early 27 B.C. almost at the end of his own record of his public career (*RG* 34.1–2). The significance of these sections of his account mean that the recent publication of a new Latin fragment from Pisidian Antioch is of the greatest importance. This small fragment, containing lettering from part of three lines, finally reveals that, in 34.1, the participle *potitus* restored by Mommsen in 1883 is now to be replaced with the adjective *potens*.<sup>1</sup>

- 1 In consulatu sexto et septimo postqua[m] bjella [civil]ia exstinxeram  
per consensum universonum [po]tens re[ru]m om[n]ium rem publicam  
ex mea potestate in senat[us] populi[que] R[om]ani [a]rbitrium transtuli.
- 2 quo pro merito meo senatu[s] consulto Au]gust[us] appe]llatus sum et laurea[s]  
postes aedium mearum v[estiti]i publ[ic]e corona[que] civica super  
ianuam meam fixa est [et clu]peus [aureu]s in [c]uria Iulia posi-  
tus quem mihi senatus pop[ul]u[m]q[ue] Rom[anu]m dare virtutis clem-  
ent[ia]eque et iustitiae et pieta[tis] caus[us]a testatu[m] est pe[r] e]ius clupei  
[inscription]em.<sup>2</sup>

1 In my sixth and seventh consulships, after I had extinguished the civil wars, when through universal consent I was in possession of power over all public affairs, I transferred the State out of my power into the authority of the Senate and Roman people.

2 For this service of mine by decree of the Senate I was named Augustus and with laurel branches the door-posts of my house were wreathed publicly and a civic crown was fixed above my door, and a golden shield placed in the Curia Iulia, which, it is attested by the inscription of that shield, the Senate and people of Rome gave to me for the sake of my courage, clemency, justice and piety.

The discovery has enabled new certainty about the manner in which Augustus chose to express his position of leadership at a crucial stage of his political career. The significant position of this episode in a work crafted with the opinion of posterity in mind (Dio 56.33.1; Suet. *Aug.* 101.4) suggests that Augustus is describing what he felt was a landmark in his career. Details that might clarify its political context are

\* My thanks are due to E.A. Judge and to the anonymous reader of this article for their suggestions and comments. It is not intended to imply, however, that they are in agreement with the views expressed here.

<sup>1</sup> The new fragment was first published by P. Botteri, ‘L’integrazione mommseniana a *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 34,1 “*potitus rerum omnium*” e il testo greco’, *ZPE* 144 (2003), 264 and may also be found together with further discussion in T. Drew-Bear and J. Scheid, ‘La copie des *Res Gestae* d’Antioche de Pisidie’, *ZPE* 154 (2005), 217–60, at 233–6. Discussion of *RG* 34.1–2 and the new fragment is also included in J. Scheid, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Hauts faits du divin Auguste* (Paris, 2007), 82–91. The fragment discovered at Pisidian Antioch has confirmed the earlier proposal to restore *potens* by R. Kassels (see W.D. Lebek, ‘*Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 34, 1: Rudolf Kassels *potens rerum omnium* und ein neues Fragment des Monumentum Antiochenum’, *ZPE* 146 [2004], 60). Despite its small size the fragment’s contribution to the historical analysis of the text is inestimable, cf. R.T. Ridley, *The Emperor’s Retrospect. Augustus’ Res Gestae in Epigraphy, Historiography and Commentary* (Leuven, 2003), 25–50 and, on *RG* 34.1 in particular, 139–41.

<sup>2</sup> The text incorporates the new fragment but is otherwise that of V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford, 1955<sup>2</sup>), 28.

lacking, however, and it is necessary to turn to other sources in order to investigate the background to the momentous events to which Augustus refers. Among both contemporary and later sources which are available, the account of this period by Cassius Dio must be considered of primary importance because it alone provides a chronological framework for events. Despite the considerable distance in time between Dio's own life-time and the events of the Augustan era, the reliability of his chronology for the Augustan years is strongly indicated by comparison with other sources which also made use of the *acta senatus* and the *acta diurna*.<sup>3</sup>

In general terms, Dio's description of actions taken by Octavian to shore up his position from 30 down to the beginning of 27 makes it clear that the threat of civil war was not entirely over in 31, or even in 30 after Antonius and Cleopatra had been finally disposed of (cf. Dio 52.42.8). Moreover, because of what Dio (51.23.2–27.3) reports about the achievements of Marcus Licinius Crassus (*cos.* 30) and about subsequent events in Rome, Crassus has been characterized as a rival to Octavian for pre-eminence in Rome in some modern discussions.<sup>4</sup> It is the scale of Crassus' military achievements, the anomalies in how these are celebrated in Rome, and the disappearance of Crassus from the literary sources after the celebration of his triumph, which have been taken to indicate that he must have been a protagonist in the political turmoil during Octavian's sixth consulship that led to Octavian being given supreme political power.

The course and nature of Crassus' campaigns when proconsul of Macedonia, provided in the substantial account of Dio (51.23.1–27.1), surely direct attention towards Crassus as a potential, and most unwelcome rival to Octavian's claim to military leadership of Rome after 31.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, Crassus' shifting political allegiances as an adherent of, first, Sextus Pompeius and, then, Marcus Antonius (Dio 51.4.3) might reasonably be suspected to have contributed both to suspicion of his future intentions by Octavian, and to a view of him as an alternative leader by contemporaries in Rome, particularly those supporters of Antonius who survived the battle of Actium and who were once again part of the Roman political scene (cf. Dio 51.2.4–6, 53.11.1–4).

In line with such an analysis, the discussion below is based on the following premises: that the victory of Octavian's forces at Actium in 31 did not establish his right to the leadership of Rome unchallenged; that, during the immediately following years down to January 27, enmity existed between Octavian and several others who were determined to lead their lives according to the traditional *mores* of public life; finally, that the most difficult and sustained opposition to Octavian's determination to

<sup>3</sup> M. Reinhold and P.M. Swan, 'Cassius Dio's assessment of Augustus', in K.A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (edd.), *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate* (Berkeley, 1990), 171–3.

<sup>4</sup> See M. Reinhold, *From Republic to Principate. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49–52 (36–29 B.C.)* (Atlanta, 1988), 162; H.L. Flower, 'The tradition of the *spolia opima*: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus', *ClAnt* 19 (2000), 44 and n. 55 with a survey of earlier literature. For a recent argument against this view, see J.W. Rich, 'Augustus and the *spolia opima*', *Chiron* 26 (1996), 85–127. A response to his view may be found below.

<sup>5</sup> The significance of Crassus' thwarted ambition is acknowledged even by K.A. Raaflaub and L.J. Samons II ('Opposition to Augustus', in Raaflaub and Toher [n. 3], 422–3) who, in other respects, minimize the opposition to Octavian between 31 and 28. Perhaps the lengthy excursus on Crassus' operations stems from Dio's own interest in the region, but this by no means excludes the possibility that his sources reflected the interest and admiration Crassus' campaigns created in contemporary Rome. Livy's account (*Per.* 134) has been largely lost.

be sole leader arose as a result of the military achievement of Marcus Licinius Crassus.

### THE YEAR 30

The year following his naval victory over Antonius and Cleopatra was a troubled one for Octavian. In his account of the year 30, Dio describes how the military veterans whom Octavian had demobilized and sent back to Italy after Actium began to express their discontent because he had failed to recognize their contribution to his victory materially (51.3.1–2). This discontent gathered strength and led to public demonstrations causing Octavian, says Dio, to be fearful that the soldiers might seek out a leader and so undermine his recently acquired political control of Rome. The leader envisaged by Octavian was a potential rival, surely a man of senatorial rank who would seize on a ready *clientela* and the opportunity to challenge him for the leadership. It is a measure of the seriousness of the situation for Octavian that he surrendered the pursuit of Antonius to his deputies and returned to Italy precipitately regardless of the fact that it was mid-winter and the sailing season had closed (51.4.2–5.1).

Many of all ranks certainly flocked to greet Octavian on arrival in Italy but not all went spontaneously. Some went because they were summoned and out of fear. Although the size of Octavian's backing in Brundisium on that occasion is unknown, his arrival must have created the threat of reprisal. Octavian, however, did not attempt to enter Rome but remained at the port.<sup>6</sup>

The mutinous veterans were not alone in causing concern to Octavian. Dio also says there were other urgent matters of business with which Octavian had to deal. Their political significance is indicated by the fact that neither Maecenas, whom Octavian had left to protect his interests in Rome, nor Agrippa, whom Octavian had sent back to Rome from the East in late 31 to ensure that Maecenas' authority was respected (51.3.5–6), was adequate to handle those urgent matters.<sup>7</sup> Some of the mutinous veterans among the large crowd which had flocked to meet Octavian at the port received cash payouts and land assignments (cf. *RG* 16.1) and were, presumably, satisfied. But, Dio reports (51.5.1), Octavian had to pardon a part of the population because it had not come to meet him. From this indication that opposition to Octavian in Rome was maintained by some, we may conclude that 'the other urgent business' included dealing with it. Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, son of the former triumvir, who was planning to assassinate Octavian and to revive civil conflict, did not go unpunished (Vell. Pat. 2.88.1–3; Dio 54.15.4).<sup>8</sup> Clearly, it was to Octavian's advantage to exert himself urgently to prevent the coalescence of disaffected veterans and any senatorial challengers to his position.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Dio (37.20.3–6) on how the arrival of victorious commanders at Brundisium created nervousness among the Romans. As Octavian's reception on the occasion of his victorious return from the East had been planned and announced well in advance (Dio 51.20.1–3) he may well have wished to avoid going to Rome before that event.

<sup>7</sup> On the contrary, Plutarch (*Ant.* 73.3) reports that Agrippa kept writing to Octavian that his presence was urgently needed in Italy.

<sup>8</sup> The conspiracy is discussed in P. Sattler, *Augustus und der Senat. Untersuchungen zur römischen Innerpolitik zwischen 30 und 17 vor Christus* (Göttingen, 1960), 29–31. The offence of the equestrian Cornelius Gallus was of a different kind but he too was eventually condemned (Dio 51.17.1, 53.23.5–24.1; cf. R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* (Oxford, 1986), 32; Raaflaub and Samons [n. 5], 423–5).

After what must have been a month of intense negotiation Octavian returned to Greece (Dio 51.5.1). The nature of the senatorial tributes dating to the latter half of 30 reveals that Octavian prevailed in persuading a majority in the Senate to back him (Dio 51.19.4–7). His success was only temporary however. Octavian again suspected the existence of conspiracies within the higher ranks against him in 29 (Dio 52.42.8).

None of Octavian's opponents during the winter of 30–29 is named by Dio; among his supporters, only Maecenas and Agrippa. There is no comment about the behaviour of Octavian's co-consul, Marcus Licinius Crassus, at the time of his visit to Italy. However, Crassus became proconsul of Macedonia later in the same year.<sup>9</sup> His war against the Bastarnae and the slaughter of their king in single-handed combat during his first provincial campaign won him a triumphal decree by the Senate in the winter of 30–29 (Dio 51.23.2–24.4).<sup>10</sup> This success and its acknowledgement in Rome can hardly have been welcome news to Octavian.

### THE YEAR 29

Octavian was absent from Italy until August during his fifth consulate. Nevertheless, two events occurred in Rome which Dio says were exceedingly pleasing to Octavian above all other honours decreed him (51.20.4). These events are of critical importance, therefore, in understanding the character of Octavian's relationship to the Roman State at that time and in the future. The events in question, linked in time by Dio and dated to the month of January, are the closing of the gates of Janus and the performance of the *augurium salutis*.<sup>11</sup> Although he was an augur (RG 7.3), Octavian's absence from Rome at that time makes it impossible that he played a role in the actual performance of that *augurium salutis*.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, Suetonius' comment (*Aug.* 31.4) that it was he who revived the rite must mean that the college's decision to secure permission for performance of the *augurium salutis* from the Senate was at his instigation.

Even then the augural auspices could be taken only if the augurs were summoned by a competent official. Octavian's consular colleague during the early months of that year, Sextus Appuleius (Dio 51.20.1), is the most likely candidate both to have sponsored the request for a decree of the Senate on Octavian's behalf and to summon the augural college for the *augurium*.<sup>13</sup> Appuleius was not only Octavian's colleague as *consul ordinarius* in 29, he was his nephew.<sup>14</sup> Given that he was himself a member of

<sup>9</sup> Three suffects followed Crassus as consul (A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII.1 [Rome, 1937], p. 510), indicating he would have been free to leave Rome by the second half of 30.

<sup>10</sup> Crassus' campaigns are usually dated 29–28 but, although Dio (51.23.1–2) mentions the despatch of Crassus to Macedonia under the year 29, he links it with the building of Statilius Taurus' amphitheatre in Rome in 30; cf. Syme (n. 8), 272 and Reinhold (n. 4), 160. For the flexibility of Dio's annalistic scheme in recounting foreign wars, see J.W. Rich (ed.), *Cassius Dio. The Augustan Settlement* (Roman History 53–55.9) (Warminster, 1990), 10.

<sup>11</sup> The closing of the gates of Janus is recorded in the *Fasti Praenestini* (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.1, p. 231). This event is proclaimed proudly by Augustus (RG 13, undated) as a mark of his success in achieving peace and prosperity for Rome, but the *augurium salutis* is not mentioned.

<sup>12</sup> A *cippus* found below the Arx (*ILS* 9337) testifies to later ceremonies of the *augurium salutis* under Augustus.

<sup>13</sup> Most often this was the *pontifex maximus* (J. Linderski, 'The augural law', in H. Temporini and W. Haase (edd.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.16.3 [Berlin, 1986], 2218) but the political circumstances in 29 made that impossible (cf. RG 10.2).

<sup>14</sup> Syme (n. 8), 30.

the augural college,<sup>15</sup> it is probable also that Appuleius was the magistrate who took the auspices and performed the ceremony.<sup>16</sup>

The last celebration of the *augurium salutis* prior to 29 was that of the year 63. The ceremony was held on the successful conclusion of Pompeius' extraordinary command in the East against Mithridates.<sup>17</sup> When the *augurium salutis* was revived in 29, Octavian's victory in the East against Cleopatra and the Parthian settlement (cf. Dio 51.17.4–18.3) would have been similarly represented. The *augurium salutis* identified Octavian as the one through whom Jupiter would always act for the well-being and safety of the State.<sup>18</sup> His inseparable link with the safety of the Roman State at an official level is documented by the inclusion, in 29, of his name in the public hymns with those of the gods (Dio 51.20.2). Among these Augustus later singles out for special mention the hymn of the Salii (*RG* 10.1).<sup>19</sup> In the same year Octavian cleansed the temple of Capitoline Jupiter of all earlier dedications and replaced them with his own (Dio 51.22.3–4; Suet. *Aug.* 30.2). By this means, he further identified himself with the chief god of the State, and hence with the fortune of the State itself.<sup>20</sup> Thereafter, he laid the laurels from his *fasces* in the Capitoline temple after each victorious war (*RG* 4.1; cf. Dio 54.25.4). The first words of an Augustan edict relayed by Suetonius (*Aug.* 28.2) displays his self-identification with the divinely-granted security of the State: *ita mihi salvam ac sospitem rem publicam sistere in sua sede liceat* ('May I be permitted to maintain the State safe and sound in its proper position').<sup>21</sup> Recognition of this important role of Octavian may be found in the subsequent traditions of the inhabitants of Augustan Rome and in Augustan literature (cf. Virg. *Aen.* 1.286–96).<sup>22</sup> It is surely also reflected in Asia Minor where Octavian was at the time of the *augurium salutis* (Dio 51.20.7–51.21.1). There, dedications linked his name with that of *Hyeia* (*Salus*).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>15</sup> T.R.S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (Atlanta, 1952), 2, 532.

<sup>16</sup> On the procedure of the *augurium salutis*, see Linderski (n. 13), 2255–6.

<sup>17</sup> Dio 37.24.1–25.2. Like Octavian, Pompeius had not yet returned to Italy. The similarity in the political circumstances leading to the *auguria salutis* of 63 and 29 should not pass unnoticed. However, an important difference between them is that the earlier of the two was irregular. When repeated it was again accompanied by unlucky omens and Cicero later reported Appius Claudius as saying the irregularity meant civil war was at hand (*De div.* 1.47.105). No such cloud hung over the ceremony of 29.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Linderski (n. 13), 2226, 2291; J. Linderski, *Roman Questions. Selected Papers* (Stuttgart, 1995), 490. The role of Augustus in this respect is also depicted on the *gemma Augustea* where he is shown in the guise of Jupiter sitting beside Roma as he is crowned with the *corona civica*. Significantly, he holds the augur's *lituus* rather than the thunderbolt of Jupiter (see P. Zanker, trans. A. Shapiro, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* [Ann Arbor, 1988], 230–1 with 234, fig. 182).

<sup>19</sup> Ovid, *Fasti* 3.361–92 reveals the significance of this for claiming divine endorsement of his leadership of Rome.

<sup>20</sup> Given the tributes to Octavian of the year 36 and the connection then made between his victory and Capitoline Jupiter (Dio 49.15.1–2), the *augurium salutis* must have presented the people of Rome with confirmation of the existing relationship rather than a novel concept. The view of E. Fantham ('Rewriting and rereading the *Fasti*: Augustus, Ovid and recent Classical scholarship', *Antichthon* 29 [1995], 53) that 'Augustus took no personal initiative to enhance the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus or his own association with Jupiter' seems unlikely in the light of these events.

<sup>21</sup> Not surprisingly there is no indication of the date of this edict in Suetonius.

<sup>22</sup> Throughout his life Octavian/Augustus' health was of importance to Rome's inhabitants (cf. Suet. *Aug.* 57.1).

<sup>23</sup> C. Habicht, *Inscriptionen von Pergamon* 8, 3 (Berlin, 1969), 164–5; J. Reynolds, 'Further information on imperial cult at Aphrodisias', *StudClas* 24 (1986), 109 = *SEG* 30 (1980), 1269.

Octavian's revival of the *augurium salutis* should not be considered only as part of his interest in restoring discontinued rituals of Rome. A specific political purpose was served by this particular revival.<sup>24</sup> The *augurium salutis* was used by Octavian as a means towards ensuring sole and enduring control in Rome. Dio says (51.20.5) that the closing of the gates of Janus and the *augurium salutis* took place despite the fact that Roman forces were still campaigning in Germany and elsewhere. The Senate's action in sanctioning the ceremony meant that it endorsed his campaigns as the only significant ones for the well-being of the State. Its decree that the gates of Janus should be closed and prayers for future safety could be offered similarly had the effect of diminishing the significance of the activities of other members of the senatorial class who were still campaigning.<sup>25</sup>

Of the Roman commanders known to have been active outside Italy in 30–29, it is Licinius Crassus whose military exploits must have demanded a response from Octavian.<sup>26</sup> As early as his first season of campaigning as governor of Macedonia, Crassus had distinguished himself among Roman commanders in an extremely rare manner. He had captured the armour of the enemy king in single combat (Dio 51.24.4).<sup>27</sup> For Octavian, this achievement must have represented the emergence of a dismaying threat to his own desire for continued supremacy. He could not afford to allow Crassus to surpass him in the strictly measurable sense that dedication of the *spolia opima* signified.<sup>28</sup> If that occurred there was a strong possibility that his own successes against Cleopatra and the Parthians would be overshadowed (cf. Dio 51.19.1–20.3).

An extra dimension to the situation was created by the fact that Caesar had signalled his intention to campaign in the Thracio-Macedonian region against the Getae on his way to attack the Parthians (Appian, *Ill. Wars* 3.13). Since Caesar was prevented from doing this by his premature death, his heir may well have considered that task his prerogative.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, Crassus had apparently intruded upon a client relationship of the Caesarian family with Roles, a king of the Getae (cf. Dio 51.24.6–7, 51.26.1). Thus, family honour may have been at stake, giving Crassus' achievement the character of a personal as well as a political rivalry in the eyes of Octavian. Whether or not this was the case, the fact remains that full recognition of Crassus' achievements would place him in a position from which he could challenge Octavian's right to the sole leadership of Rome. Hence the crucial importance to Octavian of the *augurium salutis* of January 29. It secured for himself alone the right to decide if the State was at war by the sacred role of *interpres* of Jupiter. No doubt it was this outcome that made performance of the ceremony so pleasing to him.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Octavian's revival of the ritual of the fetial priesthood in 32 (R.A. Kearsley, 'Octavian in the year 32 B.C.: the *S.C. de Aphrodisiensibus* and the *genera militiae*', *RhM* 142 [1999], 56–60).

<sup>25</sup> Dio 51.20.5 may reflect a justificatory explanation of Octavian, perhaps contained in his *Memoirs*.

<sup>26</sup> See J.J. Wilkes, 'The Danubian and Balkan provinces', in A.K. Bowman et al. (edd.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*<sup>2</sup> X (Cambridge, 1996), 548–53. Dio preserves contradictory traditions about the nature of Crassus' operations (cf. 51.20.5 with 51.23.2–27.3). The contemporary campaigns of Carrinas are mentioned but not described in Dio 51.21.6.

<sup>27</sup> Dio 51.25.1–2 reveals that Deldo was dead and the triumph announced before the winter of 30–29 had set in. Crassus' news was probably known to Octavian already by the winter of 30–29 since he was also in the East (Dio 51.21.1).

<sup>28</sup> On the *spolia opima*, see Rich (n. 4), 106; Flower (n. 4), 50–1.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Reinhold (n. 4), 66. Octavian's announcement of a campaign in Britain in 27 (Dio 53.22.5) reflects his propensity to emulate his adoptive father. Despite diplomacy replacing military action, he claims success there in *RG* 32.1, as does Horace on his behalf (*Od.* 3.5.2–4).

Octavian's return to Rome was followed closely by remarkable triple triumphal celebrations in mid-August.<sup>30</sup> The triumphal procession of the third day was especially noteworthy for the manner in which the usual order was reversed to Octavian's advantage and the detriment of his magisterial colleagues (Dio 51.21.9).<sup>31</sup> Two triumphs, one for the naval victory at Actium and one for the conquest of Egypt, had been decreed in the previous year (Dio 51.19.1–5). To these a third was added and celebrated as the first of the three days. Appian refers to it as an Illyrian triumph (*Ill. Wars* 5.28), and so it is usually described in modern discussions, as Appian attributes this triumph to a long-delayed celebration of Octavian's own campaigns in Illyricum between 35 and 33. Dio describes the day as celebrating victories over the Pannonians and Dalmatians, the Iapydes and their neighbours, and some Celts and Galatians (Dio 51.21.5–7). According to him, the day was actually a composite occasion on which Octavian caught up under his own name Carrinas' victories to the north of Italy (Dio 51.21.6), Crassus' achievements over the Dacians and the Moesians (Dio 51.25.2), and his own earlier campaigns in Illyricum against the Iapydes (Dio 51.21.5). Although Crassus' name is not included in Dio's description of the day, the claims made for Octavian by Appian bear a far closer resemblance to Crassus' campaigns (cf. Dio 51.27.1) than Octavian's own achievements in Illyricum.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, in the procession of that day, as also on the other two days, spoils from Egypt were carried (Dio 51.21.7). Thus Octavian used the first day of his triple triumph to display the results of others' victories and to assert his primacy by displaying Egyptian spoils at the same time.

Octavian's celebration of the victories of others as his own would not have been unusual during the period of the second triumvirate. Then, commanders triumphed only by permission of Octavian and Antonius.<sup>33</sup> Triumviral prerogatives were not needed by Octavian to justify the continuation of this practice after Actium however. Nor did he need to seek some re-definition of precedence for consular *imperium* over that of a proconsul.<sup>34</sup> His precedence was based upon his membership of the Iulian family and the honours inherited by him as the adopted son of Iulius Caesar.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Degrassi (n. 9), p. 570.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Reinhold (n. 4), 158.

<sup>32</sup> Reinhold argues (*ibid.* 74, 157) that Appian's text is heavily dependent on the *Memoirs* of Augustus. A variety of sources indicates that captives from Crassus' first campaign were exhibited by Octavian on that occasion and at the consecration of the shrine of Iulius Caesar in the same year (Dio 51.22.2–3). Virg. *Aen.* 8.728, for example, mentions the presence of hitherto unconquered Scythians at the triumph who, when combined with information in Dio 51.22.6, *RG* 31.2 and Livy, *Per.* 134, should probably be recognized as Dacians defeated by Crassus. Certainly Dio (51.22.8) observes that some of these prisoners were captured after the battle of Actium. They cannot have been from Octavian's own campaigns therefore: cf. A. Mócsy, 'Der vertuschte Dakerkrieg des M. Licinius Crassus', *Historia* 15 (1966), 512. Zanker (n. 18), 68–9 identifies a visual depiction of the first day of the triple triumph in the frieze of the temple of Apollo Sosianus where bound, northern, barbarians are seated to either side of a trophy with enemy helmet and armour (70, fig. 55). The trophy depicted in the lower register of the *gemma Augustea* may allude to the same occasion although Zanker connects it with Tiberius' later campaigns (*ibid.* 231–2, fig. 182). K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture* (Princeton, 1996) 107 and fig. 44 points to the helmeted trophy depicted on the rear of the cuirass on the Prima Porta statue of Augustus but makes no attempt to explain its presence.

<sup>33</sup> Dio 49.42.3 makes it clear that negotiation and bargaining were part of this process.

<sup>34</sup> This possibility was suggested by R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 309; cf. also Linderski (n. 18), 614. However, a general in the pre-Augustan period conducted a war under his own auspices and, provided his auspices were valid (cf. *ibid.* 616–17), that man was the commander-in-chief. Hence, in the years 30–28 Crassus was in fact commander-in-chief (so Flower [n. 4], 52; Ridley [n. 1], 86).

<sup>35</sup> Dio 48.46.1 states that Caesar did not avail himself of all the honours voted him by the

In 45 a decree of the Senate in favour of Caesar, his sons and his grandsons had defined the relative importance of Rome's commanders and the nature of their awards for victorious campaigns. The Senate granted Caesar the right to celebrations for victory even if he had not been on the campaign or had any hand at all in the achievements (Dio 43.44.6). Octavian claimed this right and, during the second half of 29, spent extravagantly with the aim of deepening public veneration of his adoptive father (Dio 51.22.1–2). Thus, in the political climate of the period there was nothing inherently unusual in Octavian's outranking of Carrinas and Crassus in the procession on the first day of his triple triumph.

The eventual celebration of a triumphal procession by Crassus himself makes it unlikely that acknowledgement of the imperatorial acclamation was withheld from him as Dio states (51.25.3).<sup>36</sup> The contradiction created by Dio's statement, therefore, can be understood only in light of the senatorial endorsement of the Caesarian family in the year 45. For at that time the Senate decreed that Caesar was to be Imperator once for all. He was given the right to bear the title permanently as a proper name, as were his sons and grandsons in turn (Dio 43.44.2–3; Suet. *Caes.* 76.1). This award involved a new way of using the designation Imperator, but it did not thereby replace the old. The imperatorial acclamation of the soldiers for their commander was not abolished by the Senate. The permanent and the acclamatory usages of Imperator were to co-exist (Dio 43.44.4–5). While there is disagreement among modern scholars as to whether or not Caesar himself availed himself of his new nomenclature,<sup>37</sup> no disagreement exists with respect to Octavian's use of Imperator as a *praenomen*.<sup>38</sup>

Dio highlights the year 29 when dealing with the use of the praenominal title by Octavian (52.41.3–4), but Octavian had actually not delayed so long in taking up the inheritance. Octavian availed himself of the hereditary right to this award soon after Caesar's death. It is attested almost immediately after the treachery of Salvidienus Rufus in 40.<sup>39</sup> Octavian demanded harsh punishment of Salvidienus in the Senate, asserting his offence extended beyond betrayal of personal friendship to treason against the entire Roman people. The basis of his claim must have been his possession of the name Imperator as heir of Caesar. The Senate accepted the gravity of the situation as portrayed by Octavian and passed a *senatus consultum ultimum* (Dio 48.33.3). Hence, when Dio's narrative for the year 29 attributes the denial of Crassus' right to dedicate the enemy king's armour to Octavian's superior *imperium* (Dio 51.24.4), he is actually recording the re-assertion of the right to the *praenomen* Imperator by Octavian following an effective precedent of a decade earlier.

The prosecution of a prolonged and major war during his second campaign in the Macedonian region (Dio 51.25.3–27.3) delayed Crassus' return to Rome and the celebration of his achievements in the field.<sup>40</sup> Octavian attempted during this time to

Senate in 45. This in no way affects Octavian's right to choose to use them later on; cf. Reinhold (n. 4), 231–2.

<sup>36</sup> Degrassi (n. 9), p. 87. Cf. L. Schumacher, 'Die imperatorischen Akklamationen der Triumvirn und die *auspicia* des Augustus', *Historia* 34 (1985), 210; Ridley (n. 1), 86.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. R. Syme, 'Imperator Caesar: a study in nomenclature', *Historia* 7 (1958), 176–7; M. Gelzer (trans. P. Needham), *Caesar: Politician and Statesman* (Oxford, 1969), 307, n. 2.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Syme (n. 37), 179.

<sup>39</sup> H.A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum* (London, 1910) vol. II, pp. 410–11, nos 101–4; cf. Syme (n. 34), 113, n. 1. For Salvidienus' revolt: Appian, *BC*, 5.6; Dio 48.33.2–3.

<sup>40</sup> Crassus' return was probably late in 28 (E. Badian, "'Crisis theories" and the beginning of the Principate', in G. Wirth [ed.], *Romanitas–Christianitas: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und*



consolidate the Senate's support for himself. A review of the senatorial roll was begun by Octavian and Agrippa as censors during 29. The record of discontent in the senatorial class lacks detail but is not entirely extinguished. Octavian caused some senators to depart and he enrolled other men, even adlecting some of them to consular rank (Dio 52.42.1–4). According to an authorization of the Senate and People given in the previous year,<sup>41</sup> he created more patricians to fill the ranks of important traditional priesthoods (RG 8.1; cf. Dio 52.42.5). He sought to win senators over with the promise that he would burn incriminating letters found among Antonius' possessions (Dio 52.42.8).<sup>42</sup> None of these measures can have stemmed the senatorial opposition to Octavian because he also curtailed the senators' right to travel outside Italy without permission, except to Sicily and Gallia Narbonensis (Dio 52.42.6–7). It is not hard to imagine what prompted this action. In the year 32 a large proportion of the Senate had caught Octavian unaware and left Italy to join Antonius in the East. In 29 Octavian may have anticipated, or at least feared, a repetition of such an event, this time in Crassus' favour.

Octavian not only worked to marshal the senatorial order to his support during 29, he also invested much money and energy in developing political support in other sections of Roman society. He spent a considerable amount of the proceeds from Egypt on the citizens resident in Rome (RG 15.1). Military veterans benefited, too, by cash and by land (RG 15.3). In the same year he returned to the *municipia* and colonies of Italy their contributions of 35,000 pounds of *aurum coronarium* (RG 21.3).

Ultimately, however, Octavian's claim to superiority had been most specifically expressed to all of those in Rome by including Crassus' victories of 30–29 in the first day of his triple triumphal celebration while Crassus was still on campaign in Macedonia. After that any attempt by Crassus to dedicate the armour of Deldo as *spolia opima* on his return would amount to a specific confrontation with Octavian (cf. Dio 51.24.4).

Nevertheless, Octavian did prepare for that eventuality. With specific reference to the issue of the *spolia opima*, Livy records that Octavian claimed he, rather than Crassus, held the auspices for the campaign when King Deldo was killed in single combat (4.20.6–7). Octavian's claim did not have any legal basis since, as proconsul of Macedonia, Crassus' *imperium* and auspices would have been independent of Octavian for the period he spent within his province.<sup>43</sup> Certainly there is no indication that Octavian was alleging that a *vitium* had been uncovered in the departure auspices of Crassus nor indeed that there had been auspical irregularity in the field at the time of his campaigns. Therefore, since Octavian was not asserting that the magisterial auspices of Crassus prevented him from dedicating the *spolia opima*, his claim must have been based on the auspices he held as a result of the *augurium salutis*.<sup>44</sup> The

*Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit* [Berlin, 1982], 25, n. 19, 26). The date is not indicated by Dio. However, he refers to three major expeditions undertaken by Crassus after that of 30 against Deldo, namely those against the Maedi and Serdi and the provision of help to Roles (51.25.4–26.1), the siege of Ciris (51.26.3–6), and the attack on the Artacii (51.27.1). He also says specifically (51.27.2) that a considerable time had passed.

<sup>41</sup> His authorization was the *Lex Saenia*: Reinhold (n. 4), 212.

<sup>42</sup> This promise was not completely fulfilled and men were condemned on the basis of evidence found there later on (Dio 52.42.8). Sattler (n. 8), 31–4 clarifies the nature of the difficulties Octavian faced in seeking to establish support for himself in the Senate.

<sup>43</sup> See n. 34 above; cf. Linderski (n. 13), 2217–18; Schumacher (n. 36), 213.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Linderski (n. 18), 610–11. The terms *auspicia* and *auguria* were sometimes used interchangeably: see H.D. Jocelyn, 'Urbs augurio augusto condita: Ennius ap. Cic. de Div. I. 107 (= Ann. 77–96 V<sup>2</sup>)', *PCPS* 17 (1971), 48–9; cf. Linderski (n. 13), 2292.

armour of Deldo was won during activities unsanctified by Jupiter in Octavian's view. Crassus' trophy could not be recognized as *spolia opima*, or so Octavian must have publicly argued in 29.<sup>45</sup>

J.W. Rich has also argued against deeming that Crassus held an *imperium* which was inferior to Octavian's and missed out on the imperatorial salutation for his campaigns.<sup>46</sup> With respect to the *spolia opima*, however, Rich is prepared to allow for the possibility that Crassus deferred to Octavian, or even that he refrained from claiming the right to dedicate the *spolia opima* unprompted.<sup>47</sup> Apart from the fact that such abnegation is uncharacteristic of the Roman nobility, the weakness of Rich's argument lies in the fact that he fails to identify in this context the significance of the earlier endorsement of Octavian through the *augurium salutis*. Nevertheless, in acknowledging the propensity of Crassus' military success to eclipse and to distract from Octavian's own victories, he does recognize the strong grounds Octavian must have used to argue against Crassus' celebration of the ritual of the *spolia opima*. An objection by Octavian on the basis of the *augurium salutis* could not have been considered trivial.<sup>48</sup> Octavian had been acknowledged as the *interpres* of Jupiter by it.

It is because of what was at stake for each man that a political clash must have occurred.<sup>49</sup> Crassus' achievement extended far beyond the usual level of military valour among the Roman aristocracy. The feat of the *spolia opima* had been achieved by only three Romans before 29, the first of whom was Romulus.<sup>50</sup> The *spolia opima* and the related topic of personal bravery, then, must have been a volatile issue in Rome even going into 28. It must have marked out Crassus as Octavian's most dangerous opponent.<sup>51</sup> It was an intricate situation for Octavian because the historical tradition might be interpreted in Crassus' favour.<sup>52</sup> Hence, it would be understandable if Octavian's actions during the following year while Crassus' return was awaited were designed to distinguish himself in the life of the State and to leave no room for a challenge to his leadership by Crassus.

#### THE YEAR 28

Octavian was consul for the sixth time in 28. Significantly, Agrippa was his only colleague and the pair remained in office throughout the year. The year-long appointment of Agrippa as his consular colleague, although suffect consuls had become

<sup>45</sup> Cf. E. Badian, 'Livy and Augustus', in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius. Aspekte seines Werkes* (Konstanz, 1993), 15–16 against the common view that Livy's notice of Augustus' opinion (4.20.7) was an insertion written after 27; *contra* Rich (n. 4), 118.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 93–7.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. *ibid.* 100–6, 126–7.

<sup>49</sup> Ridley (n. 1), 159–60 believes that in Crassus Octavian faced the most serious challenge to his military standing during 28.

<sup>50</sup> For the nature of the tradition and those who dedicated the *spolia opima* before 29, see Flower (n. 4), 34–48.

<sup>51</sup> Badian (n. 40), 26 seriously underrated the political acuteness of Octavian when he argued that no one would have thought of the significance of Crassus winning the *spolia opima* during 29. In a later discussion, Badian (n. 45), 15, did recognize the extreme political difficulty any such dedication by Crassus would cause Octavian. Cf. also, Flower (n. 4), 50, 53.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* 52; Rich (n. 4), 93. If Dio is correct in reporting the Senate had awarded Caesar the right to dedicate *spolia opima* in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius in 45 (44.4.3), Octavian's proprietary sense with respect to Caesar and his privileges may once again have been aroused by Crassus. Dio's information is sometimes regarded as unreliable but cf. Flower (n. 4), 48–9. Livy's personal confusion (4.20.7–8) has preserved the political ambiguities which existed.

customary, is evidence that Octavian was finding the political environment in Rome particularly difficult that year (cf. Dio 51.3.5–7, 52.1.2).<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, Dio describes the general character of Octavian's actions from the beginning of 28 as being deeply respectful of ancestral custom (cf. *RG* 8.5). He illustrates this by describing what he sees as distinctive aspects of his leadership at that time (53.1.1–3), namely Octavian's collegial attitude towards Agrippa his co-consul by sharing the *fasces*, the swearing of the customary oath at the conclusion of his consular year and the revival of the *principatus* of the Senate.

Octavian's designation as *princeps senatus* appears to represent the achievement of a senatorial consensus. The latest attested *principatus* for Republican Rome was that of Cicero in 43 when he was designated as *princeps senatus* and recognized as *princeps Romani nominis*.<sup>54</sup> The latter title, equivalent in meaning to *princeps Romanae civitatis*, was an acknowledgement of the standing which had underlain the designation *princeps senatus* since 209.<sup>55</sup> Thus, as *princeps senatus*, Octavian was ostensibly acknowledged as leader of Rome by the senators. The position gave expression in the civic sphere to the *auctoritas* he had gained through the *augurium salutis* on the basis of his military achievements in the previous year and was of great political significance. However, the circumstances of Octavian's appointment were not necessarily indicative of a voluntary affirmation of him. While Dio does not relate by whom or in what circumstances Octavian was designated *princeps senatus*, it is most likely that his appointment was made jointly by the censors, that is by Octavian himself and Agrippa.<sup>56</sup> Since appointments were commonly associated with a *lectio*,<sup>57</sup> the appointment probably occurred prior to the *lustrum* Octavian performed on completion of the censorial revision (cf. *RG* 8.2).

The other actions of Octavian discussed by Dio (53.1–2) under the year 28 involved:<sup>58</sup> the distributions of funds (to impoverished senators to enable them to hold public office; to the plebs a four-fold distribution of grain, and to the *aerarium* funds as necessary); measures of restoration and reconciliation (the cancellation of many debts owed to the *aerarium* before the battle of Actium; the destruction of records of debt to the State, and the rescinding by edict of all unjust and illegal laws he had sponsored when a triumvir to take effect from the end of his sixth consulship);<sup>59</sup> attention to cult (the completion and dedication of the Palatine temple of Apollo; provision for the maintenance of Roman temples, and the expulsion of Egyptian rites

<sup>53</sup> Agrippa's first consulship was in 37 and this was also a crucial year for Octavian (Dio 48.2.4). Rich (n. 4), 110, in disregard of Dio's account, argues that Augustus was totally secure in his leadership during the years between the victory over Antonius and the beginning of 27 (cf. Ridley [n. 1], 159–60).

<sup>54</sup> F.X. Ryan, *Rank and Participation in the Republican Senate* (Stuttgart, 1998), 202–3.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.* 230–1.

<sup>56</sup> Cicero's appointment was unconventional in that he was designated by the Senate (*ibid.* 203). Nevertheless, the political context of April 43 reveals how that appointment too served a political purpose.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.* 232–3.

<sup>58</sup> The events of this year appear to be narrated thematically rather than in sequential order, cf. Dio's words *καὶ τὰ μὲν ἑρᾶ* in 53.2.4. Arguably this is a reflection of the haphazard survival of the history of this crucial period, something also indicated by the extreme brevity of Dio's account of 28 and the lack of information about it in the *Res Gestae*.

<sup>59</sup> An *aureus* was issued in 28 with the legend LEGES ET IVRA P R RESTITVIT, see J.W. Rich and J.H.C. Williams, 'Leges et Ivra P.R. Restitvit: a new aureus of Octavian and the settlement of 28–27 BC', *The Numismatic Chronicle* 159 (1999), 176–88, at 180. According to its legend the coin is most likely celebrating this edict.

from within the *pomerium*). In addition, Octavian provided at his own expense the first celebration of the festival decreed in honour of the victory at Actium. It took an elaborate form and included chariot races for young and old among the nobility, gymnastic contests for which a special stadium was built, and also gladiatorial combats between prisoners of war.

By these actions Octavian portrayed himself once again, to the entire social order in Rome, as patron and benefactor as well as leader. Moreover, the Actian festival also revived the triumphal atmosphere of the preceding year. It and the dedication of the temple of Apollo offered Octavian the opportunity to remind those in Rome of his victory over Antonius and the Egyptian queen. His action with respect to Egyptian cult within the city provided a tangible illustration of his mastery over Egypt in 30. The highly cultivated and well-rounded image of leadership which must have resulted from the total of Octavian's actions of 28 was of vital tactical importance to him in the face of Crassus' successful campaigns and winning of the *spolia opima*.<sup>60</sup> Dio records that indeed these measures did earn Octavian popularity and praise (53.2.6).

There are other significant events that took place during the year which Dio does not record. The fact that the Senate issued a decree authorizing Octavian to restore 82 temples of Rome which were decaying and needed repair during 28, his sixth consulship, is known only from the *Res Gestae* (20.4).<sup>61</sup> But Ovid does refer to Octavian/Augustus as builder and restorer of temples and by doing so on the Kalends of February (*Fasti* 2.55–64) he most likely provides that decree's date.<sup>62</sup>

Given his renewed eminence with respect to cult during 28, Octavian may well have considered that his new responsibility for the religious life of the city should include the performance of a *lustratio* on its behalf. Such a ceremony would have provided the perfect context for him to adumbrate the potential danger arising from Crassus' impending return to Rome.<sup>63</sup>

The end of the census was traditionally marked by a purificatory *lustratio* and Augustus himself records that, as censor, he did carry out that ceremony (*RG* 8.2).<sup>64</sup>

<sup>60</sup> Rich and Williams (n. 59), 183 link the issue of the *aureus* to the settlement of 27, a view based on their prior assumption that the transfer of power was a process extending over 28–27 not as a single act in January 27; cf. nn. 97, 103 below for a different view. (The question of whether P. R. in the legend should be expanded by the genitive or the dative [Scheid (n. 1), 86] has no impact on the relevance of the coin in either context.)

<sup>61</sup> Ridley (n. 1), 182–3 expresses puzzlement at the formulation of this paragraph and surmises that Augustus meant the date only to apply to the Senate's authorization. If this is the case, it highlights the significance of the decree in Augustus' eyes. It is also noteworthy that the rebuilding resulting from this decree is distinguished by Augustus, both by inclusion of this detail and by his arrangement of the text, from the many other individual restorations and constructions he carried out (cf. *RG* 19–20.3; 21.1). Dio (53.2.4) may constitute a less specific allusion to the decree and to a range of other related measures taken by Octavian.

<sup>62</sup> No other reason for Ovid's commemoration of Augustus on this day is known, cf. G. Herbert-Brown, *Ovid and the Fasti. An Historical Study* (Oxford, 1994), 43.

<sup>63</sup> For the threatening circumstances in which a *lustratio* might be considered appropriate, cf. Lucan's account (1.584–609) of an extraordinary *lustratio* in 49 B.C. Horace (*Od.* 4.15), describing how the threat of attack from the Dacians and Getae was averted, conceivably reflects an atmosphere of fear in 28 which had been engendered by Octavian.

<sup>64</sup> The so-called Altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus may well represent this scene. Identification of the date and circumstances of the altar's creation has so far eluded scholars (cf. R.M. Ogilvie, 'Lustrum condere', *JRS* 51 [1961], 37; E.S. Gruen, *Culture and Identity in Republican Rome* [Ithaca, 1992], 145–50, pls 2–3). Arguably, however, the representation of censorial activity including a sacrifice to Mars, and marine friezes honouring Neptune, combined on the one monument, fit well with Octavian's celebrations, both in 28, of the naval victory at Actium by the

The Amburbium, a purificatory festival instituted by Numa, was regularly celebrated on the Kalends of February (Macrob. *Sat.* 1.13.3).<sup>65</sup> Octavian may also have performed a *lustratio* on that occasion, especially since it is the same date as the Senate's edict authorizing him to restore the city's temples. As a pontiff (cf. *RG* 7.3) he was eligible to officiate at the Amburbium. Moreover, contemporary sources repeatedly draw a parallel between Octavian and Numa (Virg. *Aen.* 6.810–11; Livy 1.19.3).<sup>66</sup> In fact, since the exact date of the censorial *lustrum* is unknown, it is possible that ceremony was on the Kalends of February and it was extended to include the circular procession so that the entire city was purified. Certainly, Augustus (*RG* 8.2) describes his censorial *lustrum* by the phrase *lustrum facere*, which had a wider application than the technical one, *lustrum condere*.<sup>67</sup>

The connection of Octavian with another ancestral ritual early in 28 is suggested by Ovid's reference to Augustus' strengthening of Rome's wall (*facit hic tua magna tuendo moenia*) on the Nones of February (*Fasti* 2.133–4), a ritual known as either *augustum augurium* or *inauguratio*.<sup>68</sup> This augural ceremony was associated with several of the revered figures of Rome's regal past. It had been performed by Romulus at the founding of Rome (Livy 1.7.1–4).<sup>69</sup> Numa's inauguration as king had provided the basis for his new foundation of the city on law and ancestral custom (Livy 1.18.6–19.1).<sup>70</sup> Thus an inauguration might equally relate to the well-being and prosperity of the city in peace as to the definition of its boundaries and consolidation of its defensive position.<sup>71</sup> The depiction of Octavian/Augustus as wall-strengthener by Ovid denotes the designation of him also as a 'Founder' through the same ritual.<sup>72</sup>

Once again, then, pious action offered the opportunity for Octavian's name to be linked with that of Numa, to Octavian's own political advantage. In 28 the performance of an *augustum augurium* would have been a striking way to associate himself with Rome's well-being for the purposes of short-term political gain. Over later years, Augustus' decisions would certainly increase the city's prosperity by organization,<sup>73</sup>

dedication of the temple of Apollo and new Actian festival (cf. the inscription on the victory monument at Actium: R.A. Gurval, *Actium and Augustus: the Politics and Emotions of Civil War* [Ann Arbor, 1995], 66–7, n. 116 where Neptune and Mars are mentioned together) and the ceremony at the conclusion of the censorship of himself and Agrippa (*RG* 8.2).

<sup>65</sup> G. Wissowa, 'Amburbium', *RE* 1 (1894), 1816–17.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Herbert-Brown (n. 62), 49; R.J. Littlewood, 'Imperii pignora certa: the role of Numa in Ovid's *Fasti*', in G. Herbert-Brown (ed.), *Ovid's Fasti* (Oxford, 2002), 175–80.

<sup>67</sup> For detailed discussion of the difference between *lustrum condere* and *lustrum facere*, see Ogilvie (n. 64), 31.

<sup>68</sup> The phrase *augustum augurium* is used by Ennius apud Varro, *Rust.* 3.12. Livy (5.52.2) uses *inauguratio* and its cognates for the same ritual: Jocelyn (n. 44), 48–9.

<sup>69</sup> See Jocelyn (n. 44), 49–50.

<sup>70</sup> Littlewood (n. 66), 180.

<sup>71</sup> Littlewood (n. 66), 179.

<sup>72</sup> Octavian's action recalls Numa rather than Romulus since it is unlikely from Ovid's description that Octavian extended the *pomerium*. Servius Tullius had also earned the title 'Founder' without extending the *pomerium* by his census and distribution of citizens into classes and centuries (Livy 1.42.3–5; cf. Littlewood [n. 66], 179, n. 13). Whether or not, at some time later, Augustus did extend Rome's *pomerium* remains a debatable point. Tac. *Ann.* 12.23, Dio 55.6.6, and *SHA Aurelianus* 21.11 all record he did so, but it is not mentioned in the *Res Gestae* or the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* (*CIL* VI.930); cf. Ridley (n. 1), 82.

<sup>73</sup> Augustus is known to have divided the city into a larger number of regions than Romulus. The existence of fourteen regions is first attested in 7 B.C. (Dio 55.8.7) and this may well be the date of the final Augustan organization. It is unlikely to be the date of the earliest action of Octavian/Augustus in this respect, however, as the total of fourteen was probably only arrived at as part of a process of systematic expansion (cf. J. Bleicken, 'vici magister', *RE* VIII A [1958], 2481).

by construction and restoration (Suet. *Aug.* 28–30), and by the attainment of peace over many years in the future. Thus the analogy between the accounts of Numa's actions and the strengthening of Rome's civic and social structure by Octavian/Augustus continues to be notable even after 28. Octavian/Augustus' public image was transformed over the years from a factional aggressor to the sacred protector of the State.<sup>74</sup> It is surely no coincidence, therefore, that it was also on the Nones of February (*Fasti* 2.119–27) that Augustus accepted the title *pater patriae* in 2 B.C., or that it is this occasion that he represents as the crowning achievement of his public life (*RG* 35.1).<sup>75</sup>

No literary source records that an *augustum augurium* was performed by Octavian. Neither is there a reference to one by Augustus in the *Res Gestae*. It is only the evidence of a denarius from the East that indicates its occurrence and date. The connection Livy draws (4.20.7) between the firmly dated restoration of the temples and Octavian as Founder also points to the same conjunction of ceremony and its date.

The denarius in question was long ago identified by Gag  as bearing a representation on the reverse of Octavian performing an *inauguratio*.<sup>76</sup> He argued that Octavian, shown with veiled head and ploughing a furrow with a pair of oxen, is depicted in the role of Founder, although not in the literal sense like Romulus but rather as Founder in an allusive sense, as a 'Second Founder'.<sup>77</sup> A date of between 29 and 27 was assigned to the coin at that time.<sup>78</sup> But now, when the combination of the *inauguratio* type on the reverse with the depiction of Octavian as Apollo on the obverse is considered, the date of the issue may be estimated even more precisely. Since Octavian dedicated the temple of Apollo adjoining his house on the Palatine in 28 (Dio 53.1.3), it is surely to that year, above all, that the assimilation of Octavian with Apollo is to be expected.<sup>79</sup>

In all it is probable that during 28 Octavian acted repeatedly to demonstrate he was the one who guarded Rome's relationship with its gods and, through the rituals of *lustratio* and *augustum augurium* in particular, to convey the message that peace in Rome was under threat. His emulation of Numa in the various ways discussed above would have contributed immeasurably to the impact of this strategic behaviour. As well as enabling Octavian to gain in stature as the perpetuator of ancestral custom (cf. *RG* 8.5; Dio 53.1.1), it allowed him to align himself specifically with the other great Founder of Rome besides Romulus. In doing this he achieved a tactical balance with Crassus who stood in the tradition of Romulus after winning the *spolia opima*. And, finally, his message of impending threat to Rome meant that those in Rome viewed him as the one most fit to preserve the city's well-being and prosperity.

Towards the end of 28 after the dedication of the temple of Apollo on 9 October,<sup>80</sup>

<sup>74</sup> Littlewood (n. 66), 192.

<sup>75</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 58.

<sup>76</sup> J. Gag , 'Les sacerdoces d'Auguste et ses r formes religieuses', *MEFR* 48 (1931), 93–4.

<sup>77</sup> The image of a priestly figure ploughing a furrow refers to the ritual appropriated by Rome from the Etruscans. It defined the *pomerium* of a new settlement (Varro, *Ling.* 5.143; Aulus Gellius 14.1.3); cf. Ovid, *Fasti* 4.818–19 for the ploughing action of Romulus. For a list of other *conditores* after Numa who also only 'founded' figuratively, see Littlewood (n. 66), 179, n. 13.

<sup>78</sup> H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (London, 1923–64) vol. I, p.104, no. 638, pls 15, 17.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Zanker (n. 18), 82–9; O. Hekster and J. Rich, 'Octavian and the thunderbolt: the temple of Apollo Palatinus and Roman traditions of temple building', *CQ* 56 (2006), 162–5.

<sup>80</sup> *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.1, p. 331. The Actian festival was associated with this.

Octavian was in a strong position to consolidate further political support for himself against Crassus by the use of invective.<sup>81</sup> Octavian could denigrate Crassus by drawing attention to his political vacillation during the civil wars. Perhaps even his consulate of 30 and his appointment to Macedonia might be cited to show Crassus' expediency in striking a bargain after Octavian had defeated Antonius.<sup>82</sup> Crassus was also vulnerable to innuendo over his family's impiety. The disastrous result of his grandfather's Parthian campaign was attributed to the disregard of inauspicious omens (Plut. *Cras.* 18). Survival of the story as a *topos* of wrong behaviour towards the gods was probably given new life by Octavian at this time.<sup>83</sup>

Furthermore, the tremendous success of Crassus' operations in the second campaigning season could also have been turned to his disadvantage by Octavian. The regions of Macedonia, Illyricum and Thrace were the location for armies and battles during the civil wars on more than one occasion.<sup>84</sup> They formed the bridge between Italy and the wealth of the East and were also of strategic importance for Italy's security against foreign enemies. In the decades after Actium the Romans feared Italy might be invaded from that area (Virg. *Georgics* 2.497–8; Hor. *Od.* 3.8.17–18; Hor. *Sat.* 2.50–3). In 28 Crassus was in control there and had legions at his command. Moreover, former Antonian supporters had been settled in Macedonia after Actium (Dio 51.4.6). These men could be represented as a potential source of additional manpower for Crassus should he wish to turn on Rome.<sup>85</sup>

Nearby native tribes would readily come to a Roman's mind as potential military allies for Crassus also. The significance of diplomatic links with tribal kingdoms is revealed by the frequency with which client relationships are referred to and native embassies are recorded as visiting Rome or entering into treaties of alliance.<sup>86</sup> Relationships of patronage were developed by Roman leaders among these tribes including apparently by the Licinii.<sup>87</sup> Crassus is recorded as having friendly relations with King Roles of the Getae (Dio 51.24.6, 51.26.1) and with the Odrysae (Dio 51.25.4–5) during the period in question.<sup>88</sup> His influence extended to the cities of Greece. He was the patron of Thespieae, an important city of southern Boeotia, which,

<sup>81</sup> For the probability that Crassus' return was late in 28, see n. 40 above. Octavian waged a war of words with great effect against Antonius in 32, cf. Kearsley (n. 24), 54.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. E. Groag, 'Licinius', *RE* 25 (1926), 271–2. The record in Dio 52.42.4 that C. Cluvius and C. Furnius were adlected among the ex-consuls in 29 because their year of office had been taken by others reveals the nature of such accommodation and negotiation.

<sup>83</sup> Hor. *Od.* 3.5.5–8; Dion. Hal. 2.6.4; cf. S.P. Mattern-Parkes, 'The defeat of Crassus and the just war', *CW* 96 (2003), 393.

<sup>84</sup> Wilkes (n. 26), 545–9.

<sup>85</sup> After the division of provinces in 27, Macedonia was left with little by way of a military garrison even though its border was repeatedly challenged by outsiders (Syme [n. 8], 274–5). The removal of the legionary force reflects Augustus' later suspicion of any Roman commander with a large force so close to Italy.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Dio 51.22.8, 51.24.7; Front. *Strat.* 1.10.4; Plut. *Ant.* 63.4; Suet. *Aug.* 63.2. Compare the discussion of G.W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford, 1965), 152–5 for the period of Pompey and the second triumvirate.

<sup>87</sup> A large *clientela* of the Licinii existed in Illyrian Istria in the time of Nero, one which Tacitus described as being of long standing (*Hist.* 2.73).

<sup>88</sup> The trial of Primus for making war on the Odrysae less than a decade later (Dio 54.3.2) illustrates how relationships with this tribal group still aroused strong feelings in senatorial circles. The depth of political division on the matter is demonstrated by the plot that was formed against Augustus after the trial (Dio 54.3.4) as well as by the level of his own celebration when the plot was extinguished (Dio 54.3.8).

together with Athens, honoured him and acknowledged his goodwill.<sup>89</sup> These cities also recorded the imperatorial acclamation Crassus had won during his campaigns in Macedonia.<sup>90</sup>

Remnants of Octavian's verbal attacks on Crassus may still be discernible in the speech to the Senate which Dio attributes to him in January 27.<sup>91</sup> For example, in 53.7.1 Dio portrays Octavian as claiming conquests in Moesia which actually belonged to Crassus. Elsewhere (53.7.3–4), Dio gives Octavian the words of a self-denying leader who stressed the contrast between himself and others whose passion for sole supremacy meant they would even use violence to win it. Direct evidence for the other side of the debate is harder to discern in the sources. However, Octavian's repudiation of his most unpopular acts during the triumviral years (Dio 53.2.5), and the other acts of *civilitas* (Dio 53.2.1–3, 53.2.6–7), suggest he was forced into a defensive posture during 28 by the reality of Crassus' opposition and support for it in Rome.

The scale of publicly expressed antagonism between these two leading senators would undoubtedly have led to fear and uncertainty among all Romans. Civil war had been the result of such situations more than once in recent history.<sup>92</sup> It was this which created the climate in which a *lustratio* would have been widely supported by the population of Rome.<sup>93</sup> In addition, Octavian's augural role as mediator between Jupiter and Rome continued to provide him with the authority to interpret the god's will about any threats he perceived against himself or the city.<sup>94</sup> The level of concern among senators and people alike would have favoured an attempt by Octavian to seize the initiative without even waiting for Crassus' return.<sup>95</sup> When writing about the performance of the *augurium salutis*, Cicero had argued that a good augur cooperated with Jupiter not only in protecting but also in rescuing the State in emergencies (*De leg.* 3.43). An argument from Octavian that an emergency situation was threatening the well-being of the state would, therefore, carry the weight of the auspices.<sup>96</sup>

Such supreme power had been decreed for Octavian by an *SCU* as recently as 40 when, following his denunciation of Salvidienus, the Senate committed the care of the city to the triumvirs (Dio 48.33.1–3). Given Octavian's designation as *princeps senatus* at the beginning of 28, obtaining a majority vote in the Senate for an emergency

<sup>89</sup> Thespieae: *AE* 1928.44; Athens: *IG*<sup>2</sup> III.4118. Thespieae had good relations with Rome over a long period and had a community of Roman businessmen. Cf. M. Kajava, 'Cornelia and Taurus at Thespieae', *ZPE* 79 (1989), 148.

<sup>90</sup> Their testimony is inestimable as they record a fact which disappeared from the Roman historical tradition after Augustus was established as Rome's leader.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. the comments of Reinhold (n. 4), 84 on the speeches of Antonius and Octavian included by Dio in Book 50.

<sup>92</sup> The analogous situation between Pompeius and Caesar in 49 (Dio 41.3.3–4) would also still have been fresh enough in the public mind.

<sup>93</sup> The number of citizens Augustus claims to have registered at the *lustrum* in 28 (*RG* 8.2) is believed to be impossibly large if it involved only male citizens (P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore (edd.), *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus* (Oxford, 1967), 51. The likely inclusion of women and children suggests a wider purpose for the occasion than the traditional registration of the citizen roll; cf. n. 67 above.

<sup>94</sup> Linderski (n. 13), 2295–6 underlines the fact that, in contrast to the *auspicium* of magistrates which was valid for one day only, the *augurium* was permanent since it expressed Jupiter's will for a person, place or ceremony, and not merely the timing of an action.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. the manner in which Cicero undermined Antonius in 43: *Phil.* (Cic. *Orations*, trans. W.C.A. Ker, *Loeb Classical Library* vol. 15 [Cambridge, MA, 1926]); cf. Dio 45.18–47.5, especially 45.4–46.2.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Linderski (n. 13), 2253–5 for the inclusion of an *invocatio uti avertantur mala* in the *augurium salutis*.



power directing him to ensure the city came to no harm would not have been difficult to achieve (cf. Dio 53.2.7).<sup>97</sup> There is no record in Dio of such an official endorsement of Octavian. However a cistophoros minted in Ephesus and dating to 28 appears to reflect the successful outcome after the award of supreme power to Octavian. It bears, on the obverse, the laureate head of Octavian together with the legend LIBERTATIS P.R. VINDEX ('champion/defender of the liberty of the Roman people') and, on the reverse, an image of Pax. Wording analogous to this legend, *rem publicam ... libertatem vindicavi*, is found in *RG* 1.1 where the context is also civil war. From this – Augustus' own usage – and from traditional usage, the intended allusion of the coin is made clear.<sup>98</sup> It provides contemporary evidence for factional division in Rome in 28, division which was believed to be so threatening to Rome that Octavian was called upon to rescue the State. It also records Octavian's eventual political victory over Crassus.<sup>99</sup>

The preservation of the memory of this battle of wills was undesirable from Augustus' point of view once he had prevailed. Crassus' military achievements were quickly minimized. He did triumph some six months later for victories *ex Thraecia et Geteis* but there was no mention of the victories over the Dacians, although this was Crassus' major success.<sup>100</sup> The celebration is likely to have been presented publicly as a magnanimous gesture of clemency by Octavian.<sup>101</sup> Octavian's clemency, if such it was, did not extend to the dedication of the *spolia opima* (Dio 51.24.4; cf. Livy 4.20.6–7).<sup>102</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

Written many years later, the formulation of *RG* 34.1 refers to the Senate's ultimate deferral to Octavian as leader in the vaguest possible terms and offers no indication of the events of 28 which preceded it.<sup>103</sup> Interpretation of the text by modern scholars

<sup>97</sup> For the view that an emergency power was conceded to Octavian in 28 and was released back to the Senate before the end of the year, see E.A. Judge, "'Res Publica Restituta'. A modern illusion?", in J.A.S. Evans (ed.), *Polis and Imperium: Studies in Honour of Edward Togo Salmon* (Toronto, 1974), 279–311, 293 with 309, n. 16.

<sup>98</sup> The coin was most probably minted between mid October and the end of 28 (cf. Badian [n. 40] above). Details of this coin are given in Rich and Williams (n. 59), 171. Cf. also W. Eder, 'Augustus and the power of tradition: the Augustan Principate as binding link between Republic and Empire', in Raaflaub and Toher (n. 3), 89–97.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Judge (n. 97), 294. E. Ramage, *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res Gestae"* (Stuttgart, 1987), 68 with n. 149 and Rich and Williams (n. 59), 183–6 detect a reference to Octavian's victory at Actium in this legend. However, the language used is not in accord with the consistent characterization of that conflict as a foreign war on coins and inscriptions (cf. *ibid.* 171; Gurval [n. 64], 66–7, n. 116).

<sup>100</sup> Wilkes (n. 26), 550 suggests that this was ignored because it was offensive to Octavian; cf. *RG* 30.2 and 31.2 which appear to be Augustan appropriations of Crassus' victories.

<sup>101</sup> Crassus' triumph: Degraffi (n. 9), p. 87. Dio 56.38.3–5 describes the political use of clemency by Octavian after Actium. The theme of clemency was traditionally associated with the civic crown (Judge [n. 97], 292–3). Hence, clemency was appropriate for the manner in which the conflict between Octavian and Crassus was resolved. The gift of clemency by Octavian after prevailing in no way prejudices the likelihood of enmity between the two men. Although the lack of traces of a public debate in the sources is attributed by Rich (n. 4), 108 to the absence of any confrontation between Octavian and Crassus, it is more probable that the official sources no longer acknowledged it had taken place (cf. Ridley [n. 1], 93).

<sup>102</sup> A Marcus Licinius Crassus is consul in 14 B.C. (Dio 54.24.1) but, whether or not this is a son (doubted by Syme [n. 8], 276; accepted as an adoptive son by Flower [n. 4], 50), it does not illuminate the subsequent career of the *cos.* 30.

<sup>103</sup> The interpretation that a specific threat does underlie *RG* 34.1, however, is supported by

was also complicated for many years by the gap in the Latin text where there once stood a single but crucial word. Only very recently has Augustus' own portrayal of the political situation in 28–27 been clarified by the fragment discovered at Pisidian Antioch (n. 1 above). It is now clear that Augustus described himself as *potens rerum omnium*. By selection of the word *potens*, Augustus intended to make clear the military and political nature of his supreme power.<sup>104</sup> This is in accord with the character of the entire account of his achievements which emphasizes the military aspects of his power above any other.<sup>105</sup> Even though he did not name his opposition of 28, it was obviously a matter of pride to Augustus that the context of his civic awards of January 27 be appreciated. Despite the fact that the words *per consensum universonum* failed to make explicit, or perhaps deliberately concealed,<sup>106</sup> the actual source of his supreme power they do indicate Augustus' view of the importance of the period in his public career.<sup>107</sup>

The cistophoric coin minted in Octavian's sixth consulship expands and confirms such conclusions drawn from the *Res Gestae*. It cannot have been a minor political matter which resulted in the naming of Octavian as *vindex libertatis populi Romani* that year. On the contrary, this epithet, like *potens rerum omnium* in the *Res Gestae*, relates to a political crisis of great moment and must reflect a genuine struggle for the hearts and minds of the Roman people by Octavian against strong opposition.<sup>108</sup> It has been suggested that the legend on the cistophoros reflects the passing of a decree of the Senate honouring Octavian.<sup>109</sup> If this was indeed the case, it is likely that it was only from this point on that Octavian felt sufficiently secure in his leadership of the State to surrender his supreme power to the Senate.

The amount of information preserved in the sources about the honouring of Octavian as Rome's saviour on 13 January in 27 forms a strong contrast with the lack of recorded detail about the year 28 (*RG* 34.1–2; Dio 53.16.4). Nevertheless, a link is established by the way the rewards the Senate gave Octavian/Augustus refer back to the threatening atmosphere of civil war. The wreathing of the door-posts of his house with laurels, and the civic crown placed above his door, symbolized a triumph over enemies and fellow citizens rescued.<sup>110</sup> Pompeius had felt that winding laurel around

reference to Tiberius' recapitulation of the events of the years from 31 to 27 in his funeral speech for Augustus (Dio 56.34.4–41.9). Tiberius refers to a period after Actium which would have been one of factional strife had not the Senate insisted Octavian accept their choice of him as leader again (56.39.5–6). The theme of Octavian's *recusatio*, prominent in this part of the speech as it is elsewhere in Dio (cf. 53.5.1–4), should not be allowed to distract from the political discord which is the topic of discussion (cf. Dio 53.11.1–4).

<sup>104</sup> See the discussion of the meaning and usage of *potens* in Scheid (n. 1), 82–6, at 85.

<sup>105</sup> Ridley (n. 1), 92.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Ridley (n. 1), 109 on Augustus' concealment of the nature of his censorial power of 28 in *RG* 8.2.

<sup>107</sup> For the use of comparable emphasis to highlight other significant events, cf. *RG* 5.2, 9.2, 10.2, 25.2 (and Kearsley [n. 24]), 35.1. Scheid (n. 1), 86, by contrast, attributes a political significance to such expressions of support.

<sup>108</sup> Ridley (n. 1), 221 argues that the total control of Octavian was an ongoing position following his victory at Actium. However against this, in addition to the difficult political situations which Octavian faced (discussed above), there is the nature of the rewards for Octavian's surrender of power (see *RG* 34.2 with n. 110 below).

<sup>109</sup> Rich and Williams (n. 59), 186–7. It is far less likely that an honorific decree was issued in the middle of gradually letting go aspects of the leadership (cf. *ibid.* 191) than at the successful completion of a particular action which had been previously endorsed by the Senate.

<sup>110</sup> These accolades from the Senate (*RG* 34.2) have a character directly linked to victory in war and therefore cannot be explained simply as honorific tributes; see Judge (n. 97), 290–4.

his *fascēs* was an inappropriate way of expressing victory over fellow citizens (Dio 41.52.1). Caesar, too, hesitated to appear to rejoice publicly after his victory over the Pompeians (Dio 42.18.1–2). Not so Octavian. Moreover, after the Senate's affirmation of him as leader on 13 January, he sought approval for a preferential rate of pay for his future Praetorian Guard (Dio 53.11.5).

This is not how events were presented by Augustus in his *Res Gestae* (34–5) however. He re-wrote history when he described the award of his new name 'Augustus' in isolation from its full historical context. Despite the acknowledged connection of his name with augury,<sup>111</sup> the *Res Gestae* is silent about the *auguria* of 29–28. Augustus deliberately shifted focus in the *Res Gestae* from 29–28, difficult years, to the Senate's endorsement of him early in 27.<sup>112</sup> Yet the absence of any reference to the *augurium salutis* or the *augustum augurium* is anomalous since much of his *auctoritas* during the years 30–27 stemmed from his consummate use of augury. The *augurium salutis* had played a central role in defining his military activity as, alone, important for Rome's prosperity and in identifying him as Rome's mediator with Jupiter in guarding the peace of Rome. The *augustum augurium* had permitted the pairing of himself with Numa and his designation as a 'Second Founder' of Rome.<sup>113</sup>

In *RG* 34.2, Augustus writes as if there was a causal connection between the award of the name and his transfer of power back to the Senate. The description of the award of his new name at that point was intended to associate it with a period of security and political unity in Rome rather than one of insecurity and division. He does this also by mentioning his new name before listing the honours of the laurels, civic crown and the shield.<sup>114</sup> But the true sequence of events was different.

Dio (53.16.7) describes the debate about Octavian's new name as taking place only after the Senate had recognized his unique value to the State by the award of honours and the division of powers. By revealing the passage of time before the award of the name 'Augustus' to Octavian, Dio shows that it was not a reward for the return of the extraordinary power to the Senate.<sup>115</sup> It was the military honours which were the rewards for Octavian's surrender of the extraordinary power. Statements like that of Horace (*Od.* 3.6.1–16) which attribute the establishment of peace in Rome to religious piety are not a true reflection of the basis of Octavian's supremacy even though they are significant in demonstrating how quickly an Augustan interpretation of the period took root. Peace did not come immediately after Actium; it was actually won after a struggle and sustained conflict between Octavian and some of his senatorial peers. Peace came only after a period of extreme tension which eventually forced the Senate and people of Rome to make the choice of Octavian over Crassus at the end of 28.

<sup>111</sup> This connection was in the public arena already during the lifetime of Octavian (Ovid, *Fasti* 1.607–12). Its etymological validity is unassailable (Linderski [n. 13], 2290–1).

<sup>112</sup> Abbreviation and arrangement of information, or even total silence, is used repeatedly by Augustus in the *Res Gestae* to bypass people or events from his past which he intended should disappear from the historical record; cf. the fragmented treatment of the triumviral years (*RG* 2, 7, 25 and also Ridley [n. 1], 234–41).

<sup>113</sup> It is not surprising that the name 'Augustus', which recalled Numa with his peace-loving strengths rather than war-like Romulus, was felt by Octavian's supporters to be the more appropriate for him as 'Founder' (cf. Dio 53.16.6–8.; Suet. *Aug.* 7.2; Florus 2.34.66).

<sup>114</sup> Cf. the comments of Judge (n. 97), 289 on the non-chronological arrangement of the honours in *RG* 34.2. Scheid (n. 1), 90–1 points out that the linking of the gift of the *clupeus aureus* with the other gifts in *RG* 34.2 may represent a conflation also.

<sup>115</sup> *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>.1 p. 231 (*Fasti Praenestini*) provides epigraphic evidence to the same effect.

As a result of this new standing, and using his augural authority, Augustus could henceforth even re-interpret calamities. Contrary to precedent (cf. Dio 50.8.3) and inconsistently with future interpretations (cf. Dio 53.33.5, 54.1.1), the Tiber's flooding on the night when he became Augustus was said to point to a period of new success for him as Rome's leader (Dio 53.20.1).<sup>116</sup> And Augustus continued to anchor his leadership in augury. The frequent inclusion of augural symbols on visual monuments from the period of his leadership of Rome clearly reveals how the augural doctrine remained central to Augustan ideology.<sup>117</sup>

*Macquarie University*

ROSALINDE KEARSLEY  
r.kearsley@humanities.mq.edu.au

<sup>116</sup> Linderski (n. 18), 618–19 cites this as an example of the manner in which Augustus 'conquered state religion'.

<sup>117</sup> Development of the priesthoods and ritual of the cults in the 265 *vici* of Rome (cf. Zanker [n. 18], 129–34) was probably intended by Octavian/Augustus as a complement to his inauguration.