Classical Quarterly 61.1 205–229 (2011) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838810000510

TOPOGRAPHY AND IDEOLOGY: CAESAR'S MONUMENT AND THE AEDES DIVI IVLII IN AUGUSTAN ROME

I. INTRODUCTION

When Tiberius, in A.D. 14, eulogized his predecessor and adopted father from the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii, he did so with the east end of the Forum Romanum as his backdrop, completely remade under Augustus as a dynastic complex of monuments celebrating the imperial family: the Aedes Diui Iulii itself, a memorial of the founding member, the Arch of Augustus, and the Porticus Gai et Luci, named after Augustus' grandsons. Moreover, Tiberius was standing on the *rostra* that contained a niche accommodating the monument that marked the place of Caesar's cremation, not only incorporating this sacred space into the larger dynastic complex but even preserving and embracing it, as if it were the vital centre, a topographical *omphalos*, from which these other monuments emanated. This dynastic complex emerged from Augustus' larger transformation of the topography of Rome, as the new *princeps* refurbished old buildings and constructed new ones.[1] It is not surprising that in this transformation Augustus devoted so much attention to the symbolic centre of the city – the Forum Romanum – completing and dedicating projects begun by Caesar, such as the Chalcidicum and the Curia Iulia, and adding new monuments, such as the Aedes Diui Iulii. This complex also reflects the ideology of the *princeps*, which was based on maintaining a delicate balance between continuity and innovation – a connection to the Republican past and an acknowledgment of a grand imperial future.[2]

In the Augustan Principate, then, the Aedes Diui Iulii was a dynastic monument, exalting the imperial family by commemorating the divinity of its founder. Other scholars have observed these basic points.[3] It is the purpose of this paper to broaden the discussion of Caesar's monument and the temple that marked its location by tracing the complex history of this site, with a particular focus on the

[1] Augustus' famous boast that he left Rome a city of marble having found it a city of brick was an acknowledgment of this fact. Suet. *Aug*. 28.3: *urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatam et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset*; cf. the long list in Augustus' *Res Gestae* of monuments built or refurbished (*Mon. Anc*. 19–21).

[2] On the capacity of Roman monuments to preserve social memory, see G.S. Sumi, 'Monuments and memory: the Aedes Castoris in the formation of Augustan ideology', *CQ* 59 (2009), 167–86, at 168–69, with bibliography cited in n. 4 on p. 168.

[3] P. Zanker, *Forum Romanum: die Neugestaltung durch Augustus* (Tübingen, 1972); P. Gros, *Aurea Templa. Recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste* (Rome, 1976), 84–91. Cf. L. Haselberger, Urbem Adornare. *Die Stadt Rom und ihre Gestaltumwandlung unter Augustus/Rome's Urban Metamorphosis under Augustus*. Eng. tr. by A. Thein. *JRA Supplementary Series no. 64* (Portsmouth, RI, 2007), 70–6.

role of Caesar's monument at pivotal points in Augustus' career. Most notably, unlike its immediate neighbours at the east end of the Forum Romanum – the Arch of Augustus or the Porticus Gai et Luci – the Aedes Diui Iulii was vowed and decreed amid the unrest of the late Republic. Moreover, the ideology that it communicated, as I will argue, was shaped by the circumstances of its founding and the significance of its location, which the crowd at Caesar's funeral first determined when it chose the location for Caesar's cremation near the Temple of Castor at the east end of the Forum Romanum. The popular ideology contained in Caesar's monument informed the construction of the temple and ultimately the ideology of the Principate.[4]

II. TOPOGRAPHY AND IDEOLOGY

Before we can begin our discussion of Caesar's monument, it is necessary to explain the use of the term 'ideology' in this paper. Anachronism is always a danger when applying such a modern term to an ancient context that had no precise equivalent. This modern term, however, most accurately captures the phenomenon that underpins the thesis of this paper. Ideology is both a cultural system of beliefs, values, ideas and symbols as well as the means through which this system is communicated. An essential element of the communication of ideology is the process of 'materialization', through which ideology is given physical and concrete forms. Ideology can be materialized through the construction of a monument, which then becomes symbolic of shared cultural beliefs and political values.[5] It is through this lens that we will analyse Caesar's monument, the Aedes Diui Iulii, and the topography of the Forum Romanum, as physical and concrete manifestations of first a Caesarian and later an Augustan ideology.

Additionally, the period of history that forms the focus of this paper – the late Republic through the Triumviral period and culminating in the Augustan Principate – was one of transition, marked by political instability and social unrest leading to the formation of a new form of government. Such a period was especially conducive, as we have already noted, to the formation of a new ideology.[6] But as was the case with so much of the Augustan Principate, this ideology had to obtain legitimacy by forging a link with the Republican past and hence was

[4] This paper touches upon the controversial topic of the memory of Caesar in the Augustan Principate. R. Syme argued that the infrequent references to Caesar in Augustan literature reveal a conscious attempt on the part of the *princeps* to dissociate his regime from the memory of Caesar the dictator and promote the memory of Caesar the god. Syme's view is expressed in its essentials in *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 1.432–3; *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 317–18; and *Roman Papers* (Oxford, 1979), 1.214. P. White, with whom I am in closer agreement, as will emerge from the discussion that follows, modified this view by demonstrating that references to Caesar in Augustan literature are more frequent than Syme allows and generally more positive ('Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome', *Phoenix* 42 [1988], 334–56). Our arguments part company in his conclusion where White asserts that Augustus promoted the cult of Caesar in order to prepare the Roman populace for his own deification and that the various references to Caesar in the Augustan poets reflect this objective (356).

[5] On the 'materialization' of ideology, see E. DeMarrais, L.J. Castillo and T. Earle, 'Ideology, materialization, and power strategies', *Current Anthropology* 37 (1996), 15–31.

[6] J.A. Lobur, Consensus, Concordia, *and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology* (London, 2008), 2.

inherently conservative.[7] One way that Augustus was able to forge this link was through the preservation of Caesar's monument. Moreover, the ideology that this monument represented was not imposed 'top down' but rather emerged from a discourse between the ruling power and its subjects. Indeed, Caesar's monument was erected by the people, taken down by the consul P. Cornelius Dolabella, re-erected by Caesar's veterans, and ultimately preserved permanently by Octavian and then Augustus as part of the centrepiece of a dynastic complex of monuments in the Forum Romanum. The preservation of Caesar's monument as an element of Augustan ideology promoted the belief in Caesar's divinity first established by those who erected the monument after his funeral; in this sense, preservation of the monument provided reassurance that the new *princeps* would not abandon his adoptive father, but more importantly, the new ideology appeared not to be imposed by Augustus on his subjects but rather originated from them; it was not external but internal: a voice from within.[8]

III. CAESAR'S FUNERAL AND 'CAESARIAN' IDEOLOGY

Caesar's funeral was a turning point in the politics of the year 44 B.C. and hence fertile ground for the formation and expression of a 'Caesarian' ideology that cleared the way for the erection of Caesar's monument.[9] After Caesar's assassination the senate, at a meeting at the Temple of Tellus on 17 March 44 B.C., decreed the rare honour of a public funeral (*funus publicum*), demonstrating its approval of Caesar's dictatorship, even after it had refused to condemn the conspirators' actions at this same meeting. Antony's *laudatio*, which followed the reading by a herald of all the honours decreed to Caesar, was the clearest expression of this ideology. Despite points of disagreement our sources do concur that an enumeration of Caesar's extraordinary honours, including the oath to hold his person sacred and inviolable, lay at the heart of Antony's speech.[10] This ideology had already taken root during Caesar's dictatorship, when questions of Caesar's power and divinity arose from the conferral of his extraordinary honours after the victory at Pharsalus.[11]

[7] F. Millar, 'The first revolution: imperator Caesar, 36–28 BC', in F. Millar et al., *La révolution romaine après Syme: bilans et perspectives: sept exposés suivis de discussions* (Vandoeuvres–Genève, 2000), 1–30, at 3–4.

[8] G. Jowett and V. O'Donnel, *Propaganda and Persuasion*[3] (Thousand Oaks, CA, 1999), 33–4.

[9] Lobur (n. 6) identifies the 'chaos' of the late Republic as 'a perfect seedbed for the development of ideology' (2), citing C. Geertz, 'Ideology as a cultural system', in D.E. Apter (ed.), *Ideology and Discontent* (New York, 1964), 47–76.

[10] Cicero claims in his Second *Philippic* (*Phil.* 2.91) that Antony's *laudatio* provoked the crowd to violence (cf. J. Ramsey, *Cicero: Philippics I–II* [Cambridge, 2003], 293). In a similar vein, Dio invents a long and elaborate speech for Antony (44.36–49), including at the end a summary of the honours decreed to Caesar by the senate (44.48). Suetonius, in contrast, claims that Antony provided only a few comments to the recitation of the *senatus consultum* which granted to Caesar all divine and human honours and the oath by which all were bound to protect his personal well-being (*Iul*. 84.2). Appian generally concurs with Suetonius' version, but he has Antony himself read a list of Caesar's honours with emphasis on the point that Caesar's person was sacred and inviolable (App. *B Civ.* 2.144.601). Cf. G. Kennedy, 'Antony's speech at Caesar's funeral', *QJS* 54 (1968), 99–106.

[11] Cass. Dio 44.4–7.3 and Suet. *Iul*. 76. These honours were not all conferred at once. For a discussion, see D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (Leiden, 1987), 1.1.56–72. Subsequently, Caesar also enjoyed the unprecedented distinction of having his portrait appear

Such a portrayal of Caesar's status meant that the conspirators' deed violated religious as well as civil law. Antony's *laudatio* further exalted Caesar's political position and divine status and brought it to the forefront of his funeral celebration.

The display of Caesar's body at his funeral further blurred the line between mortal and divine. A replica of the Temple of Venus Genetrix containing his body was placed on the new Caesarian Rostra (Suet. *Iul*. 84.1). Members of the Julian *gens* had long advertised a connection with Venus, the matriarch of their line, and consequently with the Aeneas legend, a lineage that Caesar himself was quick to advertise.[12] Furthermore, our sources relate the story that while the dictator was supervising this temple's construction, he neglected to rise at the approach of a contingent of senators bringing news of additional honours.[13] This story survives as an example of Caesar's arrogance and provides justification for his murder. The monumental backdrop for the story – the Temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum Iulium – gave concrete form to his family's connection to Venus and the many extraordinary honours decreed by the senate. In Caesar's funeral, then, the replica of the temple that contained his corpse acknowledged his family lineage and similarly hinted at Caesar's own divinity. The Julian *gens*, Venus Genetrix, and the Aeneas legend later, of course, became important components of Augustus' ideology.[14]

Thus far, our discussion of the formation of a Caesarian ideology suggests that it was imposed 'top down', from the decrees of the senate conferring extraordinary honours on Caesar to Antony enumerating these honours in his *laudatio*. The crowd at Caesar's funeral, however, in its treatment of Caesar's body after Antony's *laudatio*, also played a role in forming the ideology that arose around the figure of the dead dictator. The crowd's action demonstrates how a Caesarian ideology arose from a complex dialectic between the ruling authorities and the Roman people.

In a Roman funeral the body was customarily taken to its place of cremation following the *laudatio*. Indeed, in Caesar's case a pyre stood ready in the Campus Martius next to the tomb of Julia (Suet. *Iul*. 84.1). After Antony's *laudatio*, however, a group of magistrates and ex-magistrates moved the body from the Rostra to the Forum proper (Suet. *Iul*. 84.3) and placed it in front of the Regia (App. *B Civ.* 2.148.616) (a point to which we shall return later).[15] One of Caesar's extraordinary honours was to have his tomb (*taphos*) located within the sacred boundary of the city (Cass. Dio 44.7.1). Other distinguished Romans in the legendary past had enjoyed such an honour, most famously P. Valerius Poplicola, whose cremated

on coins in his own lifetime. The earliest portrait of Caesar on a coin is M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* (Cambridge, 1974), no. 480/2 (cf. his comments on 1.493 and D. Sear, *The History and Coinage of the Roman Imperators, 49–27 BC* [London, 1998], 70).

[12] In 129 B.C. Sex. Julius Caesar issued coins advertising the lineage of the Julian *gens* starting from Venus (Crawford [n. 11], no. 258/1; cf. 320/1). Caesar himself publicly made the same claim in a funeral speech for his aunt (Suet. *Iul*. 6.1). On Caesar and the Aeneas legend, see A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford, 2001), 15–23.

[13] Suet. *Iul*. 78.1; Cass. Dio 44.8.2–4; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 60.4–8 and App. *B Civ*. 2.107.445.

[14] Other features of Caesar's funeral underscored his mortality. A wax image of the deceased showing all his wounds was rotated on a mechanical device in full view of the spectators (App. *B Civ*. 2.147.612). Furthermore, after the *laudatio*, Antony waved Caesar's bloodied cloak on the end of a spear, riling the crowd and, according to our sources, sending it out on its destructive path.

[15] Livy apparently stated that the body was being carried to the Campus Martius when it was cremated in the Forum (*ante rostra* – 'in front of the Rostra' [*Per*. 116]; see further below).

remains were buried near the Velia.[16] In historical times, a crowd at Clodius' funeral carried his body from the atrium of his home and burned it in the senate house as a symbolic act of defiance against the senatorial aristocracy.[17] Clodius' tomb was never situated within the Pomerium but the crowd at his funeral did choose the senate house as a last resting place for his body. This last event perhaps served as a model for the crowd's treatment of Caesar's body at his funeral. Although rare, these other attested instances in Roman history of burial or cremation within the Pomerium all occurred at the behest of the Roman people and signalled the popularity of the honorand.[18] Dio's assertion that Caesar was granted the honour of a tomb within the Pomerium might be an *ex post facto* explanation for the cremation of Caesar's body in the Forum and the subsequent erection of a monument to mark the spot. Moreover, when one considers the preparations for his burial in the Campus Martius, the crowd must have cremated Caesar's body in the Forum on the spur of the moment, perhaps at the instigation of Caesar's most ardent supporters.

Furthermore, the movement of the crowd after Caesar's funeral as well as the removal of his corpse and its eventual place of cremation might have been influenced by the complex symbolism of the topography of the Forum Romanum. A modern visitor to this site sees a much more unified space than did the ancient visitor in the late Republic. The remains that we see today are the result of the reconfiguration of the Forum initiated by Caesar in 52 B.C. and completed by Augustus in the early part of his Principate, along with much later additions.[19] Since Rome did not have separate public spaces for *plebs* and aristocracy, as did other towns in Italy,[20] certain sectors of the Forum Romanum were devoted to different orders of society. In the Ciceronian period the north-west sector, near the Curia/Comitium complex and old Rostra, was associated with the aristocracy, while the east end of the Forum, near the Aedes Castoris, increasingly the location of *contiones* and *comitia* in this period, came to be associated with the *plebs*.[21] The effect was heightened perhaps following Sulla's legislation, which excluded the tribunes of the *plebs* from the old Rostra (Cic. *Clu*. 110). Moreover, it has been argued, the construction of the Tabularium by Q. Lutatius Catulus (*cos*. 78 B.C.), a political ally of Sulla, was a symbol of the optimate victory after the Social War and provided an optimate backdrop to the west end of the Forum.[22] It is possible that one of Caesar's objectives in moving the Rostra to the west end of the Forum

[16] Postumius Tubertus and C. Fabricius are also mentioned; Cic. *Leg*. 2.58. On Valerius Poplicola, see also Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 5.48.3; Plut. *Popl*. 23.5; cf. Livy 2.16.7.

[17] Asc. 33 (Clark); see also G.S. Sumi, 'Power and ritual: the crowd at Clodius' funeral', *Historia* 46 (1997), 80–102.

[18] G.S. Sumi, *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2005), 109–10.

[19] For the Forum Romanum in its various building phases, see the articles in *LTUR* (s.v. 'Forum Romanum',) 2.313–43. For the Forum under Augustus, see also L. Haselberger, *Mapping Augustan Rome*. *JRA Supplementary Series no. 50* (Portsmouth, RI, 2002), 129–30.

[20] e.g. at Capua; see N. Purcell, s.v. 'Forum Romanum (The Republican Period)', *LTUR* 2.326.

[21] 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 220, citing Plaut. *Curc*. 475: *in foro infumo boni homines atque dites ambulant* …). DeWitt identifies *forum infumum* as the area near the Rostra, Aedes Saturni, Curia, Aedes Concordiae and the foot of the Capitolium. The east end of the Forum, DeWitt calls *ad Castoris*, i.e. near the Aedes Castoris.

[22] Zanker (n. 3), 7; T.P. Wiseman analyses the optimate-*popularis* dichotomy in ideological terms: *Remembering the Roman People* (Oxford, 2009), 5–32.

(the Rostra Augusti)[23] was to reverse the effect of the Sullan legislation, at least in so far as it moved the Rostra out from under the shadow of the Curia.[24]

I mentioned above that Suetonius describes the movement of Caesar's corpse from the Rostra into the Forum (*in forum*). From the archaeological evidence, namely, the remains of the Aedes Diui Iulii which was erected on the spot of Caesar's cremation, we can locate the place of his cremation, or what was believed to have been the place of his cremation, fairly precisely at the east end of the Forum – in front of the later Aedes Diui Iulii and the Aedes Castoris. Moreover, Appian states that Caesar's body was cremated near the Regia, which squares with the archaeological evidence. Livy, whose account is transmitted to us only through a later epitomator, states that Caesar was cremated 'in front of the Rostra' (*ante rostra*) (Livy *Per*. 116). Livy's statement, if we assume the Rostra Augusti is meant, contradicts our other evidence. Livy, however, might not be referring to the Rostra Augusti but rather to the *rostra* Aedis Castoris or, as some scholars believe, a second *rostra* immediately across the Forum from the Rostra Augusti (one which the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii ultimately replaced). It is possible that the mysterious Tribunal Aurelium is meant, which might have been a speaker's platform that combined with the Gradus Aurelii to form a gathering place for the urban *plebs*.[25] A second possibility is that Caesar's reconfiguration of the Forum included a second speaker's platform at the opposite end of the Forum from the recently moved Rostra Augusti.[26] The passage in Livy's *Periochae* remains a puzzle, but our source tradition, and the archaeological evidence, makes it clear that Caesar's body was moved from the Rostra Augusti on the Forum's west end, where Antony delivered his *laudatio*, to the area near the Regia and Aedes Castoris at the east end, where it was finally cremated.

The movement of Caesar's body from one end of the Forum to the other was purposeful – the crowd presumably could have cremated his body on the Rostra if it had so chosen – and potentially highly symbolic. Once Antony had finished his *laudatio*, we can imagine the crowd exercising its powers of persuasion over the magistrates in charge of the funeral and convincing them to move Caesar's body from the Rostra to the east (plebeian) end of the Forum and, in so doing, taking the first step in wresting control of the ritual from the public officials in charge. If, as our evidence suggests, burial or cremation within the Pomerium was an honour conferred by the people, then it was appropriate that Caesar's cremation took place at the plebeian end of the Forum.

Appian's account offers a different perspective. He points out (as noted above) that the body was placed near the Regia. The Regia was the headquarters of the Pontifex Maximus, an office Caesar himself held at his death, behind which stood his official residence, the Domus Publica. It is possible that Caesar's body was

[23] To avoid confusion I will refer throughout this paper to the Rostra at the west end of the Forum Romanum as the Rostra Augusti, the *rostra* attached to the Aedes Diui Iulii as the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii or the Julian *rostra*, and the *rostra* attached to the Temple of Castor as the *rostra* Aedis Castoris.

[24] Sumi (n. 18), 50–1. In other ways, Caesar also tried to undo the vestigial remains of the Sullan regime, such as restoring full political rights to the sons of those proscribed under Sulla (Z. Yavetz, *Julius Caesar and his Public Image* [Ithaca, NY, 1983], 62–3, with sources cited).

[25] K. Korhonen, s.v. 'Tribunal Aurelium, Gradus Aurelii', *LTUR* 5.86–7; L. Richardson Jr., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore, 1992), 181–2, 400–1.

[26] For a discussion of the evidence and previous scholarship on the subject, see R. Ulrich, *The Roman Orator and the Sacred Stage: The Roman Templum Rostratum* (Brussels, 1994), 174–7.

kept in the Domus Publica from the time of his assassination until his funeral.[27] Cremation of his body near the Regia, then, also raised the issue of Caesar's religious position at the time of his death. But Appian does not mention the Regia by name; he rather refers to it as the palace of the ancient kings of Rome, thus making an explicit connection between the place of Caesar's cremation and ancient Roman kingship. The crowd's choice of this location was perhaps a way of posthumously elevating Caesar to regal status, which the other orders of Roman society refused to do while he was still alive. We should bear in mind in this context that it was a crowd of the urban *plebs* that greeted Caesar as king upon his return to Rome in January 44 B.C. and was responsible, our sources say, for the diadems appearing on his statues.[28] Appian's account, demonstrating that even in his day a connection could still be made between the Regia and Roman kingship, might preserve an authentic tradition surrounding Caesar's cremation.

My analysis of the crowd's efforts to find a suitable location for the cremation of Caesar's corpse following Antony's *laudatio* raises the question of whether a crowd can act on the spur of the moment, as I have described it, and still with sufficient deliberation to find such a location that was also highly symbolic. My analysis is based in part on a theoretical framework of crowd behaviour which argues that crowds cannot exist without a direction or goal and that they often target objects of symbolic importance.[29] Indeed, the crowd at Clodius' funeral chose the *curia* as the location for cremating his body as a gesture of defiance against the senatorial aristocracy.[30] Dio's account of Caesar's funeral portrays a crowd not only spurred to anger by Antony's *laudatio* but also deliberating over possible locations for the cremation of Caesar's body (44.50). Moreover, each of these possible locations held symbolic importance: if the crowd, for instance, had burned Caesar's body in Pompey's theatre, it would have destroyed the room where Caesar had been murdered; if in the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter, it would have consigned Caesar's body to the gods, thus perhaps confirming his divine status.[31] Even the later attack on the unfortunate tribune Helvius Cinna was a symbolic act, since the crowd mistook him for his namesake, Cornelius Cinna, who had publicly insulted Caesar's memory by removing the insignia of his praetorship on the grounds that it was the gift of a tyrant (Cass. Dio 44.50.4; cf. App. *B Civ*. 2.147.613). It is plausible to suggest, then, that when the crowd finally settled on the east end of the Forum, near the Aedes Castoris and the Regia, as the final location for Caesar's cremation, it did so purposefully, choosing a space in the topography of the city that was symbolically significant to the Roman people.

Our discussion thus far has established a larger context for the erection of Caesar's monument: his extraordinary honours conferred by the senate, especially

[27] Our sources tell us only that some of Caesar's slaves conveyed his body from the meeting place of the senate in the Theatre of Pompey, where he was killed, to his home (App. *B Civ.* 2.118.498).

[28] Suet. *Iul.* 79.1–2; Plut. *Caes*. 60.3; App. *B Civ.* 2.108.450.

[29] E. Canetti, *Crowds and Power* (New York, 1973), 29; what is said there about the destructiveness of crowds is relevant here as well (19–20), as is Canetti's analysis of the 'reversal' crowd (58–62).

[30] For an attempt to apply Canetti's theory of crowd behaviour to the crowd at Clodius' funeral, see Sumi (n. 17).

[31] Cf. the account in Appian, who states that the crowd actually burned the room in Pompey's portico where Caesar had been assassinated (*B Civ*. 2.147.613) and took his body to the Temple of Jupiter, but that they were prevented from burning it there (*B Civ*. 2.148.615).

the question of his divinity, the symbolic topography of the Roman Forum that helped determine the location of his cremation, and the participation of the urban *plebs* and veterans in his funeral. It is necessary to bear this larger context in mind as we turn to a discussion of the monument itself, for it is essential to understanding the function of this monument as a concrete manifestation of Caesarian ideology.

Our sources variously describe Caesar's monument as a column (*columna*) or altar (*ara* or *bômos*, in the Greek sources).[32] Cicero, one of our contemporary sources, calls it a *columna* when, in a letter dated 1 May 44 B.C., he describes its removal by the consul P. Cornelius Dolabella in late April (a point to which we shall return below).[33] Suetonius provides a few more details, stating that it was a twenty-foot-tall monolithic (*solida*) column of Numidian marble (giallo antico) with the inscription *Parenti patriae*, where the *plebs* continued to sacrifice, make vows and settle disputes with an oath in Caesar's name.[34] Our other contemporary source is a letter from Brutus and Cassius to Antony preserved in Cicero's correspondence. Dated 1 June 44 B.C. the conspirators express dismay at rumours that Caesar's veterans will be replacing the monument (referring, presumably, to the one recently removed by Dolabella) which they call an altar (*ara*).[35] A few months later, Octavian held a *contio* at the Aedes Castoris in which he swore an oath that he be allowed to achieve his father's honours and extended his hand 'toward the statue' (*ad statuam*) (Cic. *Att*. 16.15.3). A fourth contemporary source, albeit of somewhat later date, is a coin minted by Octavian in 36 B.C., showing on the reverse the facade of a tetrastyle temple with a high podium, a star in the pediment, and the inscription *DIVO IVL* on the architrave. On the left is a lighted altar, presumably a reference to Caesar's monument, which determined the temple's location.[36] Appian and Dio consistently refer to the monument as an altar (*bômos*). Appian credits Amatius with the erection of this altar, but implies that it was destroyed before it was dedicated (*B Civ.* 3.3.7). Dio claims that the people used the altar to sacrifice to Caesar, as though sacrificing to a god, before the consuls (Dio uses the plural) destroyed it (44.51.1–2). Our sources make it clear that during the months after Caesar's funeral the site of his cremation housed column, altar and statue. Based on the evidence of Cicero, the initial monument must have consisted of a column. It is unlikely, however, that the column that Suetonius describes – a monolith of Numidian marble twenty feet tall with inscription – could have been erected by the urban *plebs* in the hubbub following Caesar's funeral. Procuring, erecting and

[32] For a discussion of the significance of these terms in our sources, see C. Cogrossi, 'Pietà popolare e divinizzazione nel culto di Cesare del 44 a.C.', in M. Sordi (ed.), *Religione e politica nel mondo antico* (Milan, 1981), 141–60, at 146–8.

[33] Cic. *Att*. 14.15.1 [2]: *O mirificum Dolabellam meum! iam enim dico meum; antea, crede mihi, subdubitabam. magnam ἀναθεώρησιν res habet, de saxo, in crucem, columnam tollere, locum illum sternendum locare* ('My wonderful Dolabella! For now I can call him mine; I had doubts before, believe me. This is something that will attract attention: using the rock and the cross, removing the column, and contracting to pave over the place'). Cf. *Phil*. 1.5.

[34] Suet. *Iul*. 85: *Postea solidam columnam prope uiginti pedum lapidis Numidici in Foro statuit inscripsitque* PARENTI PATRIAE. *apud eam longo tempore sacrificare, uota suscipere, controuersias quasdam interposito per Caesarem iure iurando distrahere perseuerauit*.

[35] Cic. *Fam*. 11.2.2: *Quare petimus a te, facias nos certiores tuae uoluntatis in nos; putesne nos tutos fore in tanta frequentia militum ueteranorum, quos etiam de reponenda ara cogitare audimus* … ('We therefore ask that you let us know your inclination towards us; whether you think that we will be safe amid such a crowd of veterans, who we hear are contemplating replacing the altar').

[36] Crawford (n. 11), nos. 540/1 and 2; Sear (n. 11), nos. 314–15.

inscribing such a column would have required extensive planning, expense and, in all probability, machinery of some sort.[37] One possible scenario is that immediately after Caesar's funeral a column was erected, perhaps with an accompanying altar, under the direction of Amatius;[38] after Dolabella destroyed both (and he must have destroyed both since Cicero says that he had the site paved over), a second column now topped with a statue was put in its place, at the urging of Caesar's veterans and perhaps under the influence of Octavian, who had arrived in Rome in May. Caesar's veterans succeeded, then, in having the column replaced. Finally, the altar that appears on Octavian's *aureus* of 36 B.C. depicts a later altar that was erected at the same site after Caesar's official deification in January 42 B.C. The reference in our sources to an altar must mean either that an altar was erected along with a column or that these sources loosely refer to the column as an altar because of the activity that took place there (i.e. sacrifices and oath-taking).

The erection of the column, both the initial one, set up by the *plebs* immediately after Caesar's funeral as well as the twenty-foot-tall monolith of Numidian marble with the inscription *Parenti patriae* (as Suetonius describes), raises some intriguing questions. What is the significance of a column as honorific monument? What is the significance of the inscription? Finally, how does the monument fit into Octavian's ideology after his return to Rome?

A column's function as a grave or tomb marker was better known in the Greek than in the Roman world until the Imperial period,[39] when columns erected in honour of Trajan and Antoninus Pius also served as their tombs. The particular memory that Caesar's column preserved was the signal honour of burial or cremation within the Pomerium. Other distinguished Romans were honoured with columns,[40] but not all served as places of worship.[41] The altar or shrine near the *Porta Minucia* was somewhat analogous to Caesar's monument but with a critical difference: not only family members could worship at Caesar's monument.[42] The

[37] As other scholars have pointed out; see most recently P. Scherrer, 'Traian und der Saüle Caesars', in H. Hefner and K. Tomaschitz (edd.), *Ad fontes!: Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch zum 65. Geburtstag am 15. September 2004, dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden* (Vienna, 2004), 369–75.

[38] S. Weinstock attempts to reconcile our source tradition (*Divus Julius* [Oxford, 1971], 364–7) by asserting (following Appian) that Amatius was the first to set up an altar to Caesar on the location of his cremation but did not live to complete it. Dolabella demolished it before it was ever used. The column (which Suetonius says was in use for a long time) must have been set up after that by Octavian who provided it with the inscription. But Cicero explicitly tells us that the column was destroyed in late April, most likely before Octavian's arrival in Rome. Weinstock's scenario is plausible only if we assume that Octavian's column post-dated an original column on the site that Dolabella destroyed. M. Montagna Pasquinucci ('L'altare del tempio del Divo Giulio', *Athenaeum* 52 [1974], 144–55, at 147) believes that the altar and column were set up at the same time.

[39] On columns as tomb markers in the Greek world, see E. McGowan, 'Tomb marker and turning post: funerary columns in the archaic period', *AJA* 99 (1995), 615–32 and W. Haftmann, *Das italienische Säulenmonument* (Leipzig, 1939), 9–10.

[40] Weinstock (n. 38), 365–6 (referencing the columns of C. Maenius, C. Duillius, L. Aemilius Paullus, M. Seius and L. Minucius). A coin (dated 135 B.C.) shows a column on the rev. bearing a statue of L. Minucius (Crawford [n. 11], no. 242/1, with his comments on pp. 1.273–4).

[41] For a brief history of the column monument in the Roman world, see L. Vogel, *The Column of Antoninus Pius* (Cambridge, MA, 1973), 23–6; see also Haftmann (n. 39), 21–8 (for the Republican period). On columns in the Imperial period, see P. Davies, *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius* (Cambridge, 1997). On the relationship between Caesar's column and the Column of Trajan, see Scherrer (n. 37).

[42] Weinstock (n. 38), 293–4.

Gracchi and M. Seius offer closer analogies. In the case of the former, statues were erected in their honour, the places where they were murdered came to be regarded as sacred, and offerings were made to them throughout the year (Plut. *C. Gracch*. 18.3). M. Seius, like Caesar, was carried by the people to his place of burial (Plin. *HN* 18.15–16). The cult of the Gracchi seems not to have lasted long, while no evidence exists for a cult of M. Seius.[43]

The erection of Caesar's column marked the establishment of a cult in his honour, but the process through which this cult was formally recognized was long and difficult. Indeed, from the beginning the area around Caesar's monument became contested space. It was maintained by the urban *plebs*, Caesar's slaves and freedmen, and Caesar's veterans, apparently initially under the leadership of Amatius against the supporters of the conspirators and the principal civil authorities in the city, the consuls, Antony and Dolabella. Amatius first drew the attention of Antony, who probably around mid-April summarily executed him without trial. Around this same time Cicero praises Antony for quelling a demonstration by Caesar's freedmen that might be related to Amatius' activity, although no explicit connection is made (Cic. *Att*. 14.5.1). Cicero saves his most effusive praise for Antony's colleague in the consulship, P. Dolabella, who a few weeks later removed the monument, paved over the space it occupied, and punished those who had been active there.[44] Dolabella had some of Caesar's supporters thrown from the Tarpeian Rock, a highly symbolic punishment traditionally reserved for traitors to the state. Dolabella was not merely clearing the Forum of Caesar's supporters, whose presence must have hampered public business; he was rather showing that honouring the dead dictator was tantamount to treason.

The location of Caesar's cremation and later his monument became contested space also because of what the monument came to mean to the conspirators. Cicero applauded the destruction of Caesar's column, an outcome that encouraged him to hope for Brutus' safe return to Rome and to imagine him walking through the Forum crowned with laurel.[45] The image was clear: destruction of Caesar's monument meant victory for the conspirators. This image was an element of the ideology of the conspirators that ultimately was formed in opposition to the Caesarian ideology. It was based on the claim that Caesar was tyrant and oppressor and they the liberators and tyrannicides.[46] The conspirators' ideology naturally questioned the legitimacy of Caesar's power by providing justification for his murder.[47] Any

[43] See further Cogrossi (n. 32), 149.

[44] See above, n. 33.

[45] Cic. *Att*. 14.16.2; on the importance of Brutus' safety in Rome, cf. 14.8.2 and 14.20.3.

[46] M. Brutus had long advertised a lineage that played a role in the formation of this ideology, as he could boast descent from tyrannicides on both sides of his family – L. Junius Brutus, expeller of the Tarquins and founder of the Republic, and C. Servilius Ahala, slayer of Sp. Maelius. Already in 54 B.C. M. Brutus minted coins celebrating this lineage, in a remarkable issue showing a portrait of L. Brutus on the obverse with a portrait of Ahala on the reverse. See Crawford (n. 11), no. 433/2; J. Evans, *The Art of Persuasion* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1992), 145–8.

[47] An attempt was made to promote the conspirators' ideology in more spectacular fashion through the production of Accius' *Brutus*, presumably a dramatic retelling of the myth of L. Brutus and the Tarquins, at the *Ludi Apollinares* in July 44 B.C., whose sponsorship devolved on M. Brutus as *praetor urbanus* (Cic. *Att*. 16.5.1). In Cicero's letters and speeches of 44/3 B.C. he frequently importunes the Roman people to emulate their ancestors, a clear allusion to the tradition of L. Brutus and the expulsion of the kings. See Cic. *Fam*. 12.22.2; cf. *Phil*. 1.13, in which Cicero claims that the deed of L. Brutus was a model for the conspirators. Later sources, too, preserve this connection: see Plut. *Brut*. 9.6–8; App. *B Civ.* 2.112.469. More generally, Caesar

honour for Caesar, including the erection of this monument, was a harsh rebuke of the conspirators' deed.[48]

Caesar's cult, established by the erection of his monument, was made even clearer when the monument was restored, perhaps in the form of an altar, and still used as a rallying point for Caesar's supporters, where oaths were taken and disputes settled 'for a long time'.[49] Despite the consuls' strenuous efforts, and much to the dismay of the conspirators, the establishment of this cult confirmed Caesar's divine status at a time when it was still being hotly debated in Rome. More crucial to our argument is the fact that this cult was initially recognized only by the urban *plebs* and perhaps Caesar's veterans under the leadership of Amatius. It was not a private cult in the sense that it was restricted to members of Caesar's own family, despite the initiative of Amatius, who claimed to be a relative of Caesar. In fact, activity that centred on Caesar's bier at his funeral and immediately afterward suggests that the cult began then. We are told that once the pyre was alight some of the musicians and actors in Caesar's funeral procession threw their costumes on the flames; veteran soldiers offered their military decorations, mothers their own jewellery (*ornamenta*), the amulets (*bullae*) of their children along with their togas of boyhood (*praetextae*).[50] Finally, foreigners lamented Caesar's death in ways peculiar to their own cultures, especially the Jews who frequented the pyre for several days afterward (Suet. *Iul*. 84.4–5). A strong element of those lamenting Caesar's death, then, were those on the margins of society: musicians and actors (likely to be slaves and freedmen), a small number of veterans, women and foreigners. In light of this, it is not at all surprising that those at the centre of power, notably the consuls Antony and Dolabella – the former with the execution of Amatius, the latter with the destruction of Caesar's column – would endeavour to circumscribe a cult over which they exercised no control. Once a larger group of veterans, most likely those settled in Caesar's Italian colonies, made it known that they intended to replace the 'altar', as Brutus and Cassius refer to Caesar's monument, then this new cult could no longer be ignored.[51] Octavian's presence in Rome at this time might have facilitated cult activities, whether he led the charge

was frequently described as a tyrant and the conspirators were tyrant-killers (Cic. *Att*. 14.6.2; 14.21.3; 16.15.3) and liberators (e.g. Cic. *Fam*. 11.2.2).

[48] A hallmark of the conspirators' ideology was opposition to Caesar's honours: Brutus' games, for instance, were supposed to be advertised as beginning on the Nones of Quintilis, eschewing the new name of the month (Cic. *Att*. 16.4.1).

[49] Suet. *Iul*. 85. Weinstock (n. 38), 366 interprets this to mean that the monument served this purpose until January of 42 B.C., when Caesar was formally decreed a god by the senate and his temple vowed (Cass. Dio 47.18.4).

[50] The language that Suetonius uses makes it impossible to determine whether these mothers (*matronae*) were aristocratic or freed. Noble boys were known to wear *bullae* (as well as the *toga praetexta*) (Cic. *Verr*. 2.1.152; cf. Macrob. 1.6.10), but sons of freedmen would have as well (since they were full citizens). But cf. Plin. *HN* 33.10, who relates the tradition that Tarquinius Priscus first bestowed a *bulla* on his son as a reward for killing an enemy in battle. Since then sons of members of the cavalry wore such amulets. It was traditional for boys once they reached maturity to consecrate their *bullae* to the Lares (Pers. 5.31).

[51] We should also note that at the end of May or early June 44 B.C., when the veterans were agitating for the restoration of Caesar's monument, their support was far more crucial to Antony and Octavian. D. Brutus had already left Rome for Gaul, and the rest of the conspirators were plotting their next move. Sex. Pompeius was reconstituting his forces that would remain formidable until his final defeat at Naulochus in 36 B.C. Cicero's concern about Sextus' activities is revealed in his letters after Caesar's assassination (*Att*. 14.1.2; 14.4.1; 14.8.2; cf. 14.13.2). On attempts to accommodate Sextus, see App. *B Civ.* 3.4.11; Cass. Dio 45.9.4.

of the veterans or merely acquiesced in their demands. Such an action would have been consistent with the ideology he adopted as he made his way in the political thicket of Rome after Caesar's assassination – namely to observe Caesar's honours, which were under attack by the conspirators and their supporters. Even Antony was reluctant to observe them in the weeks immediately after Caesar's death.[52] In any event, a new column was erected, the one that Suetonius describes, perhaps with accompanying altar, and it remained the centrepiece of Caesar's cult until the construction and dedication of the Aedes Diui Iulii.

Finally, the inscription on the column commemorates another honour granted Caesar (Cass. Dio 44.4.4) – the title *Parens Patriae* ('Father of his country'). This title also appears on coins, which are usually dated to the period immediately after Caesar's assassination.[53] This chronology, if correct, provides corroborating evidence that the title *Parens Patriae* became a slogan of especial importance to the ideology of Caesar's supporters after his death. It remained so throughout the months following, as Antony erected a statue in Caesar's honour in October 44 B.C. on the Rostra at the aristocratic end of the Forum with a similar inscription (*Parenti optime merito*).[54] At the time of Octavian's *contio*, which we will discuss below, there were at opposite ends of the Forum two monuments in Caesar's honour that referred specifically to the title 'Father of his country'.[55] The statue of Caesar that Antony erected not only stood in direct competition with the monument erected by Caesar's veterans and the people, it also might have served as a tacit reminder of his role in the immediate aftermath of Caesar's assassination when he executed Amatius, the man responsible for keeping alive the memory of the dictator, and did not prevent Dolabella from removing the monument. Therefore, it is probable that even in the autumn of 44 B.C., some seven months after Caesar's cremation in the Forum, its site remained contested space.

Octavian's promotion of the Caesarian ideology that formed after Caesar's assassination can be seen in the *contio* he held at the Temple of Castor in November 44 B.C. Surrounded by two legions of Caesar's soldiers and a crowd of the urban *plebs*, the young heir swore an oath to be allowed to rise to Caesar's honours and extended his hand 'toward the statue' (*ad statuam*).[56] Which statue is not specified, but it was likely the one of Caesar that now stood atop Caesar's column in the Forum. It is possible that Octavian himself consecrated this statue with a star above its head in reference to the comet (the *Sidus Iulium*) that had appeared at

[52] A great deal of contention arose around the subject of Caesar's chair, for instance, which Octavian attempted to bring into the theatre on two occasions (in May and again in July 44 B.C.). For these incidents, see App. *B Civ.* 3.28.105–6 and Nic. Dam. 28.108 (*FrGH* 90 F 130) (with Sumi [n. 18], 130–1, 152).

[53] Crawford (n. 11), nos. 480/19 and 20.

[54] Cic. *Fam*. 12.3.1 (to C. Cassius, dated 2 October 44 B.C.).

[55] This was unusual, Weinstock (n. 38), 366–7 avers, but Lucan (9.601) refers to Cato's cult in a similar way. It seems, then, that the inscription and oath were necessary as part of the cult. This title was first granted to Cicero (Cic. *Pis*. 6; Plin. *HN* 7.117, with M. Beagon's note [*The Elder Pliny on the Human Animal: Natural History, Book 7* (Oxford, 2005), 308–9]; cf. Juv. 8.236–44). There is a tradition that confers the title on Camillus as well (Livy 5.49.7, with R.M. Ogilvie's note [*A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965), 739]). Later, the title was conferred on most emperors (Mommsen, *St. R.*[3], 2.779; see also A. Alföldi, 'Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik. Kleine Beiträge zu ihrer Entstehungsgeschichte, 3: *Parens patriae*', *MH* 11 [1954], 133–59).

[56] Cic. *Att*. 16.15.3; cf. also App. *B Civ.* 3.41.168–9; Cass. Dio 45.12.3–6.

Caesar's games in July and was interpreted to be a sign of Caesar's apotheosis.[57] Moreover, Octavian, by swearing an oath in Caesar's name, recalled one of the principal activities of the Roman people at this column following his cremation.[58] Thus, Octavian in this *contio* referenced much of the debate about Caesar's status at the time of his death or in its immediate aftermath: namely, Caesar's extraordinary honours, including his divinity, the oaths sworn in his name and the question of his successor. Finally, Octavian was also acknowledging the role of the *plebs* and veterans in preserving Caesar's memory, which M. Antonius, the dictator's political heir apparent, was reluctant to do in the immediate aftermath of Caesar's murder.[59] Octavian thus became the primary purveyor of a Caesarian ideology that the Roman people were instrumental in forming.

Thus far, my analysis of the site of Caesar's cremation and the monument to his memory presupposes that this site was of symbolic importance to the Roman people even before Caesar's funeral and was chosen as the site of his cremation for that reason. This analysis is based in part on evidence that is, admittedly, suggestive rather than conclusive. The choice of the site of Caesar's cremation, in other words, might not have been as deliberate as I have argued. (Couldn't the crowd have chosen this site because it was a convenient open space suitable for the purpose?) It should be clear, however, that after Caesar's monument was erected, the people and veterans strove to preserve his memory by preserving this site, even against the mandate of the ruling authorities, and later Octavian did the same. Whatever the precise reason for the selection of the east end of the Forum as the place to cremate Caesar's body, the people's reaction to Caesar's assassination as well as their actions at his funeral were an expression of popular will that remained in memory for many years to come. In other words, the symbolic importance of this site before Caesar's cremation is debatable; afterward, there can be no doubt.

IV. CAESAR'S MONUMENT AND THE VOWING OF THE AEDES DIVI IVLII

Almost two years after Octavian's *contio* and at the instigation of the triumvirs, Caesar was declared a god and a temple vowed in his honour that would eventually complement the altar that marked the location of his cremation.[60] The senate and people concurred – the senate by decree and the people by a law passed in the tribal assembly.[61] As a result, this site was physically transformed (or soon would be). Moreover, what had been the locus of dispute after Caesar's assassination was now at least ostensibly the focus of political harmony among those in power. Caesar's formal deification also initiated a new phase in Octavian's political life,

[57] Plin. *HN* 2.94. On the star as a symbol of Caesar's apotheosis, see L.R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, CT, 1931), 90–2. On the comet and these games, see J.T. Ramsey and A.L. Licht, *The Comet of 44 B.C. and Caesar's Funeral Games* (Atlanta, 1997); Sumi (n. 18), 150–3.

[58] Suet. *Iul*. 85; App. *B Civ.* 3.3.7; Cass. Dio 44.51.1–2.

[59] On the political circumstances surrounding Octavian's *contio*, see Sumi (n. 18), 159–68.

[60] Cass. Dio 47.18.3–4; P. Gros, s.v. 'Iulius, Divus, Aedes', *LTUR* 3.116–19.

[61] M. Beard, J. North and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1998), 1.88; cf. Cic. *Dom*. 106.

marked by the slogan *Diui filius*, thus reshaping the political landscape in the Triumviral period.[62]

We should, at the outset, bear in mind the conflict and unrest that surrounded the vowing of this temple in January 42 B.C. Still a recent memory was the battle of Mutina (April 43 B.C.), where D. Brutus, allied with Octavian, defeated Antony's forces, but both consuls for 43 B.C., A. Hirtius and C. Pansa, died as a result of the fighting. Octavian returned to Rome in August 43 B.C. to claim one of the consulships under threat of military force. A law voted on in November 43 B.C. conferred unprecedented powers on Antony, Octavian and Lepidus to restore constitutional government; the elimination of their enemies through proscription ensued (App. *B Civ*. 4.7.26–8.35).

Amid the crisis and conflict that attended the rise to power of the triumvirs the Aedes Diui Iulii was vowed through a decree of the senate and vote of the people.[63] It was customary in such instances for the augurs to mark off the sacred precinct (*templum*) where the *aedes* would stand (known as the *locus liberatus et effatus* [Livy 10.37.15]), which then awaited consecration by the *pontifices*.[64] It is possible that Octavian was elected to the augurate in this year,[65] perhaps in time to participate in the taking of the auspices as part of the preparation of the sacred site. He had previously joined the college of *pontifices* in 48 or 47 B.C., having replaced L. Domitius Ahenobarbus who had fallen at the battle of Pharsalus.[66] Octavian, then, would likely have participated in an official capacity in the ceremonies necessary to consecrate the site in preparation for building the Aedes Diui Iulii. What had been contested space now received formal sanction. Moreover, vowing the temple was a victory for Caesarian ideology by conferring on Caesar another honour and further acknowledging the space marked off by the *plebs* but destroyed by Dolabella. The triumvirs, however, performed these ceremonies – watching the sky for birds, purifying the site, making sacrifice and uttering prayers to the gods[67] – in close proximity to the Rostra Augusti, now decorated by the heads of those proscribed (App. *B Civ*. 4.15.58; Plut. *Cic*. 49). The conspirators, too, remained at

[62] If the triumvirs needed divine sanction for the site of the temple, they might have found it in the story that circulated after Caesar's funeral, as recorded in Suetonius (*Iul*. 84.3): when the crowd at Caesar's funeral was wondering where to cremate his body, two figures appeared to direct them to the place of cremation. These two figures are described as the Dioscuri. It is impossible now to know the source for this story (beyond Suetonius) and when precisely it circulated. For a discussion, see Sumi (n. 2), 176–9.

[63] Dio states only that the triumvirs 'laid the foundation' for the temple (*προκατεβάλοντο* – 47.18.4) without detailing any of the specific ceremonies involved.

[64] Serv. *ad Aen*. 1.446: … *antiqui aedes sacras ita templa faciebant, ut prius per augures locus liberaretur effareturque, tum demum a pontificibus consecraretur, ac post ibidem sacra edicerentur*. We should note that not every *aedes* was a *templum* in the sense that augurs did not mark out its sacred precinct; on this distinction, see S. Weinstock, s.v. 'templum', *RE* 5.1 (1934), 480–5, at 484; J. Scheid, *An Introduction to Roman Religion* (Bloomington, IN, 2003), 60–1, 63–73.

[65] The date of Octavian's augurate is uncertain, and the only evidence is numismatic. Symbols of the augurate (namely, the *lituus*) begin appearing on Octavian's coins in 41 B.C.; Crawford (n. 11), no. 517/7.

[66] Nic. Dam. 4.9 (*FrGH* 90 F 127) implies that Octavian achieved the pontificate in 48 B.C., immediately after he took on the *toga uirilis* (which occurred on 18 October [for the date, but not the year, see *CIL* 10.8375]); for the year 47 B.C., see T.R.S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 3 vols. (New York, 1952), 2.292.

[67] These rites were part of the consecration of the site of the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter after it was destroyed by fire in A.D. 69 (Tac. *Hist*. 4.53).

large and their ideology was still publicly espoused.[68] The triumvirs seem to have wanted to use the site of Caesar's cremation as a symbol of their consensus and cooperation, but reminders remained of the conflict surrounding this site and the erection of Caesar's monument.

Our earliest evidence for the transformation of the site of Caesar's cremation in the Triumviral period is a coin minted by Octavian in 36 B.C., some six years after Caesar's formal deification. The coin shows a tetrastyle temple on the reverse, with *DIVO IVL* on the architrave and a star in its pediment, which was probably meant to be a prototype of the temple that Octavian would later dedicate in 29 B.C. after his triumphant return to Rome. The star, a reference to the comet that appeared at Octavian's games in July 44 B.C. (the *Sidus Iulium*), was now a recognizable symbol of Caesar's apotheosis. The lighted altar on the left shows clearly the connection between the as yet to be constructed temple and one of the original monuments to Caesar's memory that marked the place of his cremation. The altar's placement on the coin to the left and not immediately in front of the temple, where it was eventually located, might be an indication that Octavian had not fully formed his plans for the temple's eventual design.[69] Even if the altar depicted on this coin only dated back to 42 B.C. when Caesar was formally deified, it still marked the place of his cremation and therefore preserved the memory of his apotheosis as well as the people's role in consecrating the space. The law passed in the tribal assembly that confirmed Caesar's divinity[70] was another indication of the instrumental role of the people, including of course Caesar's veterans, in the process of transforming Caesar into a god,[71] for they were the ones who first erected the monument in Caesar's honour; their law further made his deification a binding act.

Within the temple on this coin stands a veiled figure holding a *lituus*, the curved staff of the augur. If this is meant to be the cult statue, it is curious that Caesar is depicted as a priest, specifically an augur, rather than as a god. It has been argued that Octavian intended to show Caesar as Pontifex Maximus, striding forward from the Regia, his headquarters, to his new home in the Aedes Diui Iulii.[72] But if this interpretation is correct, why is Caesar shown as augur and not Pontifex Maximus? Other coins minted in Octavian's interest show a portrait of the new Divus (clearly marked with the inscription *DIVI IVLI*) and *lituus*, apparently making a connection between the augurate and Caesar's divinity.[73] Another explanation is that Octavian

[68] On the threat of the conspirators to the triumvirs, see App. *B Civ*. 4.8.35. The famous coin minted by M. Brutus in the East in 42 B.C., with the rev. type showing two downward-pointing daggers framing a freedman's cap (*pilleus*) with EID MAR below (Crawford, [n. 11], no. 508/3), distils most succinctly the ideology of the conspirators.

[69] F. Prayon, 'Projektierte Bauten auf römischen Münzen', in B. von Freytag gen. Löringhoff, D. Mannsperger and F. Prayon (edd.), *Praestant Interna. Festschrift für Ulrich Hausmann* (Tübingen, 1982), 319–30, at 322.

[70] *CIL* 6.872; *ILS* 72: *Diuo Iulio iussu populi Romani statutum est lege Rufrena*; cf. *CIL* 9.5136. For a discussion, see Taylor (n. 57), 268–9. She believes that the *lex Rufrena* should be dated to 44 B.C. rather than 42 B.C., and refers to the erection of statues in all the temples (an honour for Caesar recorded by Dio [44.4.4]), although she concedes that in the event of Caesar's sudden death the provisions of the law might not have been enacted until the Triumviral period.

[71] S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge, 1984), 76–7.

[72] Prayon (n. 69), 322.

[73] Crawford (n. 11), no. 526. It is also possible that the figure depicted is Octavian himself as augur, performing the auspices at the dedication of the temple. If this is the case, the coin would show an event far in the future. A much later coin (*RIC*^{2}, p. 74, no. 415=J.B. Giard, *Catalogue*

was proceeding cautiously at this time and was reluctant to depict Caesar as a divinity. Instead, he showed him as augur in order to recall Romulus' founding of the city through augury.[74]

Caesar's formal deification also allowed Octavian to begin calling himself *Diui filius* (certainly by 38 B.C. when the slogan first appeared on his coins[75]), thus initiating an important new phase in his political career. As I have already noted, the people initiated the cult at Caesar's monument in the Forum Romanum and then voted on a law vowing the temple under the Triumvirate. The slogan *Diui filius* thus carried the imprimatur of the Roman people. The coin minted in 36 B.C., bearing an image of temple and altar, illustrates the link between the two monuments to Caesar's memory and demonstrates further that Octavian's ideology was shaped not only by the fact of Caesar's apotheosis but also by the process through which it came about. Even in the Triumviral period, Octavian's ideology thus grew out of the Caesarian ideology formed at the site of Caesar's monument immediately after his death.[76]

V. THE AEDES DIVI IVLII IN THE PRINCIPATE

In the Principate the Aedes Diui Iulii continued to shape and advance Augustan ideology. Just as Augustus continued to acknowledge Caesar's divinity as his inheritance, so too did he embrace the initial source of this divinity, the urban *plebs*, whose support he attempted to win in the early years of his Principate.[77] This was no mean feat because the harsh measures he had enacted during the Triumviral period – proscriptions, confiscations, severe taxation – had left him unpopular. Relinquishing the consulship in 23 B.C. and acquiring tribunician power helped transform Augustus' image. No small factor was the number of distributions of

des monnaies de l'empire romain, vol. 1: Auguste [Paris, 1988], no. 555) shows Augustus crowning with a star a half-clad figure, identified as Divus Julius (cf. also M. Koortbojian, 'The bringer of victory: imagery and institutions at the advent of empire', in S. Dillon and K. Welch (edd.), *Representations of War in Ancient Rome* [Cambridge, 2006], 190–4). If this identification is correct, then this coin shows a more traditional rendering of Caesar's cult statue.

[74] H. Whittaker, 'Two notes on Octavian and the cult of Divus Iulius', *SO* 71 (1996), 87–99, at 87–93.

[75] Sear (n. 11), nos. 306, 308, 309.

[76] One final note about the vowing of the temple: Dio mentions in this context that the Aedes Diui Iulii was granted the right of asylum, meaning that anyone who sought refuge there could not be dragged away. He goes on to describe this honour as virtually unprecedented, having been bestowed only upon gods 'in the time of Romulus' (47.19.2), perhaps citing as a model the very asylum of Romulus. (See E. Dench, *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian* [Oxford, 2005], 17–18; K. Rigsby, *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* [Berkeley, 1996], 577–8.) It is not clear why this temple received this privileged status, nor how long it retained it. Dio also remarks that at some point in its history this temple could not be used effectively as a place of asylum since it was fenced in after so many people congregated there (47.19.3). This seems to indicate that the site of Caesar's cremation even after the temple had been built over it remained a rallying place, thus preserving in social memory the original purpose of the site. The only instance of the Aedes Diui Iulii possibly being used as a place of asylum can be found in the context of Galba's death in A.D. 69, when his colleague in the consulship, T. Vinius, was murdered in front of the temple, perhaps in an attempt to seek refuge there, although Tacitus, who records the incident, is by no means explicit on this point (Tac. *Hist*. 1.42).

[77] Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford, 1969), 83–102.

food and cash (*congiaria*) to the urban *plebs*, so assiduously recorded in his *Res Gestae*.[78] In the years immediately following his adoption of the tribunician power, Augustus seems to have played the urban *plebs* against the senatorial aristocracy, demonstrating that he and he alone was the patron of the Roman people. The Aedes Diui Iulii communicated this aspect of Augustan ideology through its function in the new political structure of the Principate, in part as a venue for legislative assemblies. Just as important, the temple's dedication marked Augustus' return to Rome and the victory at Actium that signalled the end of civil war; finally it made the cult of Caesar in Rome a central feature of the new Principate, especially through its function in funerals of members of the imperial family, including that of Augustus himself. In this period we see the transformation of the site of Caesar's cremation from a space sacred to the Roman people to the centre of a dynastic complex of monuments celebrating the centrality of the imperial family in Roman political culture.

Planning and design of the Aedes Diui Iulii must have at least been in process when Octavian minted his *aureus* in 36 B.C. (discussed above). The construction of the temple was probably begun in 32 or 31 B.C. and dedicated on 18 August 29 B.C.[79] in time to coincide with Octavian's victorious return to Rome from the East after Actium. Although the date of dedication missed by just one day the anniversary of Augustus' formal entry into political life with his election to the consulship (19 August 43 B.C.), the games celebrating the temple's dedication, which continued for several days afterwards, would have included that anniversary. The dedication of the temple and accompanying celebration thus marked Octavian's victory at Actium as well as the end of the civil conflict that had begun fifteen years earlier with Caesar's assassination. The end of war and victory were further advertised by the beaks of ships captured at Actium that decorated the *rostra* of this new temple.

The temple's dedication also marked formally and finally Caesar's elevation to divine status. The cult statue depicted Caesar with a star (the *Sidus Iulium*) above his head, recalling the comet of July 44 B.C. and perhaps also the statue that once stood atop the column in Caesar's memory. Moreover, the cella of the temple, with its wider doors and more open front, was designed less as a sanctuary and more as a display space for the cult statue.[80] According to Vitruvius (3.3.2), the temple was pycnostyle, similar to and perhaps meant purposely to recall the Temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum of Caesar, a replica of which contained Caesar's body at his funeral. The temple was also adorned with a famous painting by Apelles showing Aphrodite rising from the foam of the sea, a gesture to the mythology of Venus.[81] Finally, in the games that followed the temple's dedication, Octavian arranged for a performance of the *Lusus Troiae*, a complex equestrian exercise featuring young men of the aristocracy (Cass. Dio 51.22.4), which Caesar himself had revived during the games that celebrated his dedication of the Temple

[78] *Mon. Anc.* 15; Yavetz (n. 76), 93–9. Cf. Tacitus' more cynical assessment (*Ann.* 1.2.1): … *militem donis, populum annona, cunctos dulcedine otii pellexit* …

[79] *CIL* I^2 217, 244, 248; *Fast. Alif., Amit., Ant. min.*: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2, p. 497.

[80] Gros (n. 3), 86.

[81] Zanker (n. 3), 12; for a full discussion of the temple's decorative scheme, see M. Montagna Pasquinucci, 'La decorazione architettonica del tempio del Divo Giulio nel Foro Romano', *MonAl* 48 (1973), 257–80, at 258–9.

of Venus Genetrix.[82] In this way, Octavian reaffirmed the connection of the Julian *gens* with the Aeneas legend and adopted an important aspect of Caesar's ideology as his own.[83] In the temple's decoration and its dedication Octavian made clear the connection between Caesar's cult and his divine genealogy.

The Aedes Diui Iulii stood directly opposite the principal speaker's platform, the Rostra Augusti, and the decoration of its *rostra*, beaks of ships captured at Actium, responded thematically to similar beaks on the main Rostra, thus forging not only a visual link between the new *rostra* and the old but also an ideological connection: both *rostra* preserved the spoils of naval victories that saved the Republic, and thus equated the achievements of the new regime with those of the old Republic.[84] The spoils of the Egyptian victory were housed within the temple as well. Archaeological evidence suggests that the temple was made to fit between the monument erected in Caesar's honour and the Regia immediately to the east.[85] The *rostra* of the Temple of Divus Julius possibly stood on the Tribunal Aurelium and in close proximity to the Gradus Aurelii, which together formed an important meeting place of the Roman *plebs* in the late Republic.[86] The *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii, as this new *rostra* became known, also incorporated a semicircular niche on the centre axis designed to accommodate Caesar's monument. Thus, the original plan and construction of the temple, clearly and perhaps not surprisingly, accommodated pre-existing structures, one of which was Caesar's monument, preserving the memory of the role of the people in granting him divine status.

After its dedication the temple had two principal functions: 1) as a location for the enactment of ceremonies of popular politics – legislative assemblies (*comitia*) and public meetings (*contiones*); and 2) as a location for the *laudatio* at the imperial funeral ceremony.[87] We will begin with the ceremonies of popular politics, the evidence for which falls more substantially on the side of *comitia*. In 9 B.C., a law prohibiting private citizens from illegally tapping into public aqueducts was voted on and passed at the Aedes Diui Iulii.[88] The usual location for such activity in the late Republic was the Aedes Castoris, adjacent to Caesar's new temple. There are two possible reasons for the change in venue: one is that the Temple of Castor was partly destroyed by fire in 14 B.C.; this fire caused such extensive damage that Augustus' heir Tiberius refurbished and rededicated the temple in A.D. 7 in his own name and that of his dead brother Drusus.[89] It is possible that this damage also rendered the temple unusable for *comitia*, requiring that a new location be

[82] Suet. *Iul*. 39.2; Cass. Dio 43.23.6; Sumi (n. 18), 61.

[83] On Octavian's celebrations after Actium, see also Sumi (n. 18), 207–18.

[84] Zanker (n. 3), 14.

[85] The western wall of the Regia seems to have been modified to accommodate the back wall of the Aedes Diui Iulii; Gros (n. 3), 86.

[86] Weinstock (n. 38), 400, but see now M.G. Cecchini, 'Tempio del Divo Giulio. La zona prima della costruzione del tempio', *Roma* I (1985), 67–72, at 70–1.

[87] In the later Principate the temple is also attested as a meeting place of the *Fratres Arvales* (*CIL* 6.2051.55) in January A.D. 69, recording the co-option of a new member into the college. Under Augustus the *Fratres Arvales* met in the Regia (*CIL* 6.2023.9, 18, for meetings in A.D. 14).

[88] Frontin. *Aq*. 129; text and translation can be found in M.H. Crawford, *Roman Statutes*, 2 vols. (London, 1996), no. 63, 2.795, 797. This is our only evidence for this temple being used as a site for comitial activity, but there is no obvious reason to think that the law in question was the only law ever passed there.

[89] 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.

found. Augustus chose the Temple of Divus Julius because it was in close proximity to the Temple of Castor and was equipped with a speaker's platform (*rostra*) to facilitate the voting.

The symbolic significance of the location is the second possibility for this change of venue for comitial activity. The Augustan Principate, despite the sea change that it caused in the political structure of Rome, still required a foundation of Republican institutions, including the ceremonies of popular politics,[90] evincing once again the delicate balance between the new regime and the old Republic that characterized Augustan ideology. Augustus famously continued magisterial elections, even participating in the campaigns for his favoured candidates (Suet. *Aug*. 56.1). Elections were still held, but Augustus' participation in canvassing raises the issue of whether the electorate could elect freely the candidates of their choice. This ambivalence toward elections appears similarly in the location of these elections: the Saepta Julia, planned by Julius Caesar, completed by Agrippa and dedicated in 26 B.C. Elections were indeed held and perhaps in Republican fashion, but the name on the structure was a clear reminder under whose auspices the elections took place. Legislative activity at the Aedes Diui Iulii showed a similar ambivalence. On the one hand, the fact of legislative assemblies more than merely gestured toward an important Republican institution. Moreover, the possibility that this speaker's platform (*rostra*) was constructed at the location of the Gradus Aurelii in the plebeian end of the Forum[91] also gave a symbolic significance to the new location of the *comitia*. It showed that the rule of law was not to be sacrificed in the interests of monarchy. On the other hand, the location of legislative activity at a structure that bore the name of the *gens Iulia* showed once again under whose auspices these laws were passed. Moreover, the sponsors of these laws were either the *princeps* himself or consuls who were elected with his avowed support. The Aedes Diui Iulii, which contained Caesar's monument, had been erected on contested space in the unrest of the late Republic. The act of voting under the aegis of the *princeps* expressed a new consensus that underpinned the new regime.[92]

As noted above, the evidence for *contiones*, especially under the Augustan Principate, is scanty. The main piece of evidence that *contiones* were ever held at the Aedes Diui Iulii is a series of *sestertii* minted under the reign of the emperor Hadrian (*c*. A.D. 125–8), showing the *princeps*, togate and holding a scroll in his right hand, standing on a tribunal in front of a temple addressing a crowd of togate figures with hands outstretched toward him. The tribunal appears to be decorated with ships' *rostra*. The small temple in the background, resting on a podium of five steps, showing two front and two side columns with a pediment decorated by one or two crowns, has been identified as the Aedes Diui Iulii.[93] What activity the coin depicts is a matter of dispute. One suggestion is Hadrian's funeral oration for Plotina,[94] which is compelling mainly by analogy: we know that this temple was

[90] Sumi (n. 18), 220–62.

[91] DeWitt (n. 21), 221. For the 'plebeian Forum' see also *LTUR* 2.327–8.

[92] For an analysis of the concept of *consensus* in the formation of Augustan ideology, see Lobur (n. 6), esp. 12–36, and further below.

[93] *BMCRE* 3, p. 433, nos. 1309–11, pl. 81.10 [this coin bears a striking resemblance to *BMCRE* 3, p. 175, no. 827, pl. 30.6, A.D. 104–11]; M.T. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the City of Rome* (Princeton, 1987), 102 (with ill. 20 on p. 103).

[94] P.L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts, vol. 2: Die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Hadrian* (Stuttgart, 1933), 113–15; H. Temporini, *Die Frauen am Hofe Trajans. Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Principat* (Berlin, 1978), 168–9.

used as a venue for imperial funerals under Augustus (about which we will have more to say below). Another possibility is that the scene on the coins depicts a *contio*.[95] But if this is the case, it is still not clear what the occasion was and more importantly, how frequent such *contiones* might have been, either under Hadrian or earlier in the Principate. And finally, at best we could argue that there were *contiones* at the Aedes Diui Iulii under the Principate of Augustus only by analogy from the scene depicted on these coins.[96] We therefore are less certain about *contiones* at the Aedes Diui Iulii than *comitia*.

VI. THE AEDES DIVI IULII AND IMPERIAL FUNERALS

As important as the Aedes Diui Iulii might have been in political life under the Principate as a venue for legislative assemblies, it was even more integrated into Augustan ideology as ceremonial space for imperial funerals. Augustus did not create the imperial funeral from whole cloth, but rather modified an existing tradition, basing his new ceremony on the aristocratic funeral of the Roman Republic.[97] It was customary, in the case of the latter, for the body of the deceased to lie in state in the atrium of his home and then be conveyed to the Forum in a long procession that included the masks of the deceased's ancestors (the *imagines*); the body was then placed on the Rostra, where usually a relative delivered the speech in praise of the dead (the *laudatio*) before it was conveyed to the place of cremation or burial (Polyb. 6.53). In the first funerals for members of the imperial family, Augustus introduced two speeches in praise of the deceased, one of which was delivered from the *rostra* of the Aedes Diui Iulii. The result was a dynastic ceremony that placed the imperial family at the centre of Rome's political culture. In so doing, the memory of the dynasty's founder, C. Julius Caesar, remained alive through the prominence of the Aedes Diui Iulii.

The Aedes Diui Iulii became a central feature of imperial funerals, beginning, as far as is known, in 11 B.C. with the funeral of Augustus' sister Octavia. Octavia's body lay in state in the Aedes Diui Iulii instead of, or perhaps in addition to, the atrium of her home.[98] Octavia herself was never deified, but the display of her body in this manner closely associated her with the cult of Caesar. Moreover, this display was somewhat reminiscent of the display of Caesar's body at his funeral

[95] Richardson (n. 25), 214 states that '… the emperors frequently used [the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii] for public addresses', but he does not adduce any specific evidence. He may be thinking of this series of coins.

[96] Boatwright (n. 93), 112 argues that Hadrian's construction projects in the Forum Romanum 'worked to revive the concept of the Roman Forum as a great public space rather than a Julio-Claudian confection and memorial'. If so, this would be an argument that *contiones* held at the Temple of Divus Julius under Hadrian should not be taken as evidence for the same activity under Augustus.

[97] S.R.F. Price, 'From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman emperors', in D. Cannadine and S.R.F. Price (edd.), *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (Cambridge, 1987), 56–105, and J. Arce, *Funus Imperatorum: Los Funerales de los Emperadores Romanos* (Madrid, 1988).

[98] Agrippa's body lay in state in the Forum during his funeral (in 12 B.C.), but we do not know whether this took place at the Temple of Divus Julius (Cass. Dio 54.28). Dio also tells us that a curtain was stretched over the body to block its sight from Augustus, who had just become Pontifex Maximus.

in the replica of the Temple of Venus Genetrix: a divine honour, if not conferral of divinity.

The temple was also featured as the location of one of the two *laudationes* delivered in honour of the deceased. We do not know when Augustus initiated this practice of a double eulogy. The first imperial funeral honoured Augustus' nephew Marcellus, who died in 23 B.C. Augustus eulogized the deceased, on this occasion, 'as had been customary' (Cass. Dio 53.30.5), but it is not clear whether Dio is looking back to the custom of the Republic (and aristocratic funerals) or forward to imperial funerals under Augustus. If the latter, then we would have to assume that Marcellus received a double eulogy as well. When Agrippa died in 12 B.C., Augustus put his body on display in the Forum and delivered a speech over it (Cass. Dio 54.28.3), but we do not hear specifically of a double eulogy.[99] At Octavia's funeral, Augustus delivered one speech of praise on the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii, standing over the body of the deceased, while his stepson Nero Drusus delivered the other from the Rostra Augusti directly opposite. At Augustus' funeral (A.D. 14), the ritual pattern seems to have been changed slightly. Augustus' body was placed on the Rostra Augusti[100] instead of the Julian *rostra*, but the two *laudationes*, as at Octavia's funeral, were spoken from the two *rostra*: Augustus' successor Tiberius delivered one *laudatio* from the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii, while Tiberius' son Drusus delivered a second from the Rostra Augusti (Cass. Dio 56.34.4; Suet. *Aug*. 100.3).[101]

We are informed of the content only of the speeches at Augustus' funeral (Cass. Dio 56.35.1). The remarks of Drusus, Tiberius' son, were made in a private capacity, while Tiberius' speech was a public eulogy in accordance with a decree of the senate. At an aristocratic funeral under the Republic, it was customary for the eldest surviving son to deliver the *laudatio*, which included a family history (effectively a commentary on the *imagines* paraded during the procession[102]) and a brief history of the deceased's public career. At a *funus publicum*, a distinguished orator, usually a magistrate (M. Antonius at Caesar's funeral, for instance), delivered the *laudatio*, but the content of this speech was usually the same, including

[99] A portion of Augustus' *laudatio* for Agrippa survives on papyrus; see L. Koenen, 'Die "laudatio funebris" des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus', *ZPE* 5 (1970), 217–83. Dio further informs us that Agrippa's funeral procession was conducted in the same manner as Augustus' (54.28.5), which implies that it would have prefigured the ritual framework of Augustus' funeral (absent of course were the features peculiar to Augustus' funeral decreed by the senate [Suet. *Aug*. 100.3]).

[100] Suet. *Aug*. 100.3: *pro rostris ueteribus*; Cass. Dio 56.34.4: ἐπὶ τοῦ δημηγορικοῦ βήματος.

[101] The only other imperial funeral attested during the Principate was that of Nero Drusus who died in 9 B.C. In this case, the ceremony had to be modified to accommodate Augustus' status at the time. Drusus died while on campaign in Germany, and Tiberius escorted his body as far as Ticinum, where Augustus took over. Once the body was in Rome, it lay in state in the Forum (on one of the *rostra*, but we are not told which one), where Tiberius delivered a *laudatio*. Augustus delivered a second *laudatio* in the Circus Flaminius, since (as Dio tell us) he himself had been on campaign and was not allowed to cross the Pomerium until he had performed the customary rites (55.2.2). Dio's account of Drusus' funeral is not entirely incompatible with that of Tacitus (*Ann*. 3.5.1), but the latter does not mention Augustus' *laudatio* at the Circus Flaminius. Moreover, he states that Augustus accompanied the body into the city (*ipsum* [i.e., Augustus]… *neque abscedentem a corpore simul urbem intrauisse*), which of course required that he cross the Pomerium. Tacitus' further statement, that Drusus was praised on the Rostra (*laudatum pro rostris*), taken with the previous one, implies that Augustus was present for the *laudatio* in the Forum.

[102] H. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford, 1996), 98.

both public and private aspects of the deceased's life. If Dio's distinction between the two speeches at Augustus' funeral is accurate, then the practice of the double eulogy effectively divided the content of the traditional Republican *laudatio* into two speeches. If the content of such speeches was fundamentally the same from Republic to Principate (which appears to be the case), why change the form?

The simplest answer is that imperial funerals were first and foremost a celebration of the imperial family, both the deceased member as well as those still living. In this respect, they hardly differed from aristocratic funerals, which also celebrated the family of the deceased. The double eulogy not only elevated the ritual of praise for a member of the imperial family above that of an aristocrat, but it also provided a member of the imperial family (besides the emperor himself) with the opportunity to make a public appearance in the Forum and deliver an address to the Roman people (Nero Drusus at Octavia's funeral, Tiberius at Nero Drusus' funeral, Drusus the Younger at Augustus' funeral).[103] It was one way of demonstrating that the line of succession extended beyond the immediate successor.

A second answer is more complex and involves the symbolic topography of the Forum Romanum.[104] By using the Aedes Diui Iulii as part of the imperial funeral ceremony, it is likely that Augustus was consciously evoking the memory of the cult of Caesar contained within the temple itself. The display of the body of the deceased on, or the speech in praise of the deceased delivered from, the Julian *rostra* introduced into the imperial funeral ceremony the cult of Caesar, which was predicated on his divine honours. The Aedes Diui Iulii was a part of Augustus' larger building programme that created a unified vision of the Forum, blurring some of the traditional divisions of the Republican Forum (discussed above). At the heart of this unified vision was the sight line between the two *rostra*, both decorated with captured ships' beaks, from which the *laudationes* at imperial funerals were delivered. These speeches honoured the deceased while reaffirming the sight line across the Forum between the two tribunals and thus ceremonially highlighting the new topography of the Forum, begun by Caesar and completed by Augustus. Since it was customary for *laudationes* to be delivered by an orator while standing over the body of the deceased, it is possible that Octavia's body was conveyed across the Forum to the Rostra Augusti for the second *laudatio*, which would have further reaffirmed the sight line mentioned above. The same might have been true of Augustus' funeral. Moreover, if Dio's description of the content of the speeches at Augustus' funeral is accurate, it is curious that the 'private' speech was delivered from the Rostra Augusti, while the 'public' speech was delivered from the Julian *rostra*. One might have expected the reverse. It is equally possible, however, to see how this exchange (if you will) of the content of each speech with its location underscored further the close connection between the *gens Iulia* and the new Republic,[105] in much the same way that legislative assemblies at the Aedes Diui Iulii or electoral assemblies meeting at the Saepta Julia or even the Roman senate meeting at the Curia Julia demonstrated how the traditional organs of Republican government depended on the *princeps* and his family. Augustus'

[103] The young C. Octavius apparently made his first public appearance when he delivered the funeral oration for his grandmother (Suet. *Aug*. 8.1: *auiam Iuliam defunctam pro contione laudauit*).

[104] On the topography of the Forum Romanum under Caesar and Augustus, see F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano* (Rome, 1992), 2.233–57; Zanker (n. 3); *LTUR* 2.336–9.

[105] Zanker (n. 3), 14.

unified vision of the Forum symbolized the centrality of the imperial family in Roman political culture.

The remains of Caesar's monument, furthermore, should have drawn attention not only to the cult of Caesar and to his death, funeral and apotheosis, but also to the contentious circumstances under which these events took place. But is it realistic to believe that anyone witnessing Augustus' funeral would have recalled the circumstances surrounding the death and funeral of Caesar? After all, Tacitus famously claims that by the time the long-lived Augustus died in A.D. 14 – some fifty-eight years after Caesar's death – there were only a few left who had 'seen the Republic'.[106] But the same historian also tells us that Tiberius, anxious about possible unrest at Augustus' funeral, warned the Roman people in an edict not to demand that Augustus be cremated in the Forum, as they had done for Julius Caesar at his funeral.[107] Tacitus further states that there were still those alive who had themselves witnessed the day of Caesar's assassination or had heard of the deed from their parents.[108] Finally, Tacitus adds that some mocked the presence of an armed garrison to maintain order at Augustus' funeral: Romans were paying their respects to an old emperor, long in power, who had provided heirs for the Republic. Under such circumstances, armed guards hardly seemed necessary to ensure a tranquil funeral.

Is Tacitus' narrative an accurate account of the circumstances surrounding Augustus' funeral, especially Tiberius' concerns about possible unrest? Are we to believe that spectators at Augustus' funeral recalled the death of Caesar? Tacitus places Tiberius' edict in the larger context of the discussion of appropriate funerary honours for Augustus, enumerating first the honours proposed by the senate, the more excessive of which Tiberius rejected. The mention of Tiberius' edict is appropriate in this context, for it shows Tiberius' attitude to a popular honour – the cremation of Augustus in the Forum. Tacitus' initial purpose in discussing Tiberius' reaction to these honours, both senatorial and popular, was to reveal Tiberius' character (he acted with 'immoderate restraint', *adroganti moderatione*). The mention of this edict also allows Tacitus to compare Caesar's funeral with that of Augustus and further to reflect on the event that ultimately ushered in the Augustan Principate. He then can also touch on an important theme of the *Annales*, showing how the power of the *princeps* undermined the prerogative of the senate and the sovereignty of the Roman people, and can conclude this section with anonymous spectators mocking the armed garrison – an example of excessive force in defence of the imperial family.

Although Tacitus uses this discussion of Augustus' honours for his own narrative purposes, we need not assume that he is guilty of wholesale invention of the details. Tiberius might indeed have published his edict in response to his own concerns about possible rioting at Augustus' funeral, but it is equally possible that he was acting under the instructions of Augustus, who even on the last day of his life evinced some concern about unrest that might accompany his death (Suet. *Aug*.

[106] Tacitus (*Ann*. 1.3.7) phrases it in the form of a question: … *quotus quisque reliquus, qui rem publicam uidisset?*

[107] Tac. *Ann*. 1.8.5: … *populumque edicto monuit ne, ut quondam nimiis studiis funus diui Iulii turbassent, ita Augustum in foro potius quam in campo Martis, sede destinata, cremari uellent*.

[108] *Ann*. 1.8.6; this is a difficult passage, as other scholars have noted; see A. Gowing, *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture* (Cambridge, 2005), 28–30; A.J. Woodman, 'Not a funeral note: Tacitus, *Annals* 1.8.5–6', *CQ* 52 (2002), 629–32.

99.1). The instructions that Augustus left for his funeral (Suet. *Aug*. 101.4; Cass. Dio 56.33.1) might have included a command for Tiberius' edict. It would not be surprising if Augustus wanted to avoid the kind of rioting that marked Caesar's funeral in his own. However, as we have noted, the specific mandate of Tiberius' edict was to prevent the people from cremating Augustus' body in the Forum. Tacitus recognized that this was a popular honour (linking it in his discussion, as we noted, to the senatorial honours), and it is likely that Augustus did as well.

If we consider Tiberius' edict, then, as Augustus' refusal of a popular honour, it is possible to see it as part of a larger pattern in his career. Augustus' *Res Gestae* is replete with honours accorded the *princeps*, many of which he declined. In 22 B.C., for instance, at a time of political unrest, Augustus steadfastly refused the office of dictator. Augustus records that the offer was made by the senate and people (*Mon. Anc*. 5.1), but in Dio's account a mob besieged the senate house and refused to allow the senators to leave their meeting until they decreed Augustus the dictatorship, and then presented to Augustus the dictator's twenty-four *fasces* (Cass. Dio 54.1.1–4). Augustus' reasons for rejecting the dictatorship are not hard to find. This office, after all, conjured memories of Caesar's dictatorship that was anathema to the senatorial aristocracy and, as a result, had been outlawed by M. Antonius soon after Caesar's assassination (Cic. *Phil*. 1.4). As *princeps* Augustus had in essence the powers of dictator without the noxious title. Accepting the offer was politically and constitutionally untenable, but Augustus still recorded the offer and his refusal.[109] Augustus was quick to reject honours that were impolitic, unconstitutional, unprecedented, or simply did not fit with his image as *princeps*. On more than one occasion, Augustus returned to the city late at night to avoid being greeted by the people (Cass. Dio 54.10.4; 54.25.4–5) – perhaps in an attempt to avoid Caesar's eventful return in January 44 B.C., when he was hailed as king. It is not enough simply to say that Augustus rejected honours accorded to Caesar, since he did eventually accept the office of Pontifex Maximus, which, as he points out, his father had held, staking a kind of hereditary claim to the office, and he relished, too, the unprecedented numbers of people who flocked to Rome to vote for him (*Mon. Anc*. 10.2). What he found especially objectionable, perhaps, was the kind of popular demonstrations that attended the offer of the dictatorship, his returns to the city and any possible attempt to cremate his body in the Forum.

The second point of Tacitus' discussion of Augustus' funeral honours is that Tiberius' edict prompted memories of Caesar's assassination and a discussion of whether it ultimately benefited the Roman people. I have already suggested (above) how this point also allows Tacitus to touch on certain themes of the *Annales*. But there is no reason to believe that such a debate was unthinkable. Tiberius' edict made more explicit the connection between Augustus' funeral and Caesar's assassination, and perhaps also Caesar's funeral. Moreover, it is likely that Tiberius' *laudatio* would have touched on Augustus' entry into public life, a narrative that probably would have begun, as Augustus himself recorded it in his *Res Gestae*,[110] with his return to Rome soon after Caesar's assassination. It might also have included mention of Augustus' oration at the funeral of his grandmother, Julia (Caesar's sister) (Suet. *Aug*. 8.1), election to the pontificate, or his presence at

[109] Augustus also refused offers of additional triumphs (4.1), the perpetual consulship (5.3) and the office of Pontifex Maximus before M. Lepidus died (10.2), pointedly remarking that the latter was unprecedented.

[110] *Mon. Anc*. 1.1; cf. the version of Tiberius' *laudatio* recorded by Dio (56.36.1–2).

Caesar's triumphs. Augustus' early career was interwoven with Caesar's dictatorship, and it would have been difficult for Tiberius in his *laudatio* to discuss the former without reference to the latter.

VII. CONCLUSION

It is possible to argue that an apparent tension emerges as a result of my analysis, a tension centred on the new topography of the Forum. My contention is that Augustus heralded a new era under the aegis of the imperial family through a dynastic complex of monuments at the east end of the Forum – the same area of the Forum that, as I have also argued, had 'plebeian' or republican associations. One might further argue that any imperial ideology is anti-republican in essence, and that therefore this tension underscores the hypocrisy inherent in a regime that disguised monarchy behind a veil of republican traditions and institutions. This tension dissolves, however, if one considers closely the formation of Augustan ideology, as I have argued in this paper, namely that it emerged out of a Caesarian ideology contained in the monument to Caesar's memory and the symbolic importance of this monument at pivotal points in Augustus' career, beginning with Octavian's *contio* in November 44 B.C. Augustan ideology was not 'top down', as I have argued in this paper, but rather was the result of a complex dialectic between the ruling authority and the people.

Another reading of the topography of the new imperial funeral ceremony under Augustus leads to a similar conclusion. One of the principal innovations of this ceremony, as we discussed earlier, was the introduction of the double eulogy – one *laudatio* delivered from the *rostra* Aedis Diui Iulii and the other from the Rostra Augusti. If we bear in mind the associations of each end of the Forum – the west end with the senatorial aristocracy, including the Tabularium and Temple of Concordia in the background, and the east end of the Forum with the *plebs* – I would argue that the imperial funeral ceremony topographically symbolized the *consensus* that lay at the heart of Augustan ideology – a *consensus* between the senate and people of Rome that was the basis of Augustus' power. The discord that characterized much of the late Republic was supplanted by a new harmony among the orders of Roman society under the aegis of the imperial family. Augustus made a concerted effort, it seems, to transform the contested space of Caesar's monument into a locus of consensus emanating from the imperial family, but it was impossible to eradicate the memories associated with this site even after the topography of the Forum had been radically transformed. In the end, the incorporation of the Aedes Diui Iulii into the imperial funeral ceremony was resonant not only of the conflict that brought the Republic to an end but also of Caesar's divinity and the centrality of the emperor and his family in Roman political culture. It thus spoke eloquently of the forces that brought the Augustan Principate into being as well as those that would sustain it for the future.

Mount Holyoke College GEOFFREY S. SUMI
gsumi@mtholyoke.edu