

MONUMENTS AND MEMORY: THE AEDES CASTORIS IN THE FORMATION OF AUGUSTAN IDEOLOGY

I. INTRODUCTION

When Augustus came to power he made every effort to demonstrate his new regime's continuity with the past, even claiming to have handed power in 28 and 27 B.C. back to the Senate and people of Rome (*Mon. Anc.* 34.1). He could not escape the reality, however, that his new monarchical form of government was incompatible with the political ideals of the Republic. At the same time, Augustus was attempting to reunite a society that in the recent past had been riven by civil conflict. It should be no surprise, then, that the new ideology that evolved around the figure of the *princeps* attempted to retain the memory of the old Republic while at the same time promoting and securing the power of a single authority through which Rome could flourish.¹ The new regime's relationship to the recent past was complicated, too, inasmuch as Augustus' power was forged in the cauldron of the late Republic, and he was the ultimate beneficiary of the political upheaval of his youth. Augustus' new ideology had to recall the Republic without lingering over its tumultuous last generation; it had to restore and renew.²

Augustus' boast that he found Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble as well as the long list in the *Res Gestae* (*Mon. Anc.* 19–21.2) of monuments that he either built or restored declare that the new topography of the city was an important component of this new ideology. One monument can serve as a case study: the Aedes Castoris in the Forum Romanum. This temple, which dated back to the very foundation of the Republic and had more recently been the locus of intense and often violent political confrontations in the era before Augustus came to power, was rededicated in A.D. 6 in the names of Augustus' successor Tiberius and his deceased brother Drusus. This rededication, I shall argue, was part of a larger process through which the memories associated with the temple helped shape the ideology of the Principate. One critical juncture for the formation of this new ideology was the succession, since it was only when power was promised or bequeathed to a successor that the reality of monarchy was revealed. In order to understand how this process worked, we shall focus on three memories evoked by the Aedes Castoris: first, the temple's political function in the late Republic, especially as a location for public meetings (*contiones*) and legislative assemblies (*comitia*), made it resonant of popular sovereignty; second, the temple's foundation myth, which told of the Dioscuri's appearance at the battle of Lake Regillus, and further the traditional mythology of the Dioscuri, were adapted for the succession; third, the temple also served as the destination point for the *transvectio equitum*, a Republican ceremony of great importance to the equestrian order and revived by Augustus in the Principate in part as a showcase for his successors. Romans maintained a dialogue with the past through

¹ A. Gowing, *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (Cambridge, 2005), 20–1.

² Cf. K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction* (Princeton, 1996), 288.

memories evoked by this and other monuments in the city. Under the Principate, however, the main interlocutor in this dialogue was the *princeps* himself, and his ideology was the filter through which many of these memories were communicated to the Roman people.³

II. MONUMENTS AND MEMORY

Before we can discuss in detail the place of the Temple of Castor in Augustan ideology, it is necessary to establish the theoretical underpinnings on which this discussion will rest. For Romans much of their history was contained in the monuments that dotted the landscape of their city, and these monuments, I would argue, acted as a kind of mnemonic device that allowed Romans to remember some of the great events of their past.⁴ The process of remembering is complex and dynamic. At one end is the memorial, the physical reminder, which often stands in the place of person or persons, or even events, now remote in place or time.⁵ However, the Roman habit of constantly restoring and refurbishing temples, not to mention the more mundane task of maintenance and preservation, had the effect of keeping the founder's memory alive⁶ and by the same token the memory of any event or events with which the monument was associated. At the other end of the process of remembering is the viewer who brings to the memorial his own complex of ideas and attitudes that inform the memory produced. In the case of ancient Rome, we are usually hard pressed to do better than merely guess at the precise content of this complex of ideas and attitudes, but we are certainly witness to examples of when it is exploited.

One such example is the penchant of Roman orators for using monuments as visual aids or 'props' in their speeches (Cic. *Scaur.* 46–8, *Cat.* 4.18, *De or.* 2.266–7; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.41). In his first speech against Catiline (1.33),⁷ which was delivered at a Senate meeting, Cicero used the setting of this speech, the Temple of Jupiter Stator, to cue his audience to think about the early history of Rome. At the very end of the speech, Cicero mentions the founding of the temple by Romulus and lingers over the significance of the epithet Stator, 'Stayer'. Cicero's mention of Romulus here was meant to draw the audience's attention to the foundation myth of the temple and allow him to compare himself with Romulus.⁸ Cicero thus became another 'stayer' at another crisis in Roman history.

Cicero's rhetorical play could be effective only if he and his audience shared the

³ Cf. J. Rea, *Legendary Rome. Myth, Monuments, and Memory on the Palatine and Capitoline* (London, 2007), 8.

⁴ On monuments and memory, see Varro, *Ling.* 6.49, with the discussion in M. Jaeger, *Livy's Written Rome* (Ann Arbor, 1997), 15–18. Cicero can speak of 'the power of suggestion that exists in places' (*vis admonitionis inest in locis*, Cic. *Fin.* 5.2). The study of memory in Rome has exploded in recent years; in addition to Jaeger (above), see, in particular, C. Edwards, *Writing Rome* (Cambridge, 1996); U. Walter, *Memoria und Res Publica* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004); Gowing (n. 1); Rea (n. 3); and D.H.J. Larmour and D. Spencer, 'Introduction – *Roma, recepta*: a topography of the imagination', in D.H.J. Larmour and D. Spencer (edd.), *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory* (Oxford, 2007), 1–60.

⁵ Cf. Walter (n. 4), 133, who emphasizes the vastness of time that often separates monument and memory.

⁶ Walter (n. 4), 136.

⁷ On the invocation of Jupiter in this section of the speech, see A.R. Dyck (ed.), *Cicero, Catilinarians* (Cambridge, 2008), 122–3.

⁸ As A. Vasaly has persuasively argued (*Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory* [Berkeley, 1993], 41–59).

same memory associated with the temple and its founding. Cicero's audience on the occasion of his speech was clearly cued by the very words of the orator – cued to think about Romulus and the founding of the Temple of Jupiter Stator. In other words, one memory contained within this monument was evoked by Cicero for a particular purpose on a particular occasion. In other cases, oral tradition and historiography, inscriptions and coins, might help to evoke a memory contained in a monument.⁹ Many monuments, however, had more than one foundation myth, or contained several memories, some of which were in direct conflict with one another and therefore must have complicated the process of remembering. The Lacus Curtius, for example, recalls the death of one Curtius in the war between Sabines and Romans – but was he a Roman hero or Sabine enemy?¹⁰ Tacitus appears to be exploiting the conflicting memories evoked by the Lacus Curtius to underscore the ambiguity of the regime and death of Servius Galba, whom he describes pointedly as perishing at this very location.¹¹ Cicero in his speech against Catiline, and Tacitus in his narrative of Galba's death both show how places can evoke memories. While Cicero directs his audience explicitly to the memory that he wants them to recall, what Tacitus does is much more subtle and suggestive: he merely points to the location of Galba's death and requires his readers to recall the necessary memories. Both methods, as we shall see, were at work in Augustan ideology.

III. THE AEDES CASTORIS AND POPULAR POLITICS IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

The Temple of Castor was more than a cult centre and became increasingly important in the political life of the late Republic, as a meeting place for the Roman Senate (Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.129), the destination point in the annual parade of knights (*transuectio equestris*) (see further below), and especially as a site of contentious public meetings (*contiones*) and legislative assemblies (*comitia*) orchestrated by politicians or the urban crowd.¹² In order to understand how the Temple of Castor came to be associated with popular politics, we must first consider the place of the temple in the changing topography of the Forum Romanum. Then, we can move on to show how control of the temple came to be equated with control of the popular assemblies that met there and hence control of popular sovereignty. We will conclude with a discussion of the temple's political function under Augustus.

The temple became the site of public meetings and legislative assemblies only after the Forum changed its orientation from the early to the late Republic.¹³ The focal

⁹ Walter (n. 4), 136.

¹⁰ Livy 1.12.10, 13.5; 7.6.1–6; on the Lacus Curtius, see the discussion in D. Spencer, 'Rome at a gallop: Livy, on not gazing, jumping, or toppling into the void', in Larmour and Spencer (n. 4), 61–101; see also Edwards (n. 4), 43.

¹¹ Tac. *Hist.* 1.41.2, with the discussion in C. Damon, *Tacitus. Histories I* (Cambridge, 2003), 183–4; she points out that Tacitus here exploits (as he does elsewhere) the 'symbolic power' of the event and location; see also Edwards (n. 4), 77.

¹² On this temple in general, see I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen (edd.), *The Temple of Castor and Pollux: The Pre-Augustan Temple Phases with Related Decorative Elements* (Rome, 1992) and I. Nielsen, s.v. 'Castor, aedes, templum', *LTUR* 1.242–5. N.W. DeWitt calls the area of the Forum containing the Temple of Castor the 'plebeian' end ('Litigation in the Forum in Cicero's time', *CPh* 21 [1926], 218–24, at 221).

¹³ N. Purcell, s.v. 'Forum Romanum', *LTUR* 3.325–36; M. Bonnefond-Coudry, *Le Sénat de la République Romaine: De La Guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste: Pratiques Délibératives et Prise de Décision* (Rome, 1989), 80–90.

point of public meetings in the early period had always been the Curia and the Comitium. In fact, the original Rostra was probably built on to the Curia and faced the Comitium,¹⁴ thus serving as a platform from which one could address both people and Senate; also, it could have been used by senators to inform the people of what they had debated and decided in their meetings. After 338 B.C. a new Rostra was built, still in the Curia/Comitium corner of the Forum but now between the Comitium and the Forum. At some point in the next century orators began to turn away from the Curia/Comitium complex to address the people who gathered in the Forum for *contiones*.¹⁵ Elections continued to be held in the Comitium.

In the second century, the location of *comitia* changed as well: C. Licinius Crassus (*tr. pl.* 145 B.C.), during one assembly of the people for the purpose of passing legislation, led voters into the Forum proper and perhaps to the Temple of Castor.¹⁶ Recent excavations have unearthed evidence to indicate that modifications were made to the temple some time after 200 B.C. It is possible that this rebuilding accommodated the new function of the temple.¹⁷ This combination of factors helped change the orientation of the Forum, away from the Curia/Comitium and toward the Temple of Castor.¹⁸

When L. Caecilius Metellus Delmaticus renovated the temple in 117 B.C., thus increasing the size of the tribunal,¹⁹ which was now called a second *rostra*, he took advantage of or at any rate acknowledged the place of the temple in the new orientation of the Forum. Raised platforms (*pontes*) provided access to and egress from the tribunal, allowing citizens to cast their votes. The consequence of these modifications to the temple was that it became a more important site for *contiones* and *comitia*.²⁰

The final piece of the puzzle may have been the construction of the Gradus Aurelii or Tribunal Aurelium (*c.* 74 B.C.). The precise location of this structure cannot be determined with certainty.²¹ If it was near the Temple of Castor, which is a possible inference from some of Cicero's references to it,²² it might have provided steps for the people to stand on in front of the temple, while they attended a *contio* or awaited their turn to vote in an assembly. This combination of the temple, its tribunal (a second

¹⁴ Perhaps on the steps leading from the Curia down into the Comitium, as L.R. Taylor suggests (*Roman Voting Assemblies* [Ann Arbor, 1966], 22–3). Cf. also L. Richardson, Jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, 1992), 334–5; F. Coarelli, s.v. 'Rostra (Età Repubblicana)', *LTUR* 4.212–13. On the development of the Curia/Comitium complex during the Republic, see J.C. Anderson, *The Historical Topography of the Imperial Fora* (Brussels, 1984), 12–20.

¹⁵ Plutarch claims that C. Gracchus was the first to do this (*C. Gracch.* 26.4).

¹⁶ Varro, *Rust.* 1.2.9; Cic. *Lael.* 96; Taylor (n. 14), 21–5.

¹⁷ Nielsen (n. 12), 1.243.

¹⁸ We should also note that already around 142 B.C. P. Scipio Aemilianus delivered a speech in front of the temple, but the subject and occasion of this speech remain unknown (Festus 362L).

¹⁹ The tribunal of Temple 1A was *c.* 11 m wide and 6.50 m in depth (I. Nielsen and B. Poulsen, 'The rebuilding of the first temple (temple 1A)', in Nielsen and Poulsen [n. 12], 80–6, at 84); the tribunal of the Metellan temple was *c.* 21 m wide and 7 m deep (Nielsen and Poulsen, 'The Metellan temple', in Nielsen and Poulsen [n. 12], 87–117, at 113). On the Metellan rebuilding, see also Nielsen (n. 12), 1.244.

²⁰ Taylor (n. 14), 21–9.

²¹ K. Korhonen, s.v. 'Tribunal Aurelium, Gradus Aurelii', *LTUR* 5.86–7, succinctly explains the critical issues surrounding this structure. See also F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano*, 2 vols (Rome, 1992), 2.190–9; Richardson (n. 14), 181–2, 400–1, believes the Tribunal Aurelium and Gradus Aurelii were separate structures.

²² Cic. *Dom.* 54, *Red. pop.* 13, *Sest.* 34, *Pis.* 11. In these passages he refers to the structure as 'Tribunal Aurelium'. Earlier references (*Clu.* 93 and *Flac.* 66) call it the 'Gradus Aurelii'.

rostra), and the Gradus Aurelii would then have corresponded topographically to the Curia/Comitium/Rostra complex diagonally opposite. The precise location of the Gradus Aurelii notwithstanding, the *rostra* of the Temple of Castor provided an effective vantage point from which a popular politician could gesture angrily at the Curia across the Forum – the symbol of a remote and insensitive ruling elite; and the crowd would stand with its back to the Curia, instead of facing it, as it would if it were listening to a speaker standing on the Rostra.²³ The temple became the ideal location for a champion of the people (such as P. Clodius Pulcher, *tr. pl.* 58 B.C. [see further below]) to emphasize the gulf that existed between the senatorial aristocracy and the urban *plebs*.

There can be no doubt that the changing topography of the Forum contributed to the importance of the Temple of Castor in the political life of the city in the late Republic. In the last generations of the Republic in particular, as one location for *contiones* and *comitia*, the temple became a locus for popular politics and therefore resonant of popular sovereignty. Controversial legislation provoked the fiercest disputes in these often contentious assemblies.²⁴ Two examples can illustrate what I mean: Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos (*tr. pl.* 62 B.C.) proposed a law that would have conferred a command on Pompey to protect the city following the execution of those involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy. M. Porcius Cato, who was also tribune in this year, opposed it. When the people were gathering to vote on this law, Metellus and Caesar surrounded the Temple of Castor with armed men and gladiators and perched themselves atop the *rostra* of the temple. Cato, undaunted, ascended the tribunal and, much to everyone's astonishment, sat down between Metellus and Caesar. Metellus began to read the text of the law that was being proposed, but Cato prevented him from doing so by snatching the text from his hand. When Metellus began reciting the law by heart, Q. Minucius Thermus, Cato's friend, clapped his hand over Metellus' mouth. The crowd erupted; Metellus dispersed it and Cato was led into the temple. The law was never passed (*Plut. Cat. Min.* 27–9). A few years later, during Caesar's consulship, Caesar was at the temple presiding over the assembly that would vote on his agrarian law. His colleague in the consulship, M. Calpurnius Bibulus, entered the Forum with his supporters to break up the assembly and prevent a vote. Some in the crowd already assembled prevented Bibulus from ascending the *rostra* of the temple, threw him down, snatched the *fasces* from his lictors and broke them, and (in one account) dumped a basket of dung on Bibulus' head. He retreated and the law passed.²⁵

²³ Cicero describes the Curia as a sentinel that oversees the Rostra and stands ready to rein in revolutionary oratory, thus implying that the Rostra was in the control of the senatorial aristocracy (*Flac.* 57): *Hic, in hac grauissima et moderatissima ciuitate, cum est forum plenum iudiciorum, plenum magistratum, plenum optimorum uirorum et ciuium, cum speculatur atque obsidet rostra uindex temeritatis et moderatrix officii curia, tamen quantos fluctus excitari contionum uidetis!* Cf. DeWitt (n. 12), 220–1, who describes the area around the Rostra as having an 'aristocratic character'.

²⁴ See e.g., *Plut. Sull.* 8.5–8, which relates the dispute over a law transferring the prestigious command against Mithridates from Sulla (*cos.* 88 B.C.) to his rival Marius. To thwart this legislation, the consuls Sulla and Q. Pompeius Rufus, declared a suspension of public business. While they were holding an assembly (probably a *contio*, Plutarch's language is unclear on this point) at the Temple of Castor, Sulpicius and his supporters entered the Forum and routed them from the temple, killing Pompeius' son in the mêlée and forcing Sulla to flee. The next year another controversial law (distributing new citizens throughout all the tribes) provoked similar protests at the temple (*App. B Civ.* 1.64.290–2).

²⁵ *App. B Civ.* 2.11.39; *Cass. Dio* 38.6.2–3; *Plut. Cat. Min.* 32.3.

Many politicians in the late Republic endeavoured to control the temple in their hopes of swaying the assemblies that gathered there. It is not surprising, then, that the politician who made the most concerted effort to be the people's champion has been accused of using the Aedes Castoris as his own armed camp. Cicero claimed that P. Clodius Pulcher removed the steps of the temple to prevent access (for example, *Sest.* 34), which can only mean that Clodius made it impossible for the temple to be used as a site for *comitia*, perhaps by removing the *pontes* or otherwise blocking access to them. Clodius had already conflated the usually separate functions of the *comitia* and *contiones*. The traditional function of the *contio* was to present to the people the merits of a particular bill (*rogatio*), but the people were not expected to respond. It was not until the *comitia* that they were formally asked (*rogare*) what they felt and their vote was their response.²⁶ Clodius, on the other hand, used *contiones* to put questions to the people and allowed them to give a response. Cicero objected that these responses came only from those who were members of Clodius' gangs (*operae*) and therefore did not constitute the will of the people. When Clodius prevented access to the Temple of Castor, he (in Cicero's view) further impeded the traditional political process in Rome. Clodius himself might have claimed that he was providing another venue for the expression of popular sentiment.

In the political struggle following Caesar's assassination the temple was the site of *contiones* in which the major players in this struggle could address the urban populace and Caesar's veteran soldiers, whose allegiance was decisive to the eventual victor. First, Cicero refers to a *contio* that M. Antonius held here either in June or November of 44 B.C.²⁷ He held another *contio* in October of 44 B.C. in which he accused Cicero of being responsible for Caesar's death (*Cic. Fam.* 12.3.2). This *contio*, coupled with a new statue in Caesar's honour, with the inscription 'To our father who well deserved it', made clear the breach that divided Antonius from the conspirators and their supporters. Next, Octavian returned to Rome in November of 44 B.C. at the head of two legions of soldiers and in a *contio* swore an oath of his hopes to rise to his father's honours.²⁸ In the case of this *contio*, Octavian might have been drawn to the Temple of Castor by its proximity to the monument erected in Caesar's honour, on which he presumably swore his oath. It is worth bearing in mind that Octavian's *contio* at the temple on this occasion was a kind of ceremony of succession, inasmuch as he swore to take his father's place. This might have influenced Augustus' incorporation of the temple in his own ideology (see further below). Finally, Cicero mentions a statue of L. Antonius (*tr. pl.* 44 B.C. and brother of the triumvir) that was erected near the temple with a dedication describing him as patron of the voting tribes (*quinque et triginta tribus patrono*, *Cic. Phil.* 6.12). Cicero's remarks about this statue are contained in a speech he delivered in 43 B.C., which shows that even in the triumviral period the temple remained an important location for the expression of popular sovereignty.

This brief survey of the changing topography of the Forum Romanum, which has featured the political significance of the Temple of Castor, especially as a location for popular assemblies in the late Republic, provides a basis for understanding why this

²⁶ Taylor (n. 14), 28.

²⁷ *Cic. Phil.* 3.27, 5.21; for an argument for the earlier date, see G.S. Sumi, *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome Between Republic and Empire* (Ann Arbor, 2005), 138–41; for the later date, see H. Frisch, *Cicero's Fight for the Republic: The Historical Background of the Philippics* (Copenhagen, 1946), 151.

²⁸ *Cic. Att.* 16.15.3; cf. *App. B Civ.* 3.41.169 and *Cass. Dio* 45.12.4–5.

temple became symbolic of popular sovereignty in this period. It was a space over which politicians seemed eager to exercise control. It is not surprising, then, that Augustus, too, would want to demonstrate his control over this important monument and its immediate vicinity. The advent of the Augustan Principate effected a change in the political process. Popular assemblies, a hallmark of the Republican constitution, were still held, but only under the *princeps*' supervision. How decisive was Augustus' influence on the assemblies in his Principate is still unclear. Augustus actively campaigned for his favoured candidates before they stood for election in the new *Saepta Julia* in the *Campus Martius* (Suet. *Aug.* 56.1). Augustus might have wanted elections to maintain an air of freedom,²⁹ but it is likely that his own candidates enjoyed a decided advantage. That elections were held in a structure named for the Julian *gens* advertised who was the ultimate authority in the political process.

In a similar fashion, legislative assemblies came under the *de facto* control of the *princeps* after 23 B.C. by virtue of his tribunician power, which enabled him to bring legislation before the people, and his influence over the elections of consuls who tended to be the other sponsors of legislation.³⁰ These assemblies still met in the Forum, but we cannot be sure of the precise location throughout the Augustan Principate. We have evidence of a law passed in 9 B.C. at the new *Aedes Divi Iulii*, apparently in place of the Temple of Castor.³¹ Was this change of venue significant? One explanation is that the Temple of Castor might have been unavailable due to damage done by a fire a few years previously (14 B.C.). It was this damage that prompted the Tiberian renovations that resulted in the rededication of the temple in A.D. 6. We do not know whether all new legislation throughout the Principate was voted on at this new location. If Augustus did decide to move legislative assemblies to the Temple of Deified Julius, it is fitting that he chose a monument located in that part of the Forum of symbolic significance to the Roman *plebs*. What is more, he chose a Julian monument to demonstrate, in much the same way as he could for electoral assemblies in the *Saepta Julia*, that in the Principate the ultimate authority in the political process was the *princeps* and his family. The change from *Aedes Castoris* to *Aedes Divi Iulii* was, topographically, a small one; a slight turn to the left for the citizen body which had been convened to vote on legislation. But symbolically it was much more significant as legislative assemblies were further brought under the aegis of the *princeps* and his family. The change of venue might show that Augustus wanted to shift his focus from the more recent memories of the temple's role in popular politics in the late Republic, memories that recalled civil conflict, and embrace instead more remote memories that could be exploited more effectively for his new ideology.³² In other words, the larger historical and mythological background for the *Aedes Castoris* must be brought to account in considering the temple's role in the formation of Augustan ideology.

²⁹ On elections in the Principate, see A.H.M. Jones, 'The elections under Augustus', *JRS* 45 (1955), 9–21 = id., *Studies in Roman Government and Law* (Oxford, 1960), 27–50 and R. Frei-Stolba, *Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Zürich, 1967), 87–129.

³⁰ G. Rotondi, *Leges Publicae Populi Romani* (Milan, 1912), 442–62; cf. Sumi (n. 27), 234–7.

³¹ This was a law enacted by T. Quinctius Crispinus (*cos.* 9 B.C.); Frontin. *Aq.* 129; cf. M.H. Crawford, *Roman Statutes*, 2 vols (London, 1996), no. 63, 2.795, 797; Sumi (n. 27), 235–6.

³² 'The bloodshed, civil strife, and memories of battles fought, violent and brutal conflicts in which Romans clashed against their fellow Romans, could never be forgotten, but the memories of recent war could be placed into context by using events from Rome's more distant past to demonstrate the city's resilience' (Rea [n. 3], 4).

IV. THE FOUNDATION MYTH OF THE AEDES CASTORIS

The most frequently attested memory associated with the Aedes Castoris was its foundation myth, which not only explained the circumstances of the temple's founding but also was adapted and retold in other contexts throughout Roman history. Most importantly for our purposes, this myth remained alive under the Principate and was retold in particular in the tradition surrounding the death of Nero Drusus, Augustus' stepson and Tiberius' younger brother. Drusus was once marked out as one of Augustus' possible successors before his sudden and premature death (in 9 B.C.) while on campaign in Germany ended these hopes. Dio informs us that while on this campaign Drusus was met by a woman of unnatural size who foretold his imminent death. Afterwards, two young men were seen riding through his camp, whose appearance was one of several omens that confirmed the initial prophecy.³³ The story of the two riders appearing in Drusus' camp after his death seems to have been adapted from the foundation myth of the Temple of Castor in Rome and is an appropriate starting point for an understanding of how this Republican myth could be made to serve the ideology surrounding the succession.

The traditional story of the Dioscuri in Rome is their appearance at the battle of Lake Regillus, when the Roman commander and dictator A. Postumius Albus challenged the forces of Tusculum under the leadership of Octavius Mamilius. The tyrant Tarquinius Superbus, recently driven from Rome, joined Mamilius' army. Postumius vowed to construct a temple to Castor in Rome if he was victorious in this battle (Livy 2.20.12). In the heat of the contest, two young men, handsome and unusually tall, appeared on horseback and led the Roman army to victory. Later, these same two figures were seen in Rome watering their sweaty horses at the Lacus Juturnae, just to the east of where the temple now stands, and brought news of the successful battle.³⁴ Just as important as the epiphany of the gods in battle was their later presence in Rome where they announced the victory to the awaiting citizenry, in this instance, a victory of freedom over tyranny. Already in Greek thought the Dioscuri were often seen as saviour gods who provided timely assistance in battle, leading armies from the brink of defeat to the glory of victory.³⁵ The Dioscuri, therefore, came to be associated with victories in battle and the swift announcement

³³ The story of the two riders in Drusus' camp appears only in Cass. Dio 55.1.3–5; cf. Suet. *Claud.* 1.2 for the story about Drusus' confrontation with the woman of unusual size.

³⁴ Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.6; cf. 3.11–13; Dion. Hal. 6.13.1–3; Val. Max. 1.8.1; Plut. *Cor.* 3.4; on the announcement of the victory at Rome, cf. Plut. *Aem.* 25.2. See also Walter (n. 4), 146–8. Livy's account of the battle (2.19–20) does not mention the epiphany of the deities. However, he does mention that the dictator Postumius established a reward to be given to the first two men to penetrate the enemy camp (2.20.12). This detail might be Livy's way of implicitly explaining away the alternate tradition, of which he must have been aware, that related the epiphany of Castor and Pollux: the two young men who appeared at the head of the Roman army were in fact these soldiers who first penetrated the enemy camp. I know of no convincing explanation for the absence of the Dioscuri in Livy's account. Perhaps he was reluctant to attribute to divine intervention such an important victory in Roman history; D.S. Levene, *Religion in Livy* (Leiden, 1993), 153.

³⁵ The Dioscuri were known as *sotêres* from at least the fifth century B.C. They were credited with aiding Lysander at the battle of Aegospotami (405 B.C.) (Plut. *Lys.* 12.1). For other examples, see B. Poulsen, 'Cult, myth and politics', in Nielsen and Poulsen (n. 12), 46–53, at 48, and W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War. Part III: Religion* (Berkeley, 1979), 13–17, 21–2, 26, 27, 28. B. Poulsen argues that Augustus might have been inspired to adopt the Dioscuri as part of his ideology by Hellenistic rulers ('The Dioscuri and ruler ideology', *SO* 66 [1991], 119–46, at 137–42).

of these victories often far from where the battles took place. They were at once saviour gods and heralds of victory.³⁶

This foundation myth, a favourite in the Roman historiographical tradition, was adapted to suit the military campaigns of Rome's imperial expansion. T. Quinctius Flaminius, for instance, following his victory over Philip V at Cynoscephalae and his later declaration of the freedom of Greeks (196 B.C.), dedicated silver shields to the Dioscuri in the Temple of Apollo at Delphi,³⁷ after which he was given the honorific title *soter*,³⁸ as the saviour and liberator of Greeks from the expansionary aims of Philip V. Moreover, a coin from 126 B.C., minted by one of Flaminius' descendants, shows the Dioscuri standing on either side of a Macedonian shield – a likely allusion to Flaminius' dedication.³⁹ The Dioscuri had already been connected in Roman history with a victory of freedom over tyranny at the battle of Lake Regillus. Flaminius adapted and broadened the association of these deities with victory and freedom to include wars outside Italy, which influenced subsequent versions of the temple's foundation myth. An epiphany of the deities was said to have occurred at the battle of Pydna when L. Aemilius Paullus defeated Perseus; again two young men appeared on horseback to announce the victory and then later they were seen watering their horses at the Lacus Juturnae.⁴⁰ In 101 B.C. two young men on white horses made an appearance at the battle of Vercellae and announced in Rome the victory of C. Marius over the Cimbri.⁴¹ In Florus' version of this retelling of the legend, the two young men delivered the letter announcing the victory (*laureatae litterae*) to the praetor in front of the Temple of Castor.⁴² Thus, the Dioscuri were shown to approve of Rome's imperial ambitions.

Just as this legend came to be connected with victories on foreign soil, as the Roman Empire expanded, so too was it adapted to the civil wars of the late Republic. As one of several prodigies heralding Caesar's victory over Pompey at Pharsalus (in 48 B.C.), two young men appeared in Syria, to announce this victory on the very day that the battle took place.⁴³ In this particular retelling of the myth, the Dioscuri were merely heralds of victory.

³⁶ For the Dioscuri's connection with victory, see the coin of c. 211–208 B.C. (M.H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, 2 vols [London, 1974], no. 61/1).

³⁷ Plut. *Flam.* 12.11.

³⁸ Plut. *Flam.* 16.7.

³⁹ Crawford (n. 36), no. 267/1.

⁴⁰ Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.6; on this passage, see the discussion in A.S. Pease (ed.), *De Natura Deorum*, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA, 1955), 2.552–60; cf. 3.11–13; Val. Max. 1.8.1; Plin. *HN* 7.86; Plut. *Aem.* 24.2–3, 25.1–2; Flor. 1.28.14–15.

⁴¹ Plin. *HN* 7.86 (on this passage, see the discussion in M. Beagon, *The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History, Book 7* [Oxford, 2005], 269–71); Flor. 1.38. The association of Castor and Pollux with victory continued into the Principate. A painting of Castor and Pollux was set up in Augustus' Forum alongside one of Victoria and Alexander (Plin. *HN* 35.27).

⁴² There is some evidence to indicate that the *praetor urbanus* was especially important as an officiant in cult activity. Since the legend of Castor and Pollux usually included the announcement of victory in Rome, whoever was left in charge of the city would have received the news. In Florus' account cited above, the praetor received the letter of victory in front of the temple. In Dionysius' account of the battle of Lake Regillus, the one who was left in charge of the city (τοῦ καταλειφθέντος τῆς πόλεως ἡγέμενος) – the *praefectus urbi* or the *praetor urbanus*? – conducted a futile search for the two young men who had announced the victory in Rome (6.13.2). A certain Asellio (*pr. urb.* 89 B.C.) was murdered while making an offering to Castor and Pollux in front of their temple (App. *B Civ.* 1.54; cf. Livy *Per.* 74; Val. Max. 9.7.4). In a much later period (A.D. 216), the cult of Castor and Pollux in Ostia was administered by the *praetor urbanus* (L.R. Taylor, *The Cults of Ostia* [Bryn Mawr, 1913], 22–3).

⁴³ Cass. Dio 41.61.4: '... τοῖς τε Σύροις δύο τινὰς νεανίσκους τὸ τέλος τῆς μάχης

Thus far, we have focussed on historiography, perhaps based on an oral tradition, as the medium through which the memory of the foundation myth of the Aedes Castoris was recalled. Other media were possible, too; particularly noteworthy is the coin minted around 96 B.C. by A. Postumius Albinus, which depicts the Dioscuri watering their horses at the Lacus Juturnae, a clear allusion to the temple's foundation myth.⁴⁴ The minting of this coin is a reminder that particular *gentes* were often responsible for preserving the memories of importance to their members. In this case, the legend of the Dioscuri recalled the vowing of the temple by the minter's distant antecedent, A. Postumius Albus Regillensis, and its building later by his son, perhaps in an effort to reclaim for the Postumian *gens* a myth that had been frequently retold in the context of other Roman victories. The frequency with which this foundation myth was retold and the number of Roman commanders who adapted it suggests that it was no longer the exclusive property of the Postumian *gens* and had become a myth for all Romans – a 'national' myth.

We now can begin to see the process whereby the foundation myth of the Aedes Castoris was preserved, adapted and retold, first perhaps by members of the Postumian *gens* (although evidence for this is lacking until the coin c. 96 B.C.) and later by other Romans who desired a connection with the Dioscuri. The story of the Dioscuri's appearance following the death of Drusus is one piece of evidence for the further adaptation of the story to suit Augustan ideology. A second piece is the story of another mysterious and sudden appearance of two young men.

In Suetonius' account of Caesar's funeral, a divided crowd of mourners quarrelled over the appropriate place for the cremation of Caesar's body, with one group favouring the cella of the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter and another the curia of Pompey's theatre, where Caesar had been assassinated. Suddenly two figures appeared, each one girded with a sword and carrying two spears, and set fire to the bier with blazing torches. Immediately a crowd of bystanders piled up branches, benches, seats and other material.⁴⁵ The dispute over the location of Caesar's burial occurs in other sources for his funeral,⁴⁶ but Suetonius is our only authority for the dispute being settled by the sudden appearance of two mysterious figures. The tradition of the Dioscuri's appearances in the Roman Forum, usually to announce a military victory, and the description of these figures as armed warriors, are persuasive evidence for understanding them to be the Dioscuri.⁴⁷ Two questions in particular arise in connection with this story. First, can we determine its origin? And second, how does it promote Augustan ideology?

The description of the two figures directing the crowd in the Forum Romanum, as we have already noted, is somewhat reminiscent of Castor and Pollux directing the battle line at Lake Regillus, yet at Caesar's funeral they did so in a part of the Forum that was associated with popular politics. One can understand, then, the Dioscuri in the role of mob leaders in the minds of Romans who had become accustomed both to

ἀγγέλαντας ἀφαιεῖς γενέσθαι ...'. Dio recounts this epiphany in a long list of prodigies telling of the outcome of the battle.

⁴⁴ Crawford (n. 36), no. 335/10a and b.

⁴⁵ *Lectum pro rostris in forum magistratus et honoribus functi detulerunt. Quem cum pars in Capitolini Iovis cella cremare pars in curia Pompei destinaret, repente duo quidam gladiis succincti ac bina iacula gestantes ardentibus cereis succenderunt confestimque circumstantium turba uirgulta arida et cum subselliis tribunalia, quicquid praeterea ad domum aderat, conegessit* (Suet. *Iul.* 84.3).

⁴⁶ App. *B Civ.* 2.148; Cass. Dio 44.50.2–3; cf. Plut. *Caes.* 68.1, who describes the impromptu cremation in the Forum but says nothing about a dispute.

⁴⁷ The Dioscuri are consistently depicted on coinage carrying two spears each; see e.g., Crawford (n. 36), no. 44/5 (c. 211 B.C.).

their sudden appearances in times of crisis and to their temple, which was at the centre of the political turmoil of the late Republic. Suetonius' account of the Dioscuri's appearance at Caesar's funeral seems to be a conflation of memories, recalling both the temple's foundation myth as well as its role in late Republican popular politics.

If these figures were to be understood as the Dioscuri, however, we should acknowledge a change in their iconography from warriors on horseback or leading their horses to ones armed with sword and spears.⁴⁸ A possible explanation for this change in iconography is the Dioscuri's frequent identification with the *Di Penates* or *Penates publici*. Much about this identification remains uncertain, but it is worth exploring briefly what we do know. The *Penates* (sometimes *Penates priuati*) were deities who protected and ensured the abundance of the household cupboard (*penus*) and were worshipped in close connection with Vesta, the goddess of the hearth, and the *Lar Familiaris*.⁴⁹ The *Penates publici* had a temple on the Velia, which was purported to have stood on the site of king Tullus Hostilius' home.⁵⁰ The royal home, then, became the site of the public cult, an indication that the *Penates publici* protected the well-being of the community, along with Vesta, the goddess of the civic hearth.⁵¹ The proximity of the Regia and the Temple of Vesta in the southeastern section of the Forum is another manifestation of the connection of the royal household and civic hearth.⁵² These structures may have been part of a larger complex of buildings devoted to the Roman kingship.⁵³ The temple on the Velia is first mentioned by Livy (45.16.5) in the context of omens that appeared in the year 167 B.C., although it is probably much older.⁵⁴ Dubourdieu has argued that the identification of the Dioscuri with the *Penates publici* was probably late, as the coins of M. Fonteius demonstrate (minted in 108 or 107 B.C.).⁵⁵ More to the point, for our purposes, is the relief on the Ara Pacis, showing Aeneas sacrificing at Lavinium, where one can see the shrine of the *Penates* in the background,⁵⁶ in which they are depicted as twin gods, seated, and holding spears,⁵⁷ armed in a fashion similar to the Dioscuri but not as mounted warriors. This relief demonstrates that the *Penates* became part of the Aeneas legend certainly in the Augustan period but some connection with Troy is in evidence before then.⁵⁸ What we have in Suetonius' account of Caesar's funeral, then, is the epiphany

⁴⁸ For the depiction of the Dioscuri as mounted warriors, see e.g., Crawford (n. 36), no. 44/5 (there are numerous other examples); for a depiction of them leading their horses, see e.g., Crawford (n. 36), no. 304/1.

⁴⁹ J. Linderski, s.v. *Penates*, *Brill's New Pauly* (Leiden–Boston, 2007), 10.718–20.

⁵⁰ Varro, *ap. Non.* 852L; Solin. 1.22; Richardson (n. 14), 289. Augustus includes this temple in a list of those that he built (*feci*, *Mon. Anc.* 19).

⁵¹ Livy frequently uses the formula *penates publici priuatique* in a manner that makes them synonymous with one's homeland (*patria*) (3.17.11, 22.1.6, 25.18.10, 45.24.12).

⁵² A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor, 1971), 258.

⁵³ This is the theory of Coarelli (n. 21), 1.56–78, which still has many detractors. For a critique, see F.E. Brown, *Gnomon* 56 (1984), 381–3. A summary of modern theories about the Regia can be found in T.J. Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 BC)* (London, 1995), 239–41. The Regia was rebuilt by Cn. Domitius Calvinus in 36 B.C. (Cass. Dio 48.42.4–6; Plin. *HN* 34.48; *CIL* 6.1301=ILS 42).

⁵⁴ A. Dubourdieu, *Les Origines et le Développement du Culte des Pénates à Rome* (Rome, 1989), 440–1.

⁵⁵ Dubourdieu (n. 54), 430–9; Crawford (n. 36), no. 307/1a.

⁵⁶ Serv. *ad Aen.* 3.12 (quoting Varro); S. Weinstock, 'Two archaic inscriptions from Latium', *JRS* 50 (1960), 112–18, at 113.

⁵⁷ As Dionysius describes them on the temple on the Velia (1.68.1).

⁵⁸ 'When the idea of Trojan ancestry became established in Rome, probably around the middle of the 4th cent. BC, the sacred objects associated with Troy, such as the Palladium, were counted among the Penates' (Linderski [n. 49], 719).

of twin gods in the Forum directing a crowd of Romans, in the manner of the Dioscuri, but armed like the *Penates publici*, to cremate Caesar's body near monuments connected with kingship and the public hearth. To identify these figures as either the Dioscuri or the *Penates publici* is futile. They had characteristics of both at once.

The question remains as to the source of this story peculiar to Suetonius. Certainty is impossible, but one hypothesis is worth exploring. Of crucial importance is the role first of the crowd at Caesar's funeral in determining (with the help of these two figures) a location for the cremation of the body, and later marking the location with a monument in Caesar's memory. The crowd chose a location directly in front of the Regia,⁵⁹ which served as the official headquarters of the Pontifex Maximus, Caesar himself in 44 B.C., and behind which was the home of the Pontifex Maximus, the Domus Publica. Moreover, as Pontifex Maximus, Caesar was chief priest of the public cult, which found its focus in the public hearth represented by the Temple of Vesta adjacent. The association of the *Penates publici* with Vesta, and Vesta with the Regia, might have encouraged the conflation of the Dioscuri and *Penates publici* at the basis of Suetonius' account.

The first phase in commemorating the location of Caesar's cremation was the erection of a monument (variously identified as an altar or column),⁶⁰ which came to serve as a rallying point for Caesar's supporters and acquired cult status. If anyone ventured to wonder why Caesar's body was cremated where it had been, and therefore why the monument stood where it did, this story provided divine sanction for the crowd's choice of the location in the Forum. Moreover, this story linked Caesar's monument closely with Roman kingship. We should bear in mind that it was the urban crowd that hailed Caesar as king when he returned to Rome in January of 44 B.C., after celebrating the *Feriae Latinae* on the Alban Mount, and was seen wearing the high red boots of the Alban kings. Caesar wittily rejected the crowd's pronouncement by reminding them, as if they had mistaken his *cognomen*, that he was not Rex but Caesar. In the month following at the *Lupercalia*, M. Antonius offered Caesar a diadem 'by order of the people'.⁶¹ The dictator, seated on the Rostra resplendent in purple, refused it to the delight of the assembled crowd, and then pointedly sent the diadem to the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter, recording the act in the *Fasti* and declaring that only Jupiter was king of the Romans (Cass. Dio 44.11.3).

The second phase of commemoration of the location of Caesar's cremation was

⁵⁹ Suetonius' account does not include this detail, but we have the testimony of Appian, who states that the crowd cremated Caesar's body near the 'palace' (*basileion*), presumably a reference to the Regia (*B Civ.* 2.148.616). We can also infer it from topographical evidence (see further next note).

⁶⁰ Since most of our ancient sources for Caesar's funeral do not describe specifically where Caesar's body was cremated, we must infer the location from the future site of the monument that the *plebs* erected in his honour (Cass. Dio 47.18.4). The *rostra* of the Temple of Divus Julius contained a niche to accommodate this monument (R. Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum* [Brussels, 1994], 181–2). Livy states that Caesar's body was cremated *ante rostra*, which, if he means the Rostra at the west end of the Forum, is an error; but he could mean the *rostra* on the Temple of Castor, in which case he also connected the cremation closely with the temple (*Per.* 116). Appian (as noted above, n. 59) claims that Caesar's cremation took place near 'the ancient palace of the kings of Rome' (a probable reference to the Regia). This monument, of course, was in the same part of the Forum, not far from the Temple of Castor, but with his allusion to the Regia Appian seems to want to connect Caesar's cremation with ancient Roman kingship.

⁶¹ '*populi iussu*': Cic. *Phil.* 2.87; cf. Cass. Dio 44.11.2. Other sources are Suet. *Iul.* 79.2; Plut. *Caes.* 61.

the erection of the Aedes Divi Julii by Octavian in 29 B.C. on the spot of Caesar's cremation and incorporating the memorial erected in Caesar's honour. Of all the rebuilding of Roman monuments that Augustus undertook during his reign, he only constructed four new temples: those of Apollo Palatinus, Divus Julius, Jupiter Tonans and Mars Ultor. A recent study has pointed out that of the four only the latter was a manubial building, constructed after a vow taken by Octavian at the battle of Philippi. Augustus erected the Temples of Jupiter Tonans and Apollo Palatinus at the site of lightning strikes, clear signs from the gods as to the appropriate location for his new temples.⁶² We can reasonably believe that Augustus desired a similar sign from the gods for the location of his temple to the Deified Julius, which he found in this story that Suetonius recounts. That the story also gives the Roman people a role to play in the founding of his temple was an additional attraction.

There are other reasons to believe that Augustus would have been drawn to such a story. First, the *Penates publici* recalled the Aeneas legend, of seminal importance to the Julian *gens* and one that Augustus elevated to a national myth.⁶³ Second, the deities who later became identified with Augustus' successors were shown here at the beginning of the dynasty orchestrating the cremation of Caesar's body, the first step in his apotheosis, which cleared the way for Augustus to succeed (initially as *Diui filius*). Finally, the *Penates publici* recalled the public cult overseen by the Pontifex Maximus, Caesar himself at his death and Augustus beginning in 12 B.C. The story thus drew a direct link between the son succeeding his father as Chief Priest, skipping over the tenure of the inconveniently long-lived M. Aemilius Lepidus.

One can see how the story of the two figures at Caesar's funeral could develop from the Dioscuri's traditional mythology which recalled their sudden and timely appearances at moments of crisis. The aspect of Suetonius' account that is not in accord with this same traditional mythology and their identification with the *Penates publici*, namely the Dioscuri's depiction as leaders of a crowd in the Forum instead of an army on the battlefield, can be explained as a product of the political function of their temple. This story, a modification of the Dioscuri's traditional mythology, gave these gods a role to play in the transformation of Caesar from mortal to divine. Their appearance at Drusus' death might have had the same significance.

V. THE *TRANSVECTIO EQUITUM* AND THE SUCCESSION

The appearance of the Dioscuri at Drusus' camp suggests a connection between the Dioscuri and Augustus' successors.⁶⁴ More direct evidence for such a connection is the *transvectio equitum*, an annual parade involving members of the equestrian order who had the right of the public horse (*equites equo publico*). The parade began at the Temple of Mars on the Via Appia and wound its way to the Forum, where it ended in front of the Temple of Castor. This parade took place on 15 July each year and, according to one tradition, commemorated the role of the Dioscuri in the victory at

⁶² O. Hekster and J. Rich, 'Octavian and the thunderbolt: the temple of Apollo Palatinus and Roman traditions of temple building', *CQ* 56 (2006), 149–68, at 153.

⁶³ See A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford, 2001), 15–43, for a discussion of this process and some of its implications.

⁶⁴ Other scholars have noticed this connection; see in particular Poulsen (n. 35) and A.J. Woodman, 'Mutiny and madness: Tacitus *Annals* 1.16–49', *Arethusa* 39 (2006), 303–29, esp. 308–11.

Lake Regillus (in 499 or 496 B.C.).⁶⁵ Thus, in the Augustan period, there was an annual ceremony that cued Romans to recall the foundation myth of the Temple of Castor – in much the same way that Cicero's words at the Temple of Jupiter Stator evoked the foundation myth of that temple, through which he was able to compare himself with Romulus.

When Augustus revived this ceremony (after a long hiatus, according to Suetonius [Aug. 38.3]), he apparently altered its emphasis and brought it securely under the aegis of the imperial family by placing his heirs in prominent positions. In the Republic *equites equo publico* paraded down to the Forum, each one leading his own horse, where they presented themselves to the censors, seated at the Temple of Castor, who discharged them from military service (Plut. *Pomp.* 22). Suetonius' account of the Augustan revival (Aug. 38.3–39) lays emphasis on this ceremony as a review (*recognovit*) of knights who were required to give an account of their lives to the *princeps* assisted by ten members of the Senate. The severest punishment seems to have been loss of rank (*ignominia notauit*); others might be reprimanded for scandalous conduct.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing under the Augustan Principate and presumably a witness to the Augustan revival, describes a ceremony of great pageantry in which Roman knights paraded on horseback, arrayed in tribes and divisions, crowned with olive branches and wearing purple robes adorned with emblems of their valour – a spectacle, in Dionysius' estimation, worthy of Rome's empire. Furthermore, Augustus' grandsons, Gaius and Lucius Caesar, led the parade under the title *principes iuuentutis*,⁶⁶ apparently fitted out in a manner reminiscent of the Dioscuri. By giving his successors a leadership position in this ceremony he further advertised the role that they would play in overseeing the acquisition and maintenance of empire. A Republican ceremony with a primarily censorial function thus became a rite of succession that adumbrated a glorious future for the Roman Empire under the aegis of Augustus' successors.

A second tradition holds that this parade was instituted in 304 B.C. by the censor Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus.⁶⁷ It is more likely that this tradition preserves the memory of a revival of the ceremony than its institution, as well as its transformation from a strictly religious ceremony to one with a censorial function. The increase of the number of cavalry voting units (*centuriae*) from the original six to twelve might also have occurred around this time.⁶⁸ In the Augustan revival of this ceremony the partici-

⁶⁵ Dion. Hal. 6.13.4; Plut. *Cor.* 3.5; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 38.3. On the parade in general, see S. Weinstock, 'Römische Reiterparade', *SMSR* 12 (1937), 10–24; on the significance of the parade in the Augustan Principate, see Spencer (n. 10), 89–97.

⁶⁶ This title for C. and L. Caesar was widely advertised on inscriptions and coins; see e.g., V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford, 1949), no. 65 (= *AE* 1899, 153) and *RIC*² 1, p. 55, no. 205. See also *RIC*² 1, p. 54, no. 198, for a depiction of C. Caesar on a galloping horse armed with sword and shield. J.B. Ward-Perkins points out that the *equites* continued to be associated with the emperor's heirs, alluding in particular to the *decursio* at imperial funerals, such as the one depicted on the base of the column of Antoninus Pius ('*Columna Divi Antonini*', in P. Ducrey (ed.), *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie offerts à Paul Collart* [Lausanne, 1976] = H. Dodge and B. Ward-Perkins (edd.), *Marble in Antiquity: Collected Papers of J.B. Ward-Perkins*, Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome 6 [London, 1992], 107–14, at 107–8); cf. also L. Vogel, *The Column of Antoninus Pius* (Cambridge, MA, 1973), 56–68.

⁶⁷ Livy 9.46.15; Val. Max. 2.2.9; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 32. On the institution of the *transuectio equitum*, see also S. Oakley's note on Livy 9.46.15 in *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1997–2005), 3.642–5.

⁶⁸ A. Momigliano, '*Procurum Patricium*', *JRS* 56 (1966), 16–24.

pating *equites* were divided into six *turmae*, which were probably an allusion to the original six centuries.⁶⁹ This ceremony, and thus the temple, had close associations with the equestrian order whose patron deities were Castor and Pollux.⁷⁰ In the late Republic, the equestrian order became increasingly politicized, first by C. Gracchus who in his tribunate succeeded in identifying issues of particular importance to the equestrian order and thereby separating its interests from those of the Senate. Central to Cicero's rhetoric two generations later was *concordia ordinum*, his succinct expression of hope for rapprochement between the orders. When Augustus came to power, he began the process of separating career paths for members of the senatorial aristocracy and equestrian order,⁷¹ thereby succeeding where Cicero had failed in establishing a *concordia ordinum*. The revival of the *transuectio equitum* enabled Augustus to advertise himself as patron of the equestrian order,⁷² just as he was *princeps senatus*, and protector of the urban *plebs* (by virtue of his tribunician power). Augustus' successors, as *principes iuventutis*, were shown to be leaders of the next generation of *equites*.

The performance of the *transuectio equitum* in the Augustan period, then, was more a glorification of the imperial family than a celebration of the victory at Lake Regillus.⁷³ We should not, however, dismiss the fact that Augustus chose to glorify the imperial family through the identification of his successors with the Dioscuri in the context of a ceremony that recalled a great victory from Rome's remote past and was of central importance to the equestrian order. The memories associated with the Temple of Castor were the symbolic framework for Augustus' successors and ultimately shaped the way that Augustus communicated his ideology.

VI. DIOSCURI AS DEMIGODS: BETWEEN LIFE AND DEATH

The Dioscuri were appropriate divine counterparts for Augustus' successors also because of their traditional mythology. Cicero listed Castor and Pollux, along with Hercules, Liber, Aesculapius and Quirinus, as demigods – heroes whose achievements in their lifetimes were so grand that they were accorded divine status (Cic. *Leg.* 2.19). Horace, writing a few decades later, imagines a scene with Augustus one day reclining with Pollux and Hercules, Dionysus and Quirinus.⁷⁴ Further evidence for the importance of the Dioscuri and other demigods in Augustan ideology was a heavily

⁶⁹ Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, 3.523.

⁷⁰ M. Albert, *Le Culte de Castor et Pollux en Italie* (Paris, 1883), 81–9. Moreover, the *Campani equites* received the right of Roman citizenship in 340 B.C., and a bronze inscription commemorating the event was set up at the Aedes Castoris (Livy 8.11.15–16, with the discussion in Oakley [n. 67], 2.513–15). They may have also been given the equestrian census rank.

⁷¹ P.A. Brunt, 'Principes and equites', *JRS* 73 (1983), 42–75, at 43–4.

⁷² Augustus himself had been a member of an equestrian family before being adopted into the patrician Julii (Suet. *Aug.* 2.1; cf. *Iul.* 41.1; Plut. *Caes.* 58.1; Cass. Dio 43.47.3). He evinced no shame at his equestrian birth and even boasted of it in his own writings, remarking that his father was the first member of his family to enter the Senate. In his rivalry with Antony, however, Octavian had to endure many insults directed at his character and the relative obscurity of his family's origin (Suet. *Aug.* 2.3).

⁷³ As Weinstock concluded ([n. 65], 24).

⁷⁴ Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.9–18; cf. *Ep.* 2.1.5–6, where he enumerates some of those gods who achieved immortality through their great deeds (Romulus, Liber pater, Castor and Pollux). Later in the same poem (l. 15) Horace compared these demigods, all of whom achieved their divine status after their lifetimes, to Augustus who was *praesens diuus* (cf. *Carm.* 3.5.2–3).

frequented corner of the Forum Augustum dedicated to such figures, with a painting of Castor and Pollux placed next to one of Alexander, another mortal who achieved divine status, with Victory in between (Plin. *HN* 35.27). The traditional story of the death of Castor as told by Pindar is pertinent here. After a quarrel with the sons of Aphareus (over the division of cattle taken in a raid) Castor was killed, and Pollux, in grief over his brother's death, prayed to Zeus that he might die with him. Zeus gave him a choice of immortality for himself and death for Castor, or they both could live on Olympus for one day and spend the next in Hades.⁷⁵ (A variant version has one living in heaven and the other in Hades on alternate days.)

The traditional mythology of the Dioscuri, which has them inhabiting both the mortal and divine realms, is the foundation for modern scholars' assertions that associate the Dioscuri with death and the afterlife. For this very reason, E. Strong regards them as 'emblems of future life'.⁷⁶ Their frequent depiction on sepulchral reliefs was the result of their cult having developed 'out of that of the heroised dead' and they never lost their connection with the underworld.⁷⁷ This belief might have come to Rome from Hellenistic royal cult, since the *Diegesis* of Callimachus claims that the poet described the sudden death of Arsinoë as her having been snatched away by the Dioscuri.⁷⁸ F. Cumont points out that the Dioscuri's double existence was the basis of the ancients' view of them as representing the two hemispheres of the sky, the regions of the sun and the moon, of light and darkness.⁷⁹ Another aspect of the Dioscuri's traditional mythology has them protecting travellers, especially sailors, for whom they ensure a happy voyage. Cumont posits a natural transformation of the Dioscuri from protectors of travellers to protectors of the dead.⁸⁰ Even if one does not accept his cosmic interpretation of the Dioscuri as symbols of the two hemispheres, the story of their alternate deaths and their achievement of immortality through merit was memorable and compelling, sufficient to associate them with funerals and death.⁸¹ This might help explain their appearance at Caesar's funeral and

⁷⁵ Pind. *Nem.* 10.49–91. Horace's language in *Ep.* 2.1.5–6 (*cum Castore Pollux ... recepti*) perhaps shows that he was thinking of the same story. Ovid retells it in the *Fasti* (5.693–720).

⁷⁶ E. Strong, *Apotheosis and After Life* (London, 1915), 201.

⁷⁷ Strong (n. 76), n. 27 on p. 275. For their iconography in ancient art in general, see *LIMC* 3.1.567–635; for their appearance on Roman sarcophagi, see G. Koch and H. Sichtermann, *Römische Sarkophage* (Munich, 1982), 144.

⁷⁸ *Dieg.* 10.10 on Call. *fr.* 228 (Pfeiffer). On the *Diegesis* in general, see R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1949/1953), 2.xxviii.

⁷⁹ F. Cumont, *Recherches sur le Symbolisme Funéraire des Romains* (Paris, 1942), 64–103, citing in particular Sext. Emp. *Math.* 9.37 in n. 1 on p. 68. He is followed by J.M.C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (Ithaca, NY, 1971), 38, who also regards the Dioscuri as guardians of the dead (194); cf. M. Mackintosh, *The Divine Rider in the Art of the Western Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1995), 38. Cumont's views on the symbolic significance of sepulchral art remain at the heart of a vexed question among art historians, namely whether we should view mythological scenes in sepulchral art as representative or symbolic of the ancients' views of death and the after life or as merely ornamental. See Nock's thorough review of Cumont's book ('Sarcophagi and symbolism' [Review of Cumont, 1942], *AJA* 50 (1946), 140–70). He points out that the Dioscuri were often used as framing figures, placed on either side of another figure (e.g. Helen or another goddess) (152, n. 48). More recently, R. Ling ('A relief from Duke Street, Aldgate, now in the Museum of London', *Britannia* 24 [1993], 7–12) reminds us that many popular motifs of sepulchral art appear in other contexts as well. Clearly, some of Cumont's statements go too far (e.g. the one that sees Pythagorean philosophical ideas in much tomb art [p. 251]), but his interpretation in my view is generally sound.

⁸⁰ Cumont (n. 79), 65.

⁸¹ As Nock puts it, '... any ordinary ancient, reading of them or seeing their familiar type, would think rather of their human story, their alternate deaths, their attainment of heaven for merit ...' (n. 79), 151.

also at Drusus' camp at the time of his death. Moreover, the brotherly affection at the heart of the traditional mythology of the Dioscuri was especially relevant for Drusus and Tiberius, since in a magnificent display of fraternal *pietas* Tiberius famously recovered Drusus' body after his death and transported it back to Italy (discussed further below).

Castor and Pollux once inhabited the mortal realm, and in death they spent time both in the underworld of mortals and in the heaven of the gods. We should note, too, their capacity to move comfortably between the mortal and divine realms, as well as from the realm of death to that of life (hence their later function as funerary deities). The mythology of Castor and Pollux underscored the notion of semi-divine further by having them share their immortality, each one taking turns on Olympus. For this reason, they came to be regarded as gods on earth. In light of this it is not surprising that Augustus might want to use the Dioscuri as divine counterparts for members of the imperial family who aspired to a similar status.

Furthermore, by identifying his successors with Castor and Pollux (the DIOS-kouroi), Augustus was also identifying himself with Zeus/Jupiter, the king of the gods. In general, Augustus seems to have avoided identifying himself directly with Jupiter, choosing instead to present himself as Jupiter's agent.⁸² In fact, scholars have remarked on a topographical shift away from the Capitoline, the site of Jupiter's temple, and toward the Palatine and Augustus' new temple of Apollo.⁸³ Augustus would still have been drawn to many of Jupiter's attributes. For instance, Jupiter secured and defended Rome by virtue of his temple on Rome's citadel, now the capitol of an expansive empire. Jupiter received vows as well as the spoils of war borne in triumph. Moreover, he was connected with constitutional government, which Augustus was at pains to restore following the civil wars.⁸⁴

VII. THE DIOSCURI AND FRATERNAL HARMONY IN THE IMPERIAL FAMILY

The identification of the Dioscuri with Augustus' successors, already in evidence in the *transuectio equitum*, occurred again in the tradition surrounding Tiberius and Drusus as well as other members of the imperial family. We have already discussed the story of the appearance of the Dioscuri in Drusus' camp after his death, which is but one connection between Augustus' stepsons and the twin deities. Valerius Maximus makes the connection more explicit in his account of Tiberius' journey to recover Drusus' body after the latter's death on military campaign. Tiberius' exhibition of fraternal devotion and *pietas*, Valerius tells us, was reminiscent of the Dioscuri.⁸⁵ On

⁸² Suetonius relates a dream of Cicero who saw Augustus receiving a whip from Capitoline Jupiter (*Aug.* 94.9; cf. *Plut. Cic.* 44; *Cass. Dio* 45.2); Rea (n. 3), 56–61.

⁸³ P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, 1988), 108; cf. *Suet. Aug.* 91.2; see also J.R. Fears, 'The cult of Jupiter and Roman imperial ideology', *ANRW* 2.17.1, 3–141, at 60–1.

⁸⁴ *Mon. Anc.* 34.1–2; Rea (n. 3), 57; Fears (n. 83), 65.

⁸⁵ *Val. Max.* 5.5.3; the story of Tiberius' recovery and transport of Drusus' body was a famous one; see also *Livy Per.* 142; *Strabo* 7.1.3; *Plin. HN* 7.84; *Sen. Epist.* 11.15.5; *Suet. Tib.* 7.3; *Cass. Dio* 55.2.1. Cf. *Ov. Fast.* 1.705–8 for an oblique reference connecting Tiberius and Drusus with the Dioscuri. The story of Tiberius' recovery of Drusus' body was so important that Tiberius may have commemorated it in the sculptural programme at his grotto in Sperlonga (R.G.M. Nisbet, 'Notes on the text and interpretation of Juvenal', in N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus. Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday*, *BICS Supplement* 51 (London, 1988), 105, n. 29. Tacitus uses the occasion of Germanicus' funeral to set the honours

this occasion, Tiberius and Drusus could play the roles of Castor and Pollux, as the one brother mourned the death of the other, in a manner somewhat reminiscent of the Dioscuri's traditional mythology (discussed above).

Valerius Maximus' story also shows a further development of Augustan ideology, by introducing the notion of fraternal harmony. This was especially important in the first succession, since the early Principate featured brothers within the imperial family who were marked out as possible successors. Castor and Pollux were regarded as a paragon of fraternal harmony, as noted in the story that Valerius Maximus relates, in contra-distinction to another pair of famous mythological brothers, Romulus and Remus, whose relationship ended in fratricide, a symbolic bloodletting that infected the Roman psyche and led to periods of civil war.⁸⁶ The rededication of the Temple of Castor in the name of Tiberius and his brother Drusus drew a close link between Augustus' stepsons and their divine counterparts. Even more telling is the renovation of the Temple of Concordia in the Forum Romanum, which Tiberius undertook following his triumph in 7 B.C. In a manner similar to the Aedes Castoris the Aedes Concordiae was rededicated in Tiberius' name and that of his brother Drusus on 16 January A.D. 10, the anniversary of Octavian's adoption of the title, Augustus.⁸⁷ The coincidence of dates was probably intentional, so that Augustus could underscore the association of this temple, rededicated close to the end of his own life and reign, with transfer of power.

The Temple of Concordia, first founded according to tradition by Camillus in 367 B.C. amid the Struggle of the Orders and later refurbished by L. Opimius following the death of C. Gracchus in 122 B.C., adumbrated the harmony within the city during the most tumultuous times of the Roman Republic. This temple figured in much of the strife of the late Republic, as the site of Cicero's *Third Catilinarian* and where M. Antonius and Cicero traded barbs after Caesar's assassination (Cic. *Phil.* 5.18–20). The new temple came to be known as the Temple of Concordia Augusta (according to the *Fasti Praenestini* [*Inscr. Ital.* 13.2, p. 115]), which effectively redirected the symbolic orientation of the temple from city to imperial family. Concordia, an important symbol of the Republic, thus became subsumed under the ideology of the imperial family. The message was clear: only concord within the imperial family could ensure the peace and prosperity of the Roman world.⁸⁸ Moreover, a coin minted by Tiberius (c. A.D. 35–6) depicting the façade of this temple on its obverse shows a pediment crowned by several figures (*RIC*² 1, p. 98, nos 55, 61 and 67). The central three are apparently female figures, probably meant to represent Concordia, Pax and

Germanicus received against those of his father. In particular, he mentions the journey that Germanicus' 'brother' (probably his adoptive brother, Drusus, Tiberius' son) made to meet Germanicus' remains: Drusus deigned to go only as far as the city gates. Thus, Tacitus can demonstrate how much has changed from Augustus' regime to Tiberius', and in particular imply the end of fraternal harmony (*Ann.* 3.5; cf. A.J. Woodman and R.H. Martin (edd.), *The Annals of Tacitus, Book 3* [Cambridge, 1996], 98–9).

⁸⁶ These issues are discussed in C. Bannon, *The Brothers of Romulus* (Princeton, 1997), 178–81.

⁸⁷ The *Fasti Praenestini* record the temple's *natalis dies* (16 January); *CIL* 1.1, p. 231; *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2, p. 115. See also, *Ov. Fast.* 1.637–39. Cass. Dio 56.25.1 has A.D. 10 for the year of dedication. On this temple in general, see A.M. Ferroni, s.v. 'Concordia, aedes', *LTUR* 1.316–20; for its decorative programme, see B.A. Kellum, 'The city adorned: programmatic display at the *aedes Concordiae Augustae*', in K. Raaflaub and M. Toher (edd.), *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate* (Berkeley, 1990), 276–307.

⁸⁸ This concept was underscored by the statues of Pax, Concordia and Salus that Romans honoured.

Salus. The flanking figures may represent Tiberius and Drusus, the dedicatees of this temple, in the pose of warriors holding spears. It is possible that we are meant to think of their identification with other spear-toting brothers, namely, the Dioscuri.⁸⁹ I would take this one step further and argue that the figures depicted are actually the Dioscuri themselves. They are, after all, frequently depicted holding spears and used as flanking figures in Roman art.⁹⁰ If this interpretation is correct, then the Dioscuri oversaw, along with the other deities depicted, the harmony of the imperial household and ultimately had a hand in protecting the tranquil transition of power through dynastic succession.

The two buildings under discussion both bore the names of Tiberius and Drusus. Even if the flanking figures on the pediment were not the Dioscuri, other scholars have noted a similarity in the architectural decoration of these two buildings, after the Temple of Concordia was refurbished in A.D. 10.⁹¹ These two buildings, then, were closely linked. The rededication of the Temple of Concordia in the names of Tiberius and Drusus combined the notion of fraternal harmony within the imperial family with the more traditional Republican concept of political or civic harmony.

The rededications of both temples, of course, took place after Drusus' death, when harmony between the two brothers was no longer necessary, or possible. Their relationship, nonetheless, may have served as a model for other relationships within the imperial household, most notably that of Germanicus and Tiberius' son Drusus, who were among the hierarchy of heirs before and after Augustus' death. In A.D. 9, following victories in Illyria, Tiberius, who was by this time heir designate, was awarded a triumph, which he postponed because of Quinctilius Varus' disastrous defeat in Germany. Augustus, nonetheless, went out to meet Tiberius as he returned to the city, accompanied him to the Saepta Julia and there, flanked by the two consuls on a tribunal constructed for the purpose, *princeps* and heir greeted the people. Germanicus made the announcement of victory and was awarded the lesser distinction of triumphal honours (*ornamenta triumphalia*). Tiberius' son Drusus, although he had played no part in the campaign, was given the privilege of attending meetings of the Senate and of voting before the ex-praetors. On this occasion, Augustus conferred honours on members of his household in order of their proximity to the throne – first Tiberius, then Germanicus, and finally Drusus. Augustus used the public conferral and announcement of this triumph as an opportunity to demonstrate the stability of the Principate, recently imperilled by the disaster in the Teutoberg Forest, by honouring three men in a grand ceremony of succession,⁹² which represents Augustus' best attempts to lay the groundwork for a harmonious and tranquil transfer of power. The date of the rededication of the Temple of Concordia, as I already noted, marked the anniversary of Augustus' assumption of power; it also corresponded closely with this ceremony of succession and may have been another attempt at reassuring the populace that harmony among the heirs in fact existed at this crucial moment in the history of the Principate.

⁸⁹ Ferroni (n. 87), 1.318. Mattingly (*BMCRE* 1.116, p. 137) and Sutherland (*RIC*² 1, p. 96) identify the central figures as the Capitoline triad, Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. Mattingly identifies the flanking figures as Ceres and Diana while Sutherland declines to attempt a specific identification.

⁹⁰ E.g. the famous painting of Apelles in the Forum Augustum depicting Alexander between the Dioscuri (Plin. *HN* 35.93).

⁹¹ Kellum (n. 87), 276–307, at 277; cf. Nielsen (n. 12), 1.245.

⁹² Suet. *Tib.* 17.2; Cass. Dio 56.17; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.121.2–3.

The mythical and divine models for these earthly relationships, as noted above, were the Dioscuri, whose temple after A.D. 6 bore the names of Tiberius and Drusus. These deities were bequeathed as divine models to two of the participants in Augustus' grand ceremony of succession, Germanicus and the younger Drusus.⁹³ Tacitus also remarks on their harmonious relationship, in direct contrast to the rivalry between those closest to them, including their wives.⁹⁴ The Dioscuri continued to be associated with the fraternal harmony of imperial heirs and hence with the tranquil transition of power under dynastic succession.

VIII. CONCLUSION

A critical element in understanding the importance of the memories evoked by the Aedes Castoris to imperial ideology was the dynastic succession. When Tiberius rededicated the temple in his name and that of his brother Drusus, he claimed for the imperial family a monument that had had an important political function during the late Republic and a foundation myth that linked it to one of the great military victories in the history of the early Republic. Whether the temple's late Republican political function continued into the Principate we cannot know for certain. The temple's foundation myth, on the other hand, was frequently retold and adapted throughout Roman history and evolved into a national myth. Furthermore, the traditional mythology of the Dioscuri as demigods, who were elevated to divine statue as a result of grand achievements and who shared their immortality, made them suitable divine counterparts to Augustus' successors, first C. and L. Caesar, who led cavalry divisions in the *transuectio equitum* as *principes iuuentutis*, and later Tiberius and Drusus. The temple's foundation myth was further adapted to the circumstances surrounding Drusus' death. Tiberius' journey to retrieve Drusus' body evinced a fraternal devotion that made their identification with the Dioscuri even more explicit. The Dioscuri's later function as protective deities who oversaw the preservation of the Concordia Augusta made them especially concerned with the succession, since it was at the very moment of succession that the harmony of the imperial family was most at issue. The appearance at Caesar's funeral demonstrated to an imperial audience that the Dioscuri had such concerns even at the very beginning of the dynasty, when the uncertainty that gripped the city following Caesar's death ultimately yielded to the emergence of the new *princeps*. Thus, a national myth, comprised of memories associated with the Aedes Castoris, was transformed into Augustan ideology. The fact of this transformation shows again how Augustus and his successors exploited traditional elements of the Republic – in this case the memories evoked by a Republican monument – to help establish and consolidate their new form of government.

Mount Holyoke College

GEOFFREY S. SUMI
gsumi@mtholyoke.edu

⁹³ K. Scott, 'Drusus, nicknamed "Castor"', *CPh* 25 (1930), 155–61 and 'The Dioscuri and the imperial cult', *CPh* 25 (1930), 379–80.

⁹⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.43.6: *sed fratres egregie concordēs et proximorum certaminibus inconvulsi*. Contrast the relationship of Germanicus and the younger Drusus with the relationship of two other brothers, Nero and Drusus Caesar, the twin sons of Germanicus, whose rivalry only exacerbated the tension within the imperial household (*Ann.* 4.59.3–60).