

ON THE TEMPLE OF DIVUS AUGUSTUS

DUNCAN FISHWICK

CAESAREUM IOVIS AD SPECIEM TEMPLUM

ASIDE FROM A SCATTER OF INCONSISTENT NOTICES in the literary sources, remarkably little information has come down on the Temple of Divus Augustus at Rome.¹ Among the few details recorded are the decree of the senate providing for its construction (Cass. Dio 56.46.3; Tac. *Ann.* 1.10.8) and the fact that, though built and financed by Tiberius and Livia, it appears not to have been completed until the reign of Gaius, who had dedicated it by late August A.D. 37 (Cass. Dio 59.7.1; Tac. *Ann.* 6.45.2; Suet. *Tib.* 47; *Gaius* 21); until then a gold *eikon* of Divus Augustus lay on a *lectisternium* in the Temple of Mars Ultor (Cass. Dio 56.46.4). The actual site of the temple, on the level ground between the Capitoline and the Palatine just behind the Basilica Julia, has never been excavated, so that no tangible remains are yet in sight, on the basis of which one might judge the size and physical proportions of the building.² As can be inferred from an epigraphical reference to the Temple of Divus Augustus and Diva Augusta,³ the cult statue of Divus Augustus will have been joined by that of Livia

I am much indebted for constructive criticism to P. Gros and the outside assessors, who also contributed several key references.

The following works will be cited in abbreviated form or by author's name alone: A. A. Barrett, *Caligula: The Corruption of Power* (New Haven and London 1989); J. R. Fears, "Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology," *ANRW* II.17.1 (1981) 3–141; D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (Leiden 1987, *EPRO* 108) 1.1–2; (1991) 2.1; H. Hänlein-Schäfer, *Veneratio Augusti: Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* (Rome 1985, *Archaeologica* 39); G. Henzen (ed.), *Acta Fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt* (Berlin 1874 [1967]) = *AFA*; S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (London 1929); M. Torelli, *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs* (Ann Arbor 1982, *Jerome Lectures* 14); S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971); P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor 1988, *Jerome Lectures* 16).

¹For a full discussion of the sources see Platner and Ashby 62–65; Hänlein-Schäfer 114–128; Barrett 210. See further K. Ziegler, *RE* 18.3 (1949) cols. 66–69.

²Hänlein-Schäfer 125 f., with n. 46. For the *sacrarium* on the Palatine and the thesis that this was replaced by a second temple of Divus Augustus built by Livia see below, 245–255. As argued in detail there, the discussion assumes that the various sources refer to one and the same temple, that constructed in the depression between the Palatine Hill and the Capitolium.

³*CIL* 6.4222 = *ILS* 4995: *dis manibus | ... Aug. lib. Bathyllus aeditus templi Divi Aug. | [e]t Divae Augustae quod est in Palatium (sic), | immunis et honoratus*. It seems

following her consecration in A.D. 42, a point confirmed independently by Dio (60.5.2). Otherwise we are told that the temple was struck by lightning in A.D. 68—presuming, that is, that the building is identical with the *aedes Caesarum* mentioned by Suetonius (*Galba* 1)⁴—and Pliny reports that it was destroyed by fire, perhaps then in A.D. 64 (*HN* 12.42.94). Whether it was damaged during the great fire of Rome which consumed the adjoining library in A.D. 80 is unknown (Suet. *Dom.* 20).⁵ About the only other significant detail we have is that a painting of Hyacinthus by Nicias of Athens and another of Danae were placed in the temple by Tiberius (Pliny *HN* 35.40.131);⁶ so construction must have been very well advanced by the end of his reign.

With other categories of testimony so exiguous, discussion has of necessity centred upon the coins. The restitution of the temple by Antoninus Pius is securely attested by silver and bronze issues of his reign showing an octostyle temple of the Corinthian order with the legend *AED / TEMPLVM DIVI AVG REST.*⁷ There can be no question that this is a contemporary portrayal of the temple of Divus Augustus. More controversial is a disputed earlier representation. The well-known type of Caligula sacrificing depicts the emperor vested and togate before a hexastyle temple with composite(?) capitals; l. and r. in the field are the letters *DIVO AVG* with *SC* below.⁸ If this was in fact the temple of Divus Augustus, then it must have been reconstructed with eight columns instead of six either by Antoninus Pius

best to take in *Palatium* as a mistake, either an oversight by the stone-cutter or bad Latin on the part of the *ordinator*. For parallels see *ILS* 3.2, pp. 865 f., further *CIL* 6.8707; *CIL* 14.2886 *et passim*.

⁴The term *aedes Caesarum* will in that case imply that the *simulacra* of those who later achieved deification were added in turn to those of Augustus and Livia, though only the latter appear to be represented on the "restitution" coins of Antoninus Pius (below; see further 244). The reason is plainly that Diva Augusta received an *agalma* in the temple as a result of which she became *synnaos* with Divus Augustus (Cass. Dio 60.5.2). Those subsequently admitted evidently received an individual *aedicula* within the temple: cf. *CIL* 6.10234, lines 8, 10, 23: A.D. 153). See further Hänlein-Schäfer 127, with references, cf. 117 f.

⁵Hänlein-Schäfer (127) would associate this fire with the lightning of A.D. 68. She notes that a *restitutio* of the temple by Domitian is not recorded in the sources.

⁶The practice of placing works of art in temples was well established of course. For the rich display in the new temple of Apollo built by Augustus on the Palatine see recently Zanker 89.

⁷H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* (London 1923–50; hereafter *BMCRE*) 4.350, nos. 2051 f.; A. S. Robertson, *Roman Imperial Coins in the Hunter Coin Cabinet*, University of Glasgow (Oxford 1962) 2.239, nos. 350, 352; Hänlein-Schäfer *ibid.*, n. 57, with further references.

⁸*BMCRE* 1.cxlvi, 153, nos. 41–43; Robertson (above, n. 7) 1.83, no. 17; 86, no. 32; Barrett (210), taking the columns to be Ionic.

or, more likely perhaps, by Domitian when he lavishly restored libraries destroyed by the fire of A.D. 80 (Suet. *Dom.* 20).⁹ The identification of the temple on the coin of Gaius is by no means certain, however, and it has been argued, notably by O. L. Richmond and D. F. Brown, that the monument shown is rather the temple of Apollo Palatinus.¹⁰ The majority view, in contrast, holds that the temple is plainly that of Divus Augustus, as indicated by the legend.¹¹

⁹So P. V. Hill, "Buildings and Monuments of Rome on Flavian Coins," *NumAntCl* 8 (1979) 205–223, at 207. The work undertaken by Antoninus Pius will in that case have been simply a renovation.

¹⁰O. L. Richmond, "The Temples of Apollo and Divus Augustus on Coins" in E. C. Quiggin (ed.), *Essays and Studies Presented to William Ridgeway* (Cambridge 1913) 198–212; D. F. Brown, *Temples of Rome as Coin Types* (New York 1940, NNM 90) 10, n. 15.

¹¹Platner-Ashby 63; Hänlein-Schäfer 75 f., 126 with references, following Gagé's view that the scene in the pediment represents the apotheosis of Augustus. A complication arises from M. Torelli's interpretation of the octostyle temple shown on a well-known relief from the facade of the Villa Medici; in line with the standard view he attributes this and other Medici-Della Valle reliefs to the Ara Pietatis: Torelli 70 ff. Whereas most scholars have taken the fragment to represent the temple of Mars Ultor, Torelli (77 f.) would identify the pediment as that of the Temple of Divus Augustus, which in that case must already have been octostyle at the time of the relief, itself a product of Claudian date.

Objections to Torelli's view look overwhelming. (a) The octostyle temple accords generally with what we know of the Temple of Mars Ultor. (b) The temple shown on the type of Gaius sacrificing, which Torelli (73) takes to be that of Divus Augustus, is shown as hexastyle; this would fit Prudentius' information that it was modelled on the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (below, 236). (c) The central figure, which Torelli identifies as Divus Augustus, does not appear to wear the *corona radiata*, which is usually represented as "spiked"; for examples see Weinstock pl. 28 (facing p. 380) nos. 13–16. So far as one can tell, the head-gear looks more like a helmet, as suggested by Hänlein-Schäfer (122), noting that the beard apparently worn by the figure is also appropriate to Mars, not Augustus. (d) The fact that Mars is semi-nude can be paralleled on coins since the early principate (*ibid.* with references), but Torelli has a point in that the "heroic" pose of the central figure with mantle draped about the hips does correspond to representations of Divus Augustus: for example, on a Claudian relief at Ravenna: Weinstock 129, with nn. 9, 13, and pl. 8, 1–2; see further I. Scott Ryberg, *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art* (Rome 1955, MAAR 22) 69 f., with n. 25 and references. If the type was in fact first created for a cult statue of Divus Iulius (Zanker 249), perhaps one should take the representation of Mars to incorporate a deliberate allusion to the deified Caesar, though whether his cult statue in this pose did in fact stand in the temple of Mars Ultor beside those of Mars and Venus remains very uncertain (see further D. Fishwick, "The Statue of Julius Caesar in the Pantheon," *Latomus* 51 [1992] 329–336, at 335 f., Appendix). This "heroic" pose was later adopted for deceased emperors—notably Augustus, whose gold image (of unknown form) also lay within the temple of Mars Ultor pending completion of his own temple (above, 232). Weinstock, *loc. cit.*, takes the Ravenna relief to show Augustus as Mars. On the difficulties of interpreting the tiny figures on the Medici-Della Valle fragment see R. R. R. Smith, *JRS* 73 (1983) 225–228, at 227.

In light of the inconclusive debate that has dragged on the better part of a century, it seems worthwhile to draw attention to a further piece of evidence that has escaped notice in all previous discussion. Towards the middle of the poem that he composed in opposition to the Oration of Symmachus, Prudentius launches into a tirade against the cult of Divus Augustus, which he portrays as the epitome of pagan religion. His outburst has preserved an illuminating vignette of cult practice under the later Roman Empire¹² but, more importantly for present purposes, it also includes a key reference to the senate's decision to erect a temple to the deified Augustus:

*Hunc morem veterum docili iam aetate secuta
posteritas mense atque adytis et flamine et aris
Augustum coluit, vitulo placavit et agno,
strata ad pulvinar iacuit, responsa poposcit.
testantur tituli, produnt consulta senatus
Caesareum Iovis ad speciem statuientia templum.*

245–250¹³

Testantur tituli must allude primarily to the shrines, priesthoods, and altars which Prudentius has just mentioned (lines 246 f.); abundant evidence for these is scattered *passim* in Italy and in the provinces of the Greek East and Latin West. *Consulta senatus* (plural for singular to fit the metre) clearly refers to the decree of 17th September, A.D. 14, by which the senate, the proper authority in these matters,¹⁴ provided for construction of the temple of Divus Augustus, which was in turn to provide a model for similar temples elsewhere, notably at Tarraco (below, 245). The primary interest of the couplet in the present context, however, is Prudentius' information on the physical aspect of the *Caesareum*¹⁵—clearly the temple of Divus

¹²For analysis see D. Fishwick, "Prudentius and the Cult of Divus Augustus," *Historia* 39 (1990) 475–486.

¹³"Following this custom of olden days, posterity in an age when it had become easy to learn the lesson did reverence to Augustus with a month named in his honour, and with shrine and priest and altar, and propitiated him with calf and lamb; it prostrated itself before his sacred couch and asked for oracles. Inscriptions bear witness to it, decrees of the senate setting up a temple of Caesar in the fashion of Jupiter reveal it."

¹⁴On the responsibility taken by the senate for constructing temples, particularly those of deified emperors, cf. the (rejected) proposal of Cerealis Anicius that a temple to Divus Nero should be begun already in A.D. 65 (Tac. *Ann.* 15.74) and the senatorial decree that part of the house where Augustus had been born should be consecrated a chapel (Suet. *Aug.* 5). See in general Fishwick, 1.2, 212 f.; R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton 1984) 387, 389 f.

¹⁵Hänlein-Schäfer 10 f. For the use of the term *Kaisareion* for a temple of Julius Caesar see D. Fishwick, "The Temple of Caesar at Alexandria," *AJA* 9 (1984 [1990]) 131–134. The existence of a *Caesareum*, situated at the principal cult place of the Arvals by the fifth mile-stone of the Via Campana, is attested by the Arval record for A.D. 81, 218, 224 (AFA CIX, CCII, CCXIV). See further I. Paladino, *Fratres Arvales* (Rome

Augustus—which he describes as *Iovis ad speciem*. At least eight major shrines of Jupiter existed in Rome by the death of Augustus but a reference to the temple of Jupiter without qualification must surely mean the great edifice on the Capitol that had been restored by Augustus himself after being damaged by lightning (*Res gestae* 20; see below, 240). Under both the Republic and the Empire this was the focal point of the religion of the Roman State.¹⁶ What Prudentius—but no other source—gives, then, is the invaluable information that the form and dimensions of the temple of Divus Augustus were patterned on those of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.

What inferences can legitimately be drawn from Prudentius' brief allusion? It need hardly be observed that the division of the Capitoline temple into three *cellae*, one each for the Etruscan triad of Jupiter (centre), Juno (left) and Minerva (right), would have been entirely inappropriate to the Temple of Divus Augustus. That technicality aside, however, it seems fair to assume that the two buildings will have been similar in outward appearance and proportions, if not actual dimensions. As first constructed by the Tarquinii, then rebuilt after the fire of 83 B.C. and subsequently dedicated by Q. Lutatius Catulus, the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus stood on a high *podium*, 65 x 60 metres square, and was of hexastyle design with three successive rows of columns across the front and a single row on each side.¹⁷ A representation of the monument is preserved on the types of the moneyer Petillius Capitolinus (43 B.C.)¹⁸ Almost square in proportions, the building was oriented south-south-east and incorporated a pediment decorated with figures and a gabled roof loaded with statues and acroteria—notably a terracotta (later bronze?) group of Jupiter in a *quadriga* on the apex. Among other details that we have, the entablature was constructed of wood, the roof covered with plates of gilded bronze, and the *cella* measured a hundred feet square. But difficulties arose when the new temple was fitted out with the taller marble columns that Sulla had transported back from the Olympieion at Athens. According to Aulus Gellius, Catulus wished to lower the level of the *area Capitolina*; ... *ut pluribus gradibus in aedem conscenderetur*

1988, *Problemi e ricerche di storia antica* 11) 105 f., 108, 111, 120. Quite clearly, then, Prudentius is employing a term that was current in his own age.

¹⁶Fears 9 ff.; P. M. Martin, "Architecture et politique: le Temple de Jupiter Capitolinus," in *Présence de l'architecture et de l'urbanisme romains: Actes du Colloque des 12, 13 décembre 1981, Paris Académie d'Architecture; Hommage à Paul Dufournet* (Paris 1983, *Caesarodunum* 18bis) 9–29.

¹⁷Platner-Ashby 297–302; Martin (above, n. 16) 10 ff. See now P. Gros, "L'urbanizzazione dopo la guerra sociale" in *Storia di Roma 2: L'impero mediterraneo* (Turin 1990) 831–855, at 844 f. with references.

¹⁸M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge 1974) 1.497 f. with pl. lviii, 6–7; 2.592, n. 3.

suggestusque pro fastigii magnitudine altior fieret (2.10.2).¹⁹ More steps to the temple and a higher *podium* would compensate aesthetically for the fact that the pediment was now at a higher elevation.²⁰ In practice, however, the greater height of the columns in relation to the pediment evidently caused the temple to look squat. In his discussion of *araeostyle* temples Vitruvius has a remark which is directly relevant to the point at issue:

Et ipsarum aedium species sunt varicae, barycephalae, humiles, latae ornanturque signis fictilibus aut aereis inauratis earum fastigia tuscanico more, uti est ad Circum Maximum Cereris et Herculis Pompeiani, item Capitoli (3.3.5).²¹

P. Gros has pointed out that this unfavourable judgement—notably on the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus—is to be explained by the unusually wide separation between the columns (*varicae*) and the generally “squashed” (*humiles*) appearance of these particular temples in relation to their height.²²

If the passage of Prudentius can be taken as reasonably precise—after all he had spent several years in Rome just before 402–3, time enough to become familiar with its monuments²³—one would expect the temple of Divus Augustus to have reproduced the peculiar features Vitruvius mentions in connection with the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. A glance at the coin type of Gaius sacrificing confirms that the temple on the reverse

¹⁹“... in order that the ascent to the temple might have more steps and that the podium might be higher, to correspond with the dimensions of the pediment.” The project had to be abandoned for religious reasons. There were a number of underground *favissae*—chambers and cisterns—beneath the area, where were stored old statues that had fallen from the temple, also other religious objects from among the consecrated offerings. The presence of these *favissae* stopped Catulus from carrying out his plan to lower the *area* (Gell. 2.10.3).

²⁰I take *pro fastigii magnitudine* to refer essentially to the height of the gable from the ground: a higher *podium* to balance a *fastigium* that was now at a higher elevation because of the taller columns. There seems no reason to suppose that the *fastigium* itself had a higher pitch, though this is the way the passage is taken in Zanker 21: “... and the pediment ... was too steep and weighed heavily on the very tall, slender columns (Gell. 2.10).” That would produce a temple which looked tall and pointed whereas Vitruvius (below, n. 21) says the very opposite—that it looked squat and broad.

²¹“And the designs of the buildings themselves are straddling, top-heavy, low, broad. The pediments are ornamented with statues of terra-cotta or gilt bronze in the Etruscan fashion, as is the Temple of Ceres at the Circus Maximus, Pompey’s Temple of Hercules, and the Capitoline Temple.”

²²P. Gros, *Aurea templa. Recherches sur l’architecture religieuse de Rome à l’époque d’Auguste* (Rome 1976, BEFAR 231) 69.

²³H. J. Westra, “Prudentius (348–ca 410)” in W. T. H. Jackson and G. Stade (eds.), *European Writers. 1–2: The Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (New York 1983) 1.1–22, especially 9 ff. with bibliography.

does seem by and large to incorporate the required characteristics. Behind the emperor we see in the background the front view of a hexastyle temple; whether there were three rows of columns across the front is not deducible, nor can one tell if a row of columns ran along the sides. A festoon hanging across the entire facade is a decoration perhaps connected with the sacrificial occasion commemorated, though a similar feature is observable in the hanging decorations of the Capitoline temple, as represented on the coin of Petillius (above, 236). Particularly notable is the width between the columns in close correspondence with Vitruvius' description (*varicae*)—apart from allowing a better view of the cult idol or idols, this gave room for processions two abreast, for example (Vitr. 3.3.3)—also the relatively low pitch of the roof, which makes the building look squat. As for the decoration of the pediment,²⁴ at the centre a figure can be seen holding a sceptre and *patera* and flanked by other standing or seated figures facing inwards—a more complex and elaborate scene than the picture we have of the entablature of the Capitoline temple, which shows a single uncertain figure (probably Jupiter).²⁵ On the *fastigium* appear *tuscanico more* various figures with, most striking of all, a *quadriga* on the apex of the pediment; to the right and left stand Victories who hold wreaths above their heads, while outside of these can be seen to the left a figure of Mars, to the right Aeneas, Anchises and Ascanius. There can be no question, then, that this particular structure reproduces features that are distinctive of the Capitoline temple of Jupiter as shown on the coin of Petillius and described in the canons of Vitruvius. The conclusion is confirmed by comparison with the restored temple on the coin of Antoninus Pius except that by now the building had been modified to comprise eight columns instead of six.²⁶ The force of the verse of Prudentius is therefore to corroborate and strengthen the standard identification of the temple on the *sestertius* of Gaius as that of Divus Augustus, a conclusion reached by most observers on the strength of the legend *DIVO AVG*.

The new information that has been elicited from Prudentius' allusion to the Caesareum raises an important question. Why should the senate have hit upon the Capitoline temple of Jupiter as an appropriate model for the temple of Divus Augustus? Fortunately, the answer to this has been brought out by recent studies on the role of Jupiter Capitolinus in Republican and Imperial ideology.²⁷ As these have covered most of the ground in detail, it

²⁴For the possible interpretation of the figures in the pediment and on the *fastigium* as a reference to the apotheosis of Augustus see Hänlein-Schäfer 75 f., 126.

²⁵Crawford (above, n. 18) 497.

²⁶Above, n. 7. The coin (reproduced in Hänlein-Schäfer Taf. Ic) depicts a temple that among other characteristics repeats the familiar "squashed" look.

²⁷For the origins of Roman Jupiter and the evolution of his cult under the Republic see notably Fears 9 ff.; further Martin (above, n. 16) 16 ff.

will be sufficient for present purposes simply to sketch in briefly the main outlines, adding a few new points of particular significance for the present enquiry.

Vowed and built by the Tarquinii but not dedicated until the first year of the Republic, the temple on the Capitol had by the second half of the fourth century B.C. become the accepted symbol of the *civitas Romana* and increasing Roman grandeur.²⁸ Under the Republic Jupiter Optimus Maximus was represented on earth by the magistrate of the people, which stood collectively under the patronage of the god who had chosen Rome to rule the world. In the revolutionary period, in consequence, the preservation of the commonwealth was inextricably tied to the cult of Jupiter at the Capitoline temple, the fulcrum of national consciousness. But Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar turned to other deities, Venus in particular, to whose favour they attributed their own particular rise to greatness. Victory itself became personalized and attached to the individual victorious general.²⁹ The ultimate step would have been to follow the model of Hellenistic monarchies by linking Jupiter directly with a king, and already under Caesar there are signs that herald the establishment of an earthly monarch who would take over Jupiter's function of tending the welfare of the Roman state.³⁰ Yet Caesar seems to have sensed that this was an idea whose time had not yet come: when Anthony offered him the diadem at the Lupercalia of 44, he refused it and placed it instead in the Capitoline temple with the words "Jupiter alone is king of the Romans."³¹

At the outset of his reign, everything suggests that Augustus was at first inclined to promote the link with Jupiter. Just after Actium the coins assimilate the *princeps* to the god who had vouchsafed the overwhelming victory which made Augustus master of world.³² A privileged link with Jupiter may well be implied by the exceptional offerings made by Augustus at the Capitoline temple (Suet. *Aug.* 30.2), conceivably also by his triple triumph of 29 B.C., when for three days he will have appeared in the guise of Jupiter.³³ Significantly, the Capitoline appears first in the list of temples at which Augustus deposited the *dona ex manibiis* (*Res gestae* 21.2), and

²⁸On the role of the Capitoline temple in the genesis of the title *imperator*, itself a step on the road to monarchy, see Martin (above, n. 16) 21 f. with bibliography.

²⁹Fears 53, cf. 44; *id.*, "The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems," *ANRW* II.17.2 (1981) 736-826, at 778 ff.

³⁰For the transportation of Caesar's *andrias* in the company of the gods (45 B.C.) and the grant of a *tensa* to bear his symbols in the *pompa Circensis* (44 B.C.) see Fishwick 1.1, 58 ff. with references.; Fears 54 f.

³¹Cass. Dio 44.11.3; Cic. *Phil.* 2.85. For the view that Caesar was pushed over the threshold of monarchy by sheer force of circumstances see Fishwick 1.1, 70 f.

³²For documentation see Fears 57, nn. 258-260.

³³Suet. *Aug.* 22; Livy *Epit.* 133; Cass. Dio 51.21.5-9. For a summary of the view that the *triumphator* represented Jupiter see Weinstock 67 f. with abundant references.

even in 17 B.C. it was a sacrifice to Jupiter Optimus Maximus that began the *ludi saeculares*, the most important religious event of the early empire. It should be noted, too, that coins of 27 B.C., minted in Asia Minor, show the eagle of Jupiter holding in its claws the *corona civica*, the oak wreath fashioned from the tree sacred to Jupiter.³⁴ The temples finished by Augustus (*Res gestae* 19) included three to Jupiter, and when the Capitol temple burned down, probably in 9 B.C., Augustus was at pains to restore it. Nevertheless, the most important political function reserved for Jupiter under the new order was to receive *vota* on behalf of an emperor who in Augustan ideology was represented as the saviour of the commonwealth, exactly as Cicero had invoked Jupiter as the saviour of the Republic in the *Catilinarians* and *Philippics*.³⁵ The simple replacement of Jupiter by Augustus would have been a step that hinted at theocratic monarchy and, as such, in conflict with the whole basis of the Augustan principate. So it may have been in an attempt to forestall opposition to his station as *de facto* monarch, that Augustus deliberately downplayed Jupiter in official propaganda. As Fears has argued, following Latte in particular,³⁶ Augustus' official acts and such official testimony as the coinage make it clear that after 27 B.C. Jupiter was assigned a role of "honored insignificance" in the panoply of state gods. In the tradition of charismatic generals, of whom he was the last, Augustus rather associated his own meteoric rise with personal deities—Apollo Actiacus and Mars Ultor—to whom were credited the *felicitas* of his regime.³⁷ Thus the Sibylline books, which were filled with prophecies of kingship among other lore, were transferred to the custody of Apollo Actiacus; the *carmen saeculare*, recited on both the Capitol and the Palatine, invoked Apollo and Diana; and the Secular Games culminated in a ceremony at the temple of Apollo. In the same way the temple of Mars Ultor rivaled or replaced the Capitol as the focal point of momentous occasions of state (Suet. *Aug.* 29): critical meetings of the senate on the declaration of war or to debate claims for triumphs,

³⁴A. Alföldi, *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus* (Bonn 1973, *Antiquitas* 3.14) 13, with Taf. II, 1–4; Zanker 93, noting that this image, created of course in Rome, first appears on a cameo of the same period.

³⁵Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1.5.11, 1.13.33, 3.9.22, 3.12.29; *Phil.* 13.7, 14.8.; Fears 55. State policy aside, Augustus also had a personal link with Jupiter in that he was the adopted son of Julius Caesar, who was himself the mythical descendant of Aeneas-Iuppiter Indigites: Weinstock 10, 19, 69, 85. If the enigmatic Iuppiter Iulius can be so interpreted, Jupiter was also the god who protected Caesar personally. See further Fishwick 1.1, 51 f., 62–67. It is also relevant that some people first tried to have Caesar cremated in the Capitoline temple (Appian *BCiv.* 2.148; Suet. *Iul.* 84.3; Cass. Dio 44.50.2).

³⁶Fears 59 f.; K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*² (Munich 1967 [1976]) 305.

³⁷Fishwick 1.1, 87 f. For a correction of Fears's interpretation (59, n. 275) of the small domed shrine of Mars Ultor shown on *BMCRE* 1.65 ff., nos. 366–75 see C. J. Simpson, "The Date of Dedication of the Temple of Mars Ultor," *JRS* 67 (1977) 91–94.

the departures of generals to their new provinces, the deposit of triumphal emblems.³⁸ That Augustus felt uneasy about the novel bent of official policy may well be reflected in his reported excuse (related in his autobiography?) when Jupiter Capitolinus complained in a dream that the new temple of Jupiter Tonans on the Capitol was taking away worshippers from his cult (Suet. *Aug.* 91.2). All he wanted, Augustus claimed, was to provide Capitoline Jupiter with a door-keeper; hence the bells with which he equipped the temple on awakening.³⁹

Misgivings about the relegation of Jupiter may also explain why the "unofficial policy" of Augustus took precisely the opposite tack. As the emperor could clearly have objected had he wanted, it seems legitimate to take the charismatic imagery of the Augustan poets, the frequency with which they harp on the emperor's "divinity" or associate him with the gods in various ways, as deliberate "poetic license" that dared to utter what official pronouncements could hardly express openly.⁴⁰ The link between Augustus and Jupiter in particular is a theme modelled on the Homeric notion that it was Zeus who bestowed kingship and nurtured kings,⁴¹ an idea subsequently taken over by Hellenistic monarchs. Horace plays frequently on the topic: Jupiter rules all things but Augustus is his chosen vice-regent; just as thunder betokens the heavenly rule of Jupiter, so Augustus will be counted a *praesens divus* after conquering Britain and Persia (*Odes* 3.5.1-4 ff.). For Manilius, Augustus is *rector Olympi* and *deus ipse* descended from heaven (1.9.916); while in the same vein Ovid compares Augustus with Jupiter in various ways and is even prepared to state that Augustus is Jupiter.⁴² The theme of Augustus as the representative or deputy of Jupiter on earth is also mirrored in other evidence. On the Vienna gem Jupiter is linked with Capricorn, the sign of his conception that

³⁸M. Bonnefond, "Transferts de fonctions et mutation idéologique: le Capitole et le forum d'Auguste" in *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire (I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.-III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)* (Paris and Rome 1987, CEFR 98) 251-278.

³⁹The temple was dedicated to Jupiter for having saved Augustus from lightning in the Cantabrian war (Suet. *Aug.* 29.3; Cass. Dio 54.4.2-4). On the bells see Latte (above, n. 36) 304 f.

⁴⁰Fishwick 1.1, 91, with n. 53. For discussion of the poets see further F. Taeger, *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes* 2 (Stuttgart 1960) 166 ff. The emphasis of iconography, in contrast, is strongly in line with official policy in stressing the Republican virtues and "Augustan" image of the *princeps* in the period following the "restoration" of 28-27 B.C.; cf. Zanker 89-100. The glaring exception to this, of course, is the portrayal of the emperor in the guise of Jupiter, for which see below, n. 44.

⁴¹Fears 68 f. On kingship in Augustan Rome see now F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic* (Cambridge 1989) 1-84.

⁴²Cf. Tr. 5.2.45 f. Taeger (above, n. 40) 170 ff. assembles numerous passages. See further L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, Conn. 1931 [1981]) 235; Weinstock 304 f.; Hänlein-Schäfer 85, with nn. 26-29.

foreordained Augustus' dominion of the world,⁴³ and the Gemma Augustea likewise represents Augustus as terrestrial Jupiter, enthroned beside Roma, and repeats the sign of Capricorn.⁴⁴ Similarly inscriptions, particularly in the Eastern provinces, identify the emperor with Zeus or Jupiter in one idiom after another⁴⁵ and the same association plainly lies behind the decision of eastern potentates to dedicate a completed Olympieion at Athens to the Genius Augusti.⁴⁶ Then there are the dreams, the *omina imperii*, that revealed Augustus endowed with the royal or triumphal attributes of Jupiter Capitolinus or imaginatively associated him with the god in various ways; even Q. Catulus and M. Cicero, the enemies of Caesar, are made the vehicles of these obvious inventions of Augustan propaganda (Plut. *Cic.* 44; Suet. *Aug.* 94.8–9; Cass. Dio 45.2.3–4). As for the people, they had no inhibitions about the link between Augustus and Jupiter and it was at the Capitoline temple that victims were offered in thanksgiving for Augustus' continued survival (Suet. *Aug.* 59), a procedure followed later on the supposed recovery of his adopted grandson Germanicus (Suet. *Gaius* 6).⁴⁷

The final development came after Augustus' death, when Divus Augustus Pater is assimilated to Jupiter on coins of Tiberius and on Spanish issues; these now associate him with a winged thunderbolt or the eagle standing on a globe, or show him seated in the pose of Jupiter.⁴⁸ Jupiter himself is omitted from the types of Tiberius or Gaius, who seek legitimacy for the dynasty rather by invoking the charisma of the deified Augustus-Jupiter.

⁴³On the symbolism of the sign of Capricorn and its link with the Solarium Augusti and the Ara Pacis on the Campus Martius see E. Buchner, "Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis," *RhM* 83 (1976) 319–365, at 346–48; further G. Alföldy, *Der Obelisk auf dem Petersplatz in Rom* (Heidelberg 1990, SBHeid. Phil.-hist. Klasse 2) 55–67.

⁴⁴Fears 57 f.; Fishwick 1.1, 91, 128 f. with references. For analysis of the imagery of the Gemma Augustea see now Zanker 230–233 (with fig. 182) 318, noting that Augustus seems to have had no objection to his iconographic equation with Jupiter even in his lifetime, provided it was not done under his nose in Rome. In this respect there is a clear correspondence with the "unofficial policy" reflected in the rhetorical imagery of the court poets. For the link between poetic and iconographic themes and the restricted latitude allowed the visual artist see Zanker 107 f.

⁴⁵For the evidence see M. M. Ward, "The Association of Augustus with Jupiter," *SMSR* 9 (1933) 204–224; Weinstock 304 f.; Hänlein-Schäfer 85, with nn. 26–29.

⁴⁶Suet. *Aug.* 60. The project was never realized. See now Barrett 143, n. 19.

⁴⁷Suet. *Calig.* 6. See Martin (above, n. 16) 26 f., noting that after hounding to death Agrippina, the widow of Germanicus and grand-daughter of Augustus, Tiberius celebrated his own "clemency" (for not having had her strangled and her body thrown on the Gemoniae) by a gold offering to Jupiter Capitolinus (Suet. *Tib.* 53.2).

⁴⁸For documentation see Fears 65 f., n. 313; Fishwick 1.1, 151. Note that later emperors, Tiberius and Claudius in particular, were quite prepared to be portrayed in the guise of Jupiter during their lifetimes, an iconographic representation that was by no means restricted to deified emperors; cf. Zanker 233, 318, citing the pose of Tiberius on the Grand Camée de France and the sword sheath of "Tiberius" (fig. 183). See earlier Weinstock 112.

Indeed Gaius appears to have given the entire theme a new twist by setting *himself* up on equal terms with Jupiter. Suetonius reports that he took the title Optimus Maximus Caesar, was addressed as Jupiter Latiaris at the temple of Castor and Pollux, and even challenged Jupiter in wrestling parlance to bring their mutual contest to an end: "Ἡ μ' ἀνείηρ' ἢ ἐγὼ σέ, he exclaimed, "Throw me [literally 'lift me up'] or I'll throw you" (*Gaius* 22.4; cf. Cass. Dio 59.28.6). He also set up a special temple to his own godhead, we are told, with a gold cult statue (*simulacrum*) of himself, which was dressed every day in clothes such as he wore himself.⁴⁹ It is in direct connection with this policy that one must view his incorporation of the Templum Divi Augusti into the imperial Palatium by apparently using the building as a footing for the bridge he threw from the Palatine hill to the Capitolium (*Gaius* 22.4; below, 252–253). Invited to dwell with Jupiter, so he claimed, he now brought within his private property the Capitolium itself and even laid the foundations for a new house in *area Capitolina* (*ibid.*).

In this perspective, why the temple of Divus Augustus should have been modelled on that of Jupiter Capitolinus emerges with reasonable clarity. Essentially it is a function of the charismatic ideology that linked the emperor on earth with Jupiter on Olympus, the king of men with the king of the gods, and made the Capitoline temple the central place of this special relationship. Beyond external features of the temple, therefore, it seems obligatory in light of the above to draw the further inference that the cult statue of the Caesareum, as it was later called, will have portrayed Divus Augustus in the guise of Jupiter.⁵⁰ We have no direct evidence on the precise

⁴⁹For a thorough review of the evidence see Barrett 145–153 with bibliography. The temple could hardly have been to his "*numen*" in the technical sense since no temples exist to the imperial *numen*, which is never depicted iconographically or pictorially; see Fishwick 2.1, 383–385. One possibility is that the temple was actually to his *genius*, a term interchangeable with *numen*, and that the whole episode has been distorted; so Barrett, 151 f. But would a moderate cult of this kind have been lodged on the Capitol or have fitted Gaius' purpose? Alternatively the meaning could be that the temple was in fact to the emperor *ut deo*, an interpretation that appears to be supported by the daily clothing of the cult statue in Gaius' likeness; for the clothing of cult statues of the gods see Fishwick 2.1, 562 f. Dio reports that the temple was voted (therefore "constituted") by the senate and that Caligula built a sort of lodge (*katalusis*) on the Capitol (59.28.2–4), which would certainly fit his attempt to match Jupiter. Then, disdaining to play second fiddle to Jupiter, he hurried to build a second temple on the Palatine. In practice, however, it would have been impossible to construct such an edifice in the short time before his assassination (below, n. 68); so this must have been an unrealized or, at best, uncompleted project. As Barrett points out, there are absolutely no traces of the cult outside the texts of Suetonius and Dio, not even a mention in such hostile sources as Seneca or Philo.

⁵⁰The thesis is of considerable antiquity; cf. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina* (Paris 1844–1864) 60, col. 141, n. 250: *Chamillardus aliique probabile ratione putant, imaginem Augusti specie Iovis fuisse exhibitans*. For the way in which

form the idol took, the original having left no trace, and though the "restoration" coins of Antoninus Pius clearly show two seated figures between the pillars of the temple—thus confirming what is implicit in the epigraphical evidence (above, 232)—no other details of either image are discernible.⁵¹ A *simulacrum* of Divus Augustus as Jupiter would nevertheless be very likely. In Rome the representation of seated Jupiter was already in general circulation from sometime after 83 B.C., when the statue crafted by Apollonius replaced the archaic cult image of Iuppiter Capitolinus, which had been destroyed by fire. But the portrayal of the monarch as enthroned Jupiter, a type henceforth reserved for the emperor, seems to have been a creation of the early principate.⁵² Representations of this kind all show the emperor enthroned in majestic semi-nudity, his mantle spread across the knees, then carried in different ways to the upper torso. Among other details that vary are the extension of the right or left leg and the attribute of the spear or lance supporting the right or left hand, or simply omitted. In Rome itself only Divus Augustus is so represented⁵³ but the idea already appears in his lifetime in the *Gemma Augustea*, the imagery of which is clearly in accord with unofficial Augustan policy as reflected in the poets (above, 241 f.). With this type may be compared the cult statue in the temple of Roma and Augustus at Caesarea, built by Herod the Great and dedicated before 10 B.C. Josephus reports that the colossal image of Augustus was modelled on Phidias' statue of Zeus at Olympia (*BJ* 1.414), in which case the emperor will have been shown seated with naked upper torso, holding a Victory in his outstretched right hand, with the left supported on a spear. Interestingly, coins of Selinus in Cilicia show Trajan within his temple similarly represented as Zeus enthroned, holding a thunderbolt (globe?) in his right hand, his left resting on a sceptre.⁵⁴

What precise form the cult statue of Divus Augustus will have taken when placed within the *cella* of his completed temple can only be surmised.

imperial images copied existing images of the gods, themselves based on descriptions in Homer and Hesiod, see S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge 1984) 180 f.

⁵¹For the suggestion that the cult image of Livia may appear on a *dupondius* of Claudius celebrating her apotheosis see Hänlein-Schäfer 87, n. 42, citing *BMCRE* 1.195, nos. 224 f.

⁵²H. G. Niemeyer, *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser* (Berlin 1968, *Monumenta artis Romanae* 7) 59–61, 104–108; Hänlein-Schäfer 87, with n. 43; Zanker 21, with fig. 17b; cf. *id.*, "Prinzipat und Herrscherbild," *Gymnasium* 86 (1979) 353–368, at 357.

⁵³For Divus Augustus represented standing in the guise of Jupiter see, for instance, the relief from Ravenna showing members of the Julio-Claudian dynasty: H. von Hesberg, "Archäologische Denkmäler zum römischen Kaiserkult," *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978) 920 f.

⁵⁴G. F. Hill, *British Museum Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lycaonia, Isauria, and Cilicia* (London 1900) 143, nos. 1–2 (Septimius Severus and Severus Alexander).

We have seen that until then a gold *eikon* of the emperor reposed on a golden bed in the temple of Mars Ultor, but the details of this too are withheld by Dio (56.46.4). One other source of possible relevance in the interval is a series of coins that were struck at Tarraco under Tiberius and show on the reverse the projected local temple of Divus Augustus (completed perhaps by the reign of Vespasian).⁵⁵ On some of these the figure on the obverse evidently represents Augustus as Jupiter seated on a throne and holding in his left hand a spear, in his right hand a globe on which stands a small winged Victory; consistent with the radiate head, a clear sign of deification,⁵⁶ the legend reads *DEO AVGVSTO*. However, on the reverse of another issue Augustus seems to sit on a curule chair and holds the *patera* rather than the globe and Victory.⁵⁷ If these figures were intended to depict the future cult statue in the temple, as seems quite possible,⁵⁸ what is of interest for present purposes is that the engraver has copied (with some variation) both of the types outlined above. Indirect though it is, this testimony surely supports the conjecture that the cult statue in the temple at Rome will likewise have shown the emperor as Jupiter, even if the details of his pose remain obscure. To have represented the deified emperor in this fashion within a temple which was itself modelled upon the shrine of Jupiter Capitolinus would be consistent with everything we know of the political ramifications of the cult of Jupiter and would tie in nicely with the information on the temple of Divus Augustus uniquely preserved by Prudentius. It may also explain why Tiberius dragged his feet over finishing a temple, the imagery of which can hardly have been to his liking, though *pietas* required its completion. The opposite is the case with Gaius, for whom the idea of a temple that visibly assimilated the deceased emperor to Jupiter must have been eminently congenial.

A TEMPLE OF DIVUS AUGUSTUS ON THE MONS PALATINUS?

It is important to distinguish the temple of Divus Augustus behind the Basilica Julia from the *sacrarium* created by senatorial decree at some point between Augustus' death and (apparently) the break between Tiberius and

⁵⁵R. Étienne, *Le Culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Paris 1958, BEFAR 191) 417 f., with pl. XII, 8–9; Fishwick 1.1, 151, with references; see pl. XXVII, especially b, c. On the building of the temple see 152, n. 17, 154.

⁵⁶On the *corona radiata* see in general Weinstock 381–384.

⁵⁷Cf. the identical representation on a coin of Caesaraugusta: Étienne (above, n. 55) pl. XIII, 10. The *patera* is restored on the Vatican statue of Claudius as Jupiter standing: Niemeyer (above, n. 52) 61, with Taf. 34, 1; Hesberg (above, n. 53) 934.

⁵⁸For the long-standing suggestion that the figures represent the actual cult statue in the temple see Fishwick 1.1, 151, n. 10, with references. For a similar representation of Divus Augustus on coins at Turiaso see Étienne (above, n. 55) 417, n. 4, with pl. XIII, 8; cf. 10 (Caesaraugusta).

Livia in A.D. 26 (Suet. *Tib.* 51).⁵⁹ This provided for the consecration of part of the house where Augustus had been born *ad Capita Bubula*:

Natus est Augustus . . . regione Palati ad Capita Bubula, ubi nunc sacrarium habet, aliquanto post quam excessit constitutum. Nam ut senatus actis continetur . . . decretum est ut ea pars domus consecraretur (Aug. 5).⁶⁰

Lugli argued *post alios* that this *sacrarium* on the north-east rim of the Palatine was later replaced with a temple financed by Livia.⁶¹ The thesis can point to no secure archaeological traces in support but literary evidence has been sought in Pliny's statement that a *templum Palatii* was constructed for Divus Augustus by his wife Augusta: *radicem eius (cinnami) magni ponderis vidimus in Palatii templo quod fecerat Divo Augusto coniunx Augusta* (HN 12.42.94).⁶² Enlarging on this view, Torelli has recently proposed that it was Claudius who altered the status of the Palatine *sacrarium* to that of a temple of Divus Augustus and Diva Augusta.⁶³ On the basis of a complex analysis of the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* he infers that this innovation in the private, Palatine cult of Augustus took place following the consecration of Livia on 17th January 42, more precisely in 43. The change of status is then reflected in inscriptions of temple personnel, three of which attest a *servus publicus* at the *sacrarium Divi Augusti* (CIL 6.2329 = ILS 4992; CIL 6.2330a,b = ILS 4993, 4993a), whereas a fourth refers to an imperial freedman who is *aeditus templi Divi Augusti et Divae Augustae quod est in Palatium* (CIL 6.4222 = ILS 4995).

Difficulties arise at several steps along this chain of reasoning. Since the literary authorities record variously that Tiberius or Livia and Tiberius financed the temple below the Palatine (Tac. *Ann.* 6.45; Cass. Dio 54.46.3 f.), Pliny's attribution of construction to Livia alone looks very much like a further variant relative to the same temple. The references to two *servi publici* at a *sacrarium* / *sacrarium Divi Augusti* clearly relate to the shrine on the Palatine hill, but the freedman Bathyllus, who is *aeditus* at the temple of Divus Augustus and Diva Augusta, looks rather to have served at the temple in the depression below: nothing tells against the *communis opinio* that

⁵⁹Torelli 73, n. 38; Hänlein-Schäfer 120, noting the distinction between *sacrarium* and *templum*; contra Torelli 86, n. 38.

⁶⁰"Augustus was born . . . at the Ox-Heads in the Palatine region, where he now has a shrine, constituted shortly after his death . . . For as is recorded in the proceedings of the Senate . . . it was decreed that that part of his house should be consecrated." On the "constitution" of temples see above, n. 14.

⁶¹G. Lugli, " 'Aedes Caesarum in Palatio' e 'templum novum divi Augusti'," *BullCom* 69 (1941) 29–58, at 48; *id.*, *Roma Antica, il centro monumentale* (Rome 1946) 185 f.

⁶²"We once saw a very heavy cinnamon-root in the Temple of the Palatium which his wife Augusta had built in honour of Divus Augustus . . ."

⁶³Torelli 73–76; *id.*, "Culto imperiale e spazi urbani in età flavia" in *L'Urbs* . . . (above, n. 38) 563–582, at 570 ff.

Dio's information on the inclusion of Livia refers to this temple (60.5.2). The inscription of Bathyllus evidently belongs to the mid-first century A.D., but on Torelli's view the two *servi publici* must be dated before the *sacrarium* was transformed into a temple in 43. Yet one of these at least may well be later, since his inscription refers to a certain Lachne, who is a deceased freedwoman of Claudia Antonia, the first-born daughter of the emperor Claudius.⁶⁴ It might also be asked whether the supposed conversion of the *sacrarium* into a temple would not have required a further senatorial decree—of which we hear nothing in the sources.

As for the evidence of the Arvals, Torelli states that in 35 the two-day festival of Augustus' birthday, 23rd–24th September, was celebrated on the Capitol (*CIL* 6.2025 = 32342a = *AFA* XXXVI). In fact no date relevant to the *biduum* is preserved in the surviving part of the record, only a reference to Divus Augustus and the sacrifice of an ox to Jupiter. Even if Henzen's conjectural referral of the fragment to Augustus' birthday is correct, we still have no way of knowing to which of the two days the entry refers. A sacrifice on the Capitol to Jupiter would certainly seem appropriate, but one to Divus Augustus elsewhere (at the temple of Mars Ultor?) on one of these days is not impossible. In 38 in contrast it is clear that Divus Augustus received a sacrifice on the first day of his birthday celebration (23rd September) *in templo n]ovo* (*CIL* 6.2028e = *AFA* XLVI).⁶⁵ For the following day only *bo]vem* is preserved—clearly the sacrifice of a *bos mas* to a male deity. Given that in all other texts one of the sacrifices on one of the two days is to Jupiter, a sacrifice to Jupiter must surely be inferred here also. Torelli argues that Henzen unjustifiably places this sacrifice on the Capitolium in his completions and that the rite could equally well have been *in Palatio*—an unlikely supposition when the regular place for the sacrifice of an ox to Jupiter is the Capitol.

Of particular interest are two Claudian fragments. One of these was published in 1968 by Panciera, who dates it to 42–45 and restores the date of 23rd September for the sacrifice in some locality (*in Capitolio* is restored) of an ox to Divus Augustus and a cow to Diva Augusta;⁶⁶ for the following

⁶⁴Hänlein-Schäfer 114, nn. 1, 3.

⁶⁵See now the new fragment of the *AFA* (lines 64–67) confirming sacrifices to Divus Augustus on 23rd September, A.D. 38: *a. d. viiii K. Octobr . . . [. . . in temp]o novo natali Divi Augusti Divo Augusto | [bovem marem immola]vit*: J. Scheid and H. Broise, "Deux nouveaux fragments des actes des frères Arvales de l'année 38 ap. J.-C.," *MEFRA* 92 (1980) 215–248, at 225 f. (= *AEpigr* 1983.95).

⁶⁶S. Panciera, "Due novità epigrafiche romane," *RendLinc* 23 (1968) 315–340, proposing the following text: [*VIII k(alendas) Oct(obres). | Natale Divi Augusti. In Capito]lio immolavit L. Vitellius, | magister, pro collegio fratrum | Arvalium Di]vo Aug(usto) [bovem marem | et Divae Au]g(ustae) vaccam. | [Adfuerunt C.] Caecina La[rgus, Fabius | Persicu]s, Statili[us Corvinus. | In Palati]o L. Vi[tellius, magister, | pro colle]gio fratrum Arvalium | immolavit . . .]. (= *AEpigr* 1969–70.1)*

day only an "o" is preserved—apparently the final letter of the place of sacrifice. The second fragment (*CIL* 6.2035 = 32349 = *AFA LIX*) records for 23rd September the sacrifice on the Capitol of an ox to Jupiter and a cow (therefore to a female deity) *ad aram gentis Iuliae*; for the following day we have the sacrifice in *Palatio* of an ox to Divus Augustus and a cow to Diva Augusta. The entry, which must lie between 42 and 47, was dated by Groag to 44.⁶⁷ Torelli looks to be right in holding that the two fragments belong to consecutive years since they mention the same sacrificant, but he argues that the second, better preserved text, which is certainly later than Livia's consecration on 17th January, 42, is prior to 44—therefore to be dated in 43. He believes that in this year the presence of the *ara gentis Iuliae* on the Capitol has modified the ritual on 23rd September, while the sacrifice in *Palatio* on the following day is an innovation to be explained by the transformation of the Palatine *sacrarium* into an *aedes*⁶⁸ and the addition of the cult of Diva Augusta, "under whose sign appears the *ara gentis Iuliae*" (p. 76). The Panciera fragment he would date a year earlier in 42—before the *ara gentis Iuliae* was inaugurated—and suggests that the sacrifice on the 23rd took place at the *templum novum*, that on the following day in *Capitolio* or, less likely, in *Palatio*. Unfortunately nothing of this is binding. Too little is preserved of the Panciera fragment in particular for it to be serviceable. The restoration of the first day of the *biduum* (23rd September) is possible but not obligatory; some other occasion of the year could equally well be intended. Even if this restitution were correct, as Torelli assumes, the sacrifice to Divus Augustus, here joined by Diva Augusta, could have been recorded as in *templo novo* (as in 38) or in *Palatio* (as in ?43); on either possibility the sacrifice on the second day will surely have been to Jupiter, therefore in *Capitolio* not in *Palatio*. And what is to prevent placing the Panciera fragment immediately *after* rather than before the other text, that is in 44 rather than in 42: which would then give the same sequence of rites in 44 as in 38? Amid so many uncertainties it is unjustified to argue that the fragment Torelli dates to 43 marks a profound change connected with a supposed transformation of the cult at the Palatine *sacrarium*. We simply do not know whether the rites recorded for this year did or did not mark a permanent change or whether the order of ritual for the *biduum* was simply an aberration in that particular year.

In the final analysis the key evidence for inferring the existence of a second temple on top of the Palatine hill reduces to Pliny's allusion to a *templum Palatii* (above, 246) and various epigraphical references to a

⁶⁷Torelli 75, n. 58, citing E. Groag, "Zu den Arvalenakten unter Claudius," *OJh* 10 (1907) 33 ff.

⁶⁸Apart from other difficulties, the supposed conversion of a *sacrarium*—surely a room in Augustus' house (below, n. 89)—into an *aedes*, later called *templum*, must have involved large-scale construction or reconstruction. On the time taken to build temples see Fishwick 1.2, 197.

temple in *Palatio* (see below, 254). Here a general observation is in order. Begun under Tiberius (presumably early) and almost completed by his death, the *templum novum*, as the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* call it, had been some twenty years in building before it was dedicated by Gaius with great pomp and splendid games and entertainment in A.D. 37 (above, 232). Why it was called the “new temple” is not immediately clear. It might be thought that a temple which was “new” implied the existence of an older temple, although Torelli does not make this argument; the supposed conversion of the *sacrarium* on the Palatium he puts in A.D. 43, six years *after* the dedication of the *templum novum*. In practice, however, the possibility of an earlier temple of Divus Augustus is surely excluded by Dio’s statement that a gold *eikon* of Divus Augustus lay on a *lectisternium* at the Temple of Mars Ultor pending completion of the temple (56.46.4). It is inconceivable that Dio would have reported this explicitly if another temple—which would necessarily have had its own cult statue of Divus Augustus—was already in use prior to A.D. 37. Attempts to link a prior temple to all references which omit the term “new” from the designation of the temple of Divus Augustus are consequently futile; no such earlier temple existed. As for why not only the Arvals but also the literary sources and sundry inscriptions term the temple “new,” if one assumes that the banal use “newly built” is hardly credible, there seem to be three possibilities worth serious consideration. The first is that the temple was “new” in comparison with the numerous other temples of Rome; “new”—in this sense “latest”—then relates simply to *templum*. Secondly, “new” might have the sense of “built for the first time”: this was the first occasion on which a temple had been built to Divus Augustus.⁶⁹ What one would surely think the likeliest interpretation in the present case, however, is that the temple is called “*novum*” because Divus Augustus now had a new lodging at his new temple in contrast to his old lodging at the temple of Mars Ultor.⁷⁰ The “*vetus templum*” implied by “*novum templum*” would thus be the great temple in the Forum Augustum with its cult statues of Mars and Venus,⁷¹ not a phantom prior temple of Divus Augustus.

Whatever the precise nuance of “*novum*” may have been, a close relationship with the temple is attested in the records of the Arvals, who now had an official place for the worship of Divus Augustus.⁷² But in 43, on Torelli’s analysis, the Arvals transferred their sacrifices on Augustus’ birthday, the

⁶⁹For *novus* in this sense see G. Di Vita-Evrard, “Gasr Duib: Construit ou reconstruit sous les Philippes?,” in *L’Armée et les affaires militaires* (Paris 1991, IV^e Colloque international d’histoire et d’archéologie de l’Afrique du Nord) 2.427–444, at 434–437.

⁷⁰See the judicious analysis of Hänlein-Schäfer (120 f.).

⁷¹For the view that a cult statue of Divus Iulius is unlikely to have stood in the temple of Mars and Venus see Fishwick (above, n. 11).

⁷²Torelli 74, with n. 51. The Arvals evidently had no cult place of their own in Rome until the Flavian period, when they may have been given the Temple of Concordia

high festival of his cult, to the reconsecrated shrine on the Palatine hill and no rites at all were held at the *templum novum* in the valley below. This would mean that, five years after its dedication, the new temple behind the Basilica Julia was effectively abandoned as the principal place of the cult of Divus Augustus, which instead became the supposed *templum Divi Augusti et Divae Augustae* on the Palatine hill, now "virtually rendered public." For on Torelli's view this innovation was permanent since it is the temple on the Palatine,⁷³ renamed *Divorum*, which appears on the coin of Antoninus Pius (above, 233) and it was here that the Arvals met in 145 (*CIL* 6.32379, line 24), in some year under Antoninus Pius (*CIL* 6.2037, lines 4 f.), and (apparently) again on 27th May, 218 (*CIL* 6.2104, line 6).⁷⁴ Surely this unlikely. In the first place we have no later references (apart from the Panciera fragment?) to the celebration of Augustus' birthday in the preserved *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, but other, lesser, imperial occasions continue to be marked at the *templum novum* down to the death of Nero (Hänlein-Schäfer 115 f.); this category of anniversaries then disappears from the record, probably because of retrenchment under the Flavians (Fishwick 2.1, 485). The continued importance of the temple is also underlined by the fact that official texts—*diplomata militaria* from the time of Domitian (*CIL* 16.36 ff.)⁷⁵—persist in referring to the temple by its original title, *templum Divi Augusti*, despite the admission of Livia and others. Above all the legend on the coin of Antoninus Pius identifies the monument it depicts as *aedes / templum Divi Augusti*,⁷⁶ a name which *never* applied to the supposed temple on the Palatine. By decree of the senate this was a *sacrarium Divi Augusti* until its supposed change of status under Claudius, at which point it would on Torelli's view have become a *templum Divi Augusti et Divae Augustae*.

In view of these considerable difficulties it looks a more reasonable interpretation of the evidence to hold that the new temple between the Palatine and the Capitol continued to be the principal centre of the cult of Divus Augustus and later consecrated members of the *domus divina*.⁷⁷ Henzen argued that *in Palatio* in the better preserved Claudian fragment of the AFA (LIX) must refer to the *novum templum* behind the Basilica Julia since the

as their locale: E. Olshausen, "‘Über die römischen Ackerbrüder’: Geschichte eines Kultes," ANRW II.16.1 (1978) 820–832, at 825 f.

⁷³Torelli (73) takes the *aedes Caesarum* of Suet. *Galba* 1 (above, 233) to be the same building.

⁷⁴Confused in Torelli 73, n. 44. For a reply to his reconstruction of the later history of the temple see Hänlein-Schäfer 123.

⁷⁵Until 13th May, 86 the *diplomata* were set up *in Capitolio post tropaea Germanici in tribunali quae sunt ad aedem Fidei*: Hänlein-Schäfer 117, n. 6, citing M. M. Roxan, *Roman Military Diplomas 1954–1977* (London 1978) 7 ff.

⁷⁶So G. Lugli, *Itinerario di Roma antica* (Rome 1975) 258, with illustr. 197b.

⁷⁷On the *domus divina* see Fishwick 2.1, 423–435.

sacrifice of a bull to Divus Augustus and a cow to Diva Augusta on 24th September corresponds to the rites at the new temple on 23rd September, 38.⁷⁸ In a development of Henzen's view, Hänlein-Schäfer points out (124) that Gaius had in practice joined the Palatine hill to the Capitolium by the bridge which Suetonius reports he built *super templum Divi Augusti* (Gaius 22), and argues that *in Palatio* refers in fact not to the hill but to the region: *Regio X Palatium*. To refer *in Palatio* to the ground below the Palatine hill would in that case be consistent with Pliny's *in Palatii templo*, which we have taken to mean the *novum templum* immediately behind the Basilica Julia. The second part at any rate of this interpretation looks untenable. As noted above (250), the *diplomata militaria* consistently refer by its original name to the *templum Divi Augusti*, which is then located *ad Minervam*—evidently the Temple of Castor in which Minerva was included from the time of Domitian. The *Curiosum*, however, refers to the *templum Castorum et Minervae* as being in *Regio VIII Forum Romanum Magnum* (lines 22 f.).⁷⁹ Furthermore, a slightly corrupt passage of John the Lydian (*De mens.* 4.138), as emended and interpreted by R. E. A. Palmer,⁸⁰ would put the Augusteum (= the new temple of Divus Augustus) in the place called Graecostadium, which is also located in Region VIII by both the *Curiosum* (line 20) and the *Notitia* (line 30).⁸¹ As whatever was Palatine stood in Region X, it follows that *in Palatio* cannot refer to the region in which was constructed the *templum novum Divi Augusti*. An extension of Region X to include the ground on which the new temple of Divus Augustus stood is ruled out by the fact that the ancient sources plainly imply that this was located in Region VIII.

The first part of Hänlein-Schäfer's thesis nevertheless demands careful consideration. Suetonius reports that Gaius extended the imperial property to the Forum, as result of which he converted the Temple of Castor and Pollux into a *vestibulum*: *partem Palatii ad forum usque promovit, atque aede Castoris et Pollucis vestibulo transfigurata . . .* (Gaius 22.2).⁸² Dio adds that he cut the temple in two in such a way that the approach to the palace ran straight between the two cult statues, thus making Castor and Pollux his doorkeepers (59.28.5). Whatever the precise meaning of the

⁷⁸ AFA 51, 55; cf. *AEpigr.* 1983.95. In 38 only Divus Augustus receives a sacrifice, the identity of which is not preserved but must have been a *bos mas*.

⁷⁹ H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum* (Berlin 1871–1907 [1970]) 2.553.

⁸⁰ R. E. A. Palmer, "The *EXCUSATIO MAGISTERI* and the Administration of Rome under Commodus," *Athenaeum* 52 (1974) 268–288, at 287.

⁸¹ Jordan (above, n. 79) 2.553.

⁸² "... he built out a part of the Palace as far as the Forum, and making the temple of Castor and Pollux its vestibule . . ." Hänlein-Schäfer (124, with n. 38) cites this passage in support of her view that Gaius extended the *Regio X Palatium*. But by *Palatium* is surely meant here the imperial property, not the Region.

sources here,⁸³ it seems clear that the *aedes Castorum* gave access to, or was actually absorbed into, the "palace." The expansion of the imperial property—from the Palatine Hill down into the area below its north-west corner in the direction of the Forum—looks confirmed by the discovery of remains beneath the Church of Santa Maria Antiqua. It was here that Domitian constructed, in alignment with the Forum, a palatial complex which was later converted into the Church. "Reconstructed" is probably a more accurate term since below the Domitianic complex have now been uncovered Republican buildings, and above these a later structure which includes an *atrium*, the dimensions of which (26.5 m x 22.3 m) make it the largest known *atrium* in the Roman world. Traces of other features, notably a *tablinum* (gallery), a peristyle and a swimming-pool, seem to confirm the view that this is an extension of the "palace" on the hill above, and a marble tablet referring to the "son of Germanicus" combines with the evidence of pottery and building material to indicate a structure of Caligulan date.⁸⁴

What archaeological exploration has also revealed is that an entrance to the *atrium* on the west side probably gave access to and from the Vicus Tuscus, a circumstance that raises the possibility, still to be confirmed by excavations, that the complex may have been physically linked with the temple of Divus Augustus.⁸⁵ If that is the case, then the *novum templum* would clearly have become part of the Palatium. While this development remains necessarily hypothetical, at least in part, we may have direct literary evidence that the new temple was incorporated into the imperial property in another way. Suetonius tells us that Gaius threw a bridge from the Palatine to the Capitolium *super templum Divi Augusti* (Gaius 22.4), a report which thus locates the temple in the depression between the Capitolium and the Palatine. The meaning of *super templum Divi Augusti* is far from clear but, given the dimensions of the bridge—on Barrett's figures (210) 250 m long and 30 m above the ground at its highest point—Lugli may well be right in supposing that the temple served as a support or pylon.⁸⁶ Whether a bridge of this size could have actually been built is another matter—Lugli categorically states that it was of wood. However, if one can

⁸³T. P. Wiseman, "*Conspicui postes tectaque digna deo*: The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire" in *L'Urbs* (above, n. 38) 393–413, at 407; Barrett 209 f.

⁸⁴H. Hurst, "Nuovi scavi nell' area di Santa Maria Antiqua," in *Archeologia Laziale IX* (Rome 1988; Quaderni del Centro di studio per l'archeologia etrusco-italica 16) 13–17, with fig. 1.

⁸⁵An anonymous assessor makes the interesting suggestion that part of the Vicus Tuscus might have been turned into a *via tecta*.

⁸⁶Lugli (above, n. 61 [1946]) 185, 187.

accept the evidence of Suetonius, our sole authority in the matter, the temple would necessarily have lain within the imperial property since it served to extend the Palatine complex to the Capitol, where Gaius planned a new residence.

The evidence presented, both archaeological and literary, clearly has its limitations, but there begins to be sound reason to hold that under Gaius the "palace" on the Palatine (cf. Cass. Dio 53.16.5) was extended below the hill itself and that the new wing included the *novum templum Divi Augusti*. If that is the case, the reference in *AFA LIX* to the sacrifice on 24th September of an ox to Divus Augustus and a cow to Diva Augusta in *Palatio* could very well refer to the temple of Divus Augustus, now part of the Palatium. Other references to the temple that qualify it as in *Palatio* can be understood in the same way, and Pliny's *Palatii templum* becomes more comprehensible.⁸⁷ What recommends this interpretation in particular is that it is possible to see why the temple should have been incorporated and why in consequence the Arvals ca 43 should refer simply to sacrifices in *Palatio*. In attempting to make himself the rival of Jupiter (above, 243), Gaius extended the imperial complex on the Palatine so that it included not only the temple and shrine of Apollo and Vesta on the hill top but also the temple of Divus Iulius dominating the Forum and the temples of the Dioscuri and Divus Augustus in the valley below. On Suetonius' evidence he was even prepared to incorporate the Capitol, on which stood the temple of Jupiter. As Wiseman has put it, he was thus

⁸⁷Pliny *HN* 12.42.94; *CIL* 6.4222 (1st century), 32379 (A.D. 145), 2087 (reign of Antoninus Pius). A fragmentary text of Caligulan date might appear at first sight to contradict this conclusion since, as edited by A. Pasoli, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (Bologna 1950, Studi e ricerche 7) 13, no. 10, f-h, it appears to record sacrifices both in *templo novo* and in *Palatio* on the same occasion—sometime before the birthday of Agrippina I (25th October), the next entry in the record: ... *Minervae vaccam, [in templo novo] | Divo Augusto bovem [marem, item] | in templo Concordiae [vaccam, in] | Palatio Divo Augusto b[ovem] marem | et a[d] aram Providentiae | vac[cam] immolavit. | [Adfuer]unt Cn. Domitius, Ca[ecina] Largus, | Taurus Statilius Corvinus. | ...*; cf. P. Herz, "Kaiserfeste der Prinzipatszeit," *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978) 1135–1200, at 1162, n. 177. What is important to note here is that in *templo novo* is a restoration at a point in the text where analogy would rather suggest a reference to another deity with appropriate sacrificial victim. See, for example, Pasoli 114, no. 15, lines 7–10: ... in *Capi[to]li[o] Iovi bovem marem, Iun[oni] | vac[cam], Minervae vaccam, Felici[tati] | v[accam], Divo Aug. bovem marem, Di[vae] | Augustae vaccam. (vacat) | ...* This fragment must be roughly contemporary with 10, f-h, since it repeats the names of several members of the Confraternity: C. Caecina Largus, Paullus Fabius Persicus, Taurus Statilius Corvinus; cf. the Panciera fragment: above, n. 66. The more likely restoration of *Felicitati vaccam* or, perhaps, *Saluti vaccam* (cf. Pasoli, 15, no. 12, line 3) after *Minervae vaccam* in no. 10, f, line 1 would remove the apparent inconsistency with the suggested sense of in *Palatio*.

reaching out from the *caput imperii* to the *caput rerum*.⁸⁸ That sacrifices at the temple of Divus Augustus, where the deified emperor will surely have been represented as Jupiter, should now be recorded as made *in Palatio*, that is, as performed within the imperial property, is clearly in direct line with this policy. In appropriating the temple of Divus Augustus, Gaius had taken a major step towards achieving equality with Jupiter. Sacrifices on the Capitol (*in Capitolio*) to mark Augustus' *natalis* were now matched by sacrifices within the imperial complex (*in Palatio*), which is thus put on level terms with the Capitolium.

On the whole, then, the case for a second temple on the Mons Palatinus looks weak. By far the stronger view is that the shrine at the house of Augustus on the Palatine continued to be a *sacrarium*, as indeed Suetonius, writing in the early second century A.D., explicitly states: *ubi nunc sacrarium habet* (*Aug.* 5).⁸⁹ There was one temple of Divus Augustus, that completed and dedicated by Gaius in the depression between the Capitolium and the Palatine Hill and subsequently incorporated within the extended Palatine complex. It was here that Livia, followed by later *divi* and *divae*, was subsequently admitted. The temple of Divus Augustus thus became in time an *aedes Caesarum* and a *templum divorum*, as the sources document, and it is to this single temple that relate the various allusions to a *templum Palatii*, *templum/aedes Augusti/Divi Augusti*, *templum novum* (*Divi Augusti*), *aedes Caesarum/Divorum*, *in Palatio in Divorum/aede Divorum*. It should be emphasized in conclusion, however, that even if the view of Lugli-Torelli were correct, it would impinge only marginally on the argument developed above. The temple on the Antonine coin might in that case conceivably be referable to a supposed temple on the Palatine hill (though the legend tells emphatically against it), but the coin of Gaius, struck in 37–38, can only show the temple dedicated in 37. As for the Prudentius passage (above, 235), this clearly relates to a *temple* of Augustus established by senatorial decree—therefore that “constituted” in A.D. 14 and located below the Palatine hill. It must be to this monument, then, that Prudentius’ invaluable information applies, namely that it was constructed *Iovis ad speciem*. What the passer-by saw in the depression between the Palatine hill and the Capitolium was thus a copy or resemblance of the great temple of Jupiter perched on top of the Capitolium, a parallel that must

⁸⁸ Wiseman (above, n. 83) 407–409.

⁸⁹ It is difficult to see how Suetonius could have written the account at *Aug.* 5, if the shrine at Augustus’ house had in fact been converted into a temple more than a half century early. As seems clear from “... *decretum est ut ea pars domus consecraretur*,” what was consecrated a *sacrarium* was one or more rooms within the house. For helpful commentary see E. S. Shuckburgh’s edition of *C. Suetoni Tranquilli, Divus Augustus* (Cambridge 1896) 10, with references.

have strikingly brought home to him the relationship of Divus Augustus to Jupiter. The visual impact of this image can be compared with the power of other images to project the imperial message, an effect that Zanker has brought sharply into focus.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON, ALBERTA, T6G 2E1