Open access • Dissertation • DOI:10.14264/UQL.2017.607

Caesar's contribution to Augustus' religious programme — Source link

Timothy Graham Charles Hamlyn

Published on: 22 May 2017

Topics: Principate, Autocracy and Dictator

THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

AUSTRALIA

Caesar's Contribution to Augustus' Religious Programme

Timothy Graham Charles Hamlyn

BSc/BA(Hons), MPhil

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at

The University of Queensland in 2016

The School of Historical and Philosophical Inquiry

Abstract

Although Caesar is sometimes argued to have been the founder of the Principate, Augustus is the one typically considered by modern scholars to have been responsible for its creation. There is acknowledgement of some obvious marks of inspiration but the stress is often on what Augustus did differently to his adoptive father. A contrast is drawn between the barely concealed autocracy of the dictator Caesar and the carefully cultivated image of the *princeps* Augustus as first among equals within a restored Republic. Augustus' actions in the religious sphere are characterised as focussing on tradition, whether real or invented, while practising relative restraint in the way he promoted his own position. For many historians, the underlying basis of his power was ultimately the military forces under his command and the prerogatives he acquired through the so-called settlements. In actual fact, however, Augustus' rule was much more similar to Caesar's than is generally recognised. Several key features of the Principate directly followed the example of the dictator and this is particularly evident with respect to religion. Augustus did not accept a public cult at Rome during his lifetime but he extensively associated himself with a number of deities, including personified virtues, much like Caesar did. He portrayed himself as a sacred father-figure in a fashion that closely emulated Caesar. The chief pontificate and title *pater patriae* were especially significant in this regard. Caesar's contribution is sufficiently great that he can be considered the Principate's true founder. Furthermore, both Caesar and Augustus were directly responsible for the important measures that helped to secure their autocracy. Contrary to what is often stated, particularly for Caesar, the senators did not have a major role in formulating the extraordinary honours that were decreed. The emphasis on Augustus' supposed restraint and moderation within the scholarship is misleading. He could hardly have done more to strengthen his own position within the state without risking dangerous levels of discontent and resentment. He merely demonstrated the caution necessary to hold on to his power. Augustus deliberately engineered the establishment of permanent one-man rule at Rome, just as Caesar probably did after he won the civil war. Suggestions that concerns for stability were uppermost in his mind do not accord with the consistent manner in which he pursued personal supremacy. Religion was not simply important in all this but vital. It formed a pillar of both Caesar's and Augustus' autocracy that was no less critical than their formal political powers or their military backing.

Declaration by author

This thesis is composed of my original work, and contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference has been made in the text. I have clearly stated the contribution by others to jointly-authored works that I have included in my thesis.

I have clearly stated the contribution of others to my thesis as a whole, including statistical assistance, survey design, data analysis, significant technical procedures, professional editorial advice, and any other original research work used or reported in my thesis. The content of my thesis is the result of work I have carried out since the commencement of my research higher degree candidature and does not include a substantial part of work that has been submitted to qualify for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. I have clearly stated which parts of my thesis, if any, have been submitted to qualify for another award.

I acknowledge that an electronic copy of my thesis must be lodged with the University Library and, subject to the policy and procedures of The University of Queensland, the thesis be made available for research and study in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968 unless a period of embargo has been approved by the Dean of the Graduate School.

I acknowledge that copyright of all material contained in my thesis resides with the copyright holder(s) of that material. Where appropriate I have obtained copyright permission from the copyright holder to reproduce material in this thesis.

Publications during candidature

Hamlyn, T. 2014. 'The Nature of Caesar's Illness'. *Latomus* 73.2: 360-367.

Publications included in this thesis

No publications included.

Contributions by others to the thesis

No contributions by others.

Statement of parts of the thesis submitted to qualify for the award of another degree

None.

Keywords

religion, Rome, Caesar, Augustus, Octavian, *pontifex maximus*, Vestal Virgins

Australian and New Zealand Standard Research Classifications (ANZSRC)

ANZSRC code: 210306, Classical Greek and Roman History, 100%

Fields of Research (FoR) Classification

FoR code: 2103, Historical Studies, 100%

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used are those given in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (revised third edition, 2003), with the additions and deviations listed below.

Please note that the references to Plutarch's Lives use the section numbers from the Loeb edition and should match those given in the editions of Sintenis and Bekker rather than the Teubner of Ziegler, although this has apparently changed in more recent printings (cf. Ramsey 2003: xiii; Pelling 2011: xi).

AFA	*Acta Fratrum Arvalium*
Alc. fr. *x* LP	Alcaeus, where *x* is the fragment number from the edition of Lobel and Page (also adopted in the Loeb edition)
Ar. *Pax*	Aristophanes, *Peace*
Aristid. *Or*. *a*.*b* D = *x*.*y* K	Aristides, *Orationes*, where *a* and *x* are the numbers of the oration and *b* and *y* are the section numbers in the editions of Dindorf and Keil respectively (with Behr also using the latter)
Arr. *Ind*.	Arrian, *Indica*
Ath. *Mitt*.	*Mitteilungen des kaiserlich deutschen archäologischen Instituts, athenische Abteilung*
Auson. *a* Gr. (*b*) = *x* P. (*y*)	Ausonius, where *a* and *x* are the page numbers of Green's and Peiper's editions respectively, and *b* and *y* are the epigram numbers
Auson. *Griph*.	Ausonius, *Griphus ternarii numeri*
Cass. Dio (*x*.*y* B)	Cassius Dio, where *x* is the volume number and *y* the page number in Boissevain's edition
Charisius, *Gramm*. (*x* K)	Charisius, *Ars grammatica*, where *x* is the page number of Keil's edition
Cic. *Ad Caes*. *Iun*.	Cicero, *Ad Caesarem Iuniorem*
Cic. *Consol*. fr. *x* OBH	Cicero, *De consolatione*, where *x* is the fragment number in the edition of Orelli, Baiter and Halm
Cic. *De consul*. fr. *x* B	Cicero, *De consulatu suo*, where *x* is the fragment number in the edition of Blänsdorf
Cic. *Parad*.	Cicero, *Paradoxa Stoicorum*
Cic. *Rab*. *perd*.	Cicero, *Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*

Cic. *Vat*.	Cicero, *In Vatinium*
Claud. *Gig*.	Claudian, *Gigantomachia*
De praenom.	*De praenominibus*
Din. *Dem*.	Dinarchus, *In Demosthenem*
Enn. *Ann*. *x* W	Ennius, *Annales*, where *x* is the line number in Warmington's edition
Enn. *Epigr*. *x* W	Ennius, *Epigrammata*, where *x* is the line number in Warmington's edition
Epigr. *Bob*.	*Epigrammata Bobiensia*
Eur. *Phaëthon* fr. *x*.*y* N^2	Euripides, *Phaëthon*, where *x* is the fragment number and *y* the line number in Nauck's second edition
Festus *x* L	Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatu* (including the epitome by Paulus Diaconus), where *x* is the page number of Lindsay's edition
Gran. Licin.	Granius Licinianus
Hes. fr. *x* MW	Hesiod, where *x* is the fragment number in the edition of Merkelbach and West (also provided in the Loeb edition)
Hom. *Hymn*	*Homeric Hymn*
Hyp. *Dem*.	Hyperides, *In Demosthenem*
Hyp. *Epit*.	Hyperides, *Epitaphios*
IErythrai	*Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*
Josephus, *AJ*	Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*
Josephus, *BJ*	Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*
Manil. *Astr*.	Manilius, *Astronomica*
Naev. *B Poen*. *x* W	Naevius, *Bellum Poenicum*, where *x* is the line number in Warmington's edition
Nep. fr. *x* W	Cornelius Nepos, where *x* is the fragment number in Winstedt's edition
Obseq.	Obsequens
OGIS	*Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*
OGR	*Origo Gentis Romanae*
OLD	*Oxford Latin Dictionary*
Philo, *Dec*.	Philo, *De decalogo*
Plaut. *Aul*.	Plautus, *Aulularia*

Plaut. *Pers*.	Plautus, *Persa*
Plut. *Cor*.	Plutarch, *Coriolanus*
Plut. *De cohib*. *ira*	Plutarch, *De cohibenda ira*
Plut. *De* Ei *ap*. *Delph*.	Plutarch, *De* Ei *apud Delphos*
Plut. *Dion*	Plutarch, *Dion*
Plut. *Publ*.	Plutarch, *Publicola*
Plut. *Reg*. *et imp*. *apophth*.	Plutarch, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*
Plut. *De se ips*. *citr*. *invid*. *laud*.	Plutarch, *De se ipsum citra invidiam laudando*
Pompon. Mela, *De chorogr*.	Pomponius Mela, *De chorographia*
Porph. *VP*	Porphyry, *Vita Pythagorae*
Ps.-Acro ad Hor. *Sat*.	Pseudo-Acro's commentary on Horace, *Satirae*
RG	*Res Gestae Divi Augusti*
RPC	*Roman Provincial Coinage*
[Sall.] *In Cic*.	[Sallust], *In Ciceronem*
Schol. *in Dem*. (*x* D)	*Scholia in Demosthenem*, where *x* is the page number of Dindorf's edition
Schol. *Veron*. *Aen*.	*Scholia Veronensia ad Vergilii Aeneidem*
Sen. *Brev*. *Vit*.	Seneca, *De brevitate vitae*
Sen. *Ira*	Seneca, *De ira*
[Sen.] *Oct*.	[Seneca], *Octavia*
Sen. *Troad*.	Seneca, *Troades*
Serv. *Aen*.	Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid* (including the *Scholia Danielis*)
Serv. *Ecl*.	Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*
Serv. *G*.	Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Georgics*
Tert. *De coron*. *mil*.	Tertullian, *De corona militis*
[Verg.] *Ciris*	[Virgil], *Ciris*
[Verg.] *Lydia*	[Virgil], *Lydia*
Zonar. (*x*.*y* D)	Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, where *x* is the volume number and *y* the page number in Dindorf's edition

Introduction

Stefan Weinstock's *Divus Julius* made the case that Iulius Caesar had been a great religious innovator and had laid the foundations of the Principate.[1] Although Weinstock's book is frequently referred to as a source of information and for discussion of certain points, his arguments have not gained much acceptance.[2] Weinstock does draw some dubious conclusions and the work is not without its errors and idiosyncrasies. It is highly unlikely, for instance, that Caesar attempted a coronation ceremony at the Lupercalia in 44 BC, and it is almost certainly wrong that his cult title was to be Iuppiter Iulius.[3] Nevertheless, the basic premise Weinstock presented was right. Caesar implemented a raft of measures through which he planned to establish a divine autocracy. These measures were closely followed by Octavian-Augustus to a considerable degree. His behaviour during the Triumviral Period is often contrasted with that during his principate but there is actually significant consistency. An example is the way in which he portrayed himself and his family members as fundamental to the state's well-being, much like the *pignora imperii* ('pledges of empire') cared for by the Vestals. He also anticipated his attainment of the chief pontificate with a number of major honours long before he came to acquire the priesthood. This does not mean that his actions were planned years in advance. What it shows, however, is that his intentions and general aims were consistent across a great span of time. More to the point, the debt he owed to his adoptive father went far beyond the terms of his will.[4] Numerous religious measures that helped to secure Augustus' principate had been pioneered by Caesar or inspired by him to some extent. It should be doubted whether Augustus would have succeeded as a ruler without Caesar's example. At the very least, the Principate would have taken a different form. As a consequence, Caesar can be justly called the founder of the Principate.

The first chapter of this thesis will examine Caesar's heavy influence on Augustus' claims to divinity. Caesar was the driving force behind his honours and not Cicero or the Senate as is often claimed. The honours were thus deliberately implemented with a view to creating a new form of one-man rule at Rome, one fusing Roman and Hellenistic elements. Augustus was likewise responsible for his main honorary measures. The theology behind Caesar's deification continued for Augustus. Worthiness of being worshipped as a god was based on being an outstanding benefactor, saviour and new founder of the state, being divinely favoured and associated with the gods, exhibiting virtuous conduct, and having a divine bloodline. Each of these points was present

[1] Weinstock 1971: *passim*, cf. 411-414.
[2] Cf. North 1975. Barnes (2009: 278) discusses the modern preference for Augustus being the first emperor (cf. Yavetz 1983: 10-56).
[3] See next chapter.
[4] It should be noted that when Caesar is referred to as Octavian-Augustus' adoptive father in this thesis, it is not meant to imply that the adoption was completely valid and legal in the way it occurred. It is merely an acknowledgment that Octavian succeeded in depicting it as such (cf. Lindsay 2009: 182-189).

under Caesar and utilised in a very similar fashion by Augustus. Indeed, he received many of the very same honours that Caesar had. Caesar foreshadowed Augustus in the links he formed with several deities and especially with personified virtues, which were prominent under Augustus.

The second chapter discusses the ways in which Augustus portrayed himself as a sacred father-figure upon whom Rome depended for its safety and success. Once again, this imitated Caesar and his plans as dictator. It was Caesar who first emphasised his Trojan ancestry and his chief pontificate as part of his authority. He cultivated ties to the Vestal Virgins in order to gain some of their positive associations. He became 'father of the fatherland' to help cast his hegemony in a positive light and make himself the focus of loyalty. Augustus did the same as his adoptive father in each case. Augustus did extend and build on the platform Caesar had left, particularly with his reforms of the compital cults and his identification of Gaius and Lucius Caesar with the Dioscuri, although even in those cases Caesar might have provided some inspiration.

Augustus' actions in the religious sphere indicate that he intentionally went about instituting one-man rule at Rome. Moreover, this rule was surely to be dynastic in nature. Not only would his own exceptional and divine status have inevitably made his relatives superior to others, but he also took many measures that directly and permanently augmented his family's standing. He developed the Palatine into an Augustan religious precinct centred on his home, where his close relatives also lived. Indeed, his family's hearth was virtually made the hearth of the state. Several members of the imperial family were identified with gods and linked to the cult of Vesta, including Livia. Even without considering Augustus' political initiatives to promote his relatives, it is difficult to see how they would not have a substantial advantage in succeeding to a similar position after his death. This would have been even more true after his official deification, which he evidently planned to occur after his death. Once again, Augustus took actions to this end over a long period of time, beginning in at least the mid-30s BC. The suggestion from some modern scholars that Augustus sought only to maintain stability at Rome and did not plan for a permanent autocracy does not accord with these facts.[5]

Two secondary points will be made during the course of this thesis. The first is that religion was vital to the positions of Caesar and Augustus. This may seem obvious but religion is often depreciated in comparison to politics and the military as a source of power. Even among those who acknowledge it as important, it often seems to be presented as a reaction to an individual's extraordinary status, a matter of prestige or as a buttress to power rather than an actual foundation of it. In truth, the religious measures enacted under Caesar and Augustus formed a pillar of their autocracy, just like their political prerogatives and their military might. The other secondary point that will be made is that the foreign influences evident in many of the religious measures were

[5] See below.

introduced from above by Caesar and Augustus and were actively adapted by them where necessary. It was not a case of the population becoming so Hellenised and 'contaminated' by foreign contact and migration that practices external to Rome, like ruler cult, had to be adopted in order for there to be viable government. This point supports the view put forward by various historians that Romans had always been receptive to outside influences, as long as they accorded with their own needs and circumstances.[6]

Sources

The sources for study of Roman religion are exceptionally diverse because of the extensive connections between religion and daily life in the Roman world. Literary sources are of course essential as they tend to provide the most explicit and detailed information but they are not without their problems. One must always consider the author's purpose and personal biases when using their work, as well as their sources and the circumstances under which they wrote. For instance, philosophical treatises featuring religious speculation, like Cicero's *De natura deorum*, are heavily influenced by Greek models and ideas and so they must be used with this in mind, although they are still of value and should not be dismissed completely.[7] Inscriptions are immensely important, providing information from a range of different contexts and generally being contemporary with their literary content. A large body of epigraphic material like the Arval Acta is especially significant for the detailed insights it provides into a specific cult over a period of time.[8] Coins are useful for their imagery and how this reflects upon the time during which they were minted, and the economic information that can be obtained from them illustrates trends and issues that are poorly represented in other sources. Archaeology holds a critical place in the study of Roman religion because it provides evidence that relates to all different parts of society, from the elite to the lowest classes, and from temples and large buildings to jewellery and figurines. It is therefore vital for forming a much fuller picture than would be possible from literary or other sources on their own. The haphazard and difficult nature of ancient source material in general means it is crucial for the modern historian to make use of all the relevant evidence available. Each type has its own strengths and weaknesses and can correct, confirm or contradict conclusions that could be made from other types of evidence on their own. Even so, it is inevitable that limitations will exist on the extent to which various issues can be understood, no matter how exhaustive or incisive the analysis.

This thesis places an emphasis on the importance and primacy of the ancient evidence. It has been taken as a fundamental principle that a worthy argument should always rest as much as

[6] See below.
[7] *Contra* Gradel 2002: 3.
[8] Rives 1998: 356; Gradel 2002: 18-22.

possible on the evidence available. Scholarly discussion that goes beyond the evidence can only be speculation and opinion, no matter how interesting, plausible or clever. A scarcity of quality evidence sometimes means that speculation can be unavoidable, and it may still be valuable as an exploration of possibilities. Nevertheless, it must inevitably rank below an argument that seeks support from the ancient sources. By no means does this suggest that the sources should always be accepted at face value and without question. On the contrary, all the evidence must be weighed critically and scrutinised in detail. Yet excessive scepticism or an assumption that some modern scholars can claim a special authority independent of the sources is no less dangerous than blind faith in ancient testimony.[9]

Another important reason for the focus in this thesis on the ancient evidence rather than modern historians' views is that the scholarship on topics related to Caesar and Augustus is so immense. To some degree, it has been sustained by scholars arguing among each other or elaborating on relatively minor points.[10] Ideas put forward decades ago are sometimes resurrected without new support and despite the fact that the weight of the evidence lies against them.[11] Such is the breadth and variety of modern opinion that some consider further writing on such topics as fruitless.[12] Although the existence of this thesis represents disagreement with that conclusion, there is little to be gained by engaging with the scholarship *en masse*. The main result of such an effort could only be to illustrate how wide-ranging and convoluted the modern debate has been. Moreover, it would not help to illuminate the argument presented here, where the available space is better utilised by concentrating on the sources from which all our knowledge comes and their implications for key historical issues. This is not to say that modern scholarship should be ignored.[13] In this thesis, select modern works are cited where they are relevant to understanding and interpreting the evidence or where the ideas they contain should be credited. Alternative views are debated and criticised where it is apt to do so.[14]

Some scholars have taken a very sceptical attitude to the ancient literary evidence, particularly the testimony of Cassius Dio, for Caesar's honours during his dictatorship. To some extent, this has been fuelled by Weinstock arguing for Dio's accuracy on certain points, particularly Caesar's cult name, when the evidence favours other conclusions. This was a major point of

---

[9] See below.
[10] Cf. Gradel 2002: 54.
[11] E.g. Koortbojian (2013) renews some of the arguments of Gesche (1968), despite problems raised decades ago (cf. Hamlyn 2011: 84).
[12] Cf. Yavetz 1983: 48, 50. In his first chapter of almost 50 pages, Yavetz gives a survey of some modern views of Caesar up to the time he was writing. He could easily have written a whole book on the matter if he had wished.
[13] *Contra* Gradel 2002: 54.
[14] For example, Cole's view of Cicero's role in promoting deification at Rome (Chapter 1), various scholars' proposals that Cicero voted honours to Caesar (Chapter 1), and Gradel's characterisation of the compital cults (Chapter 2). Where space does not permit proper discussion and criticism or where the point at issue is relatively minor, a reference may be provided simply to acknowledge that a noteworthy work offers a different position.

criticism in North's review of Weinstock's book and it has been used by sceptics as a way of discrediting or casting doubt on the wider arguments of Weinstock and on the information provided by Dio in general.[15] Such an attitude, however, was evident long before Weinstock's book was published and was even directed against other key sources. No less a scholar than Syme called an important passage in Cicero's *Second Philippic* 'difficult' despite it patently not being so.[16] This is obviously because he was unconvinced that Caesar was deified in his lifetime as Cicero attests.[17] There was a strong reluctance to countenance the idea of a cult of Caesar before his assassination, particularly among British historians.[18] Questioning the sources' veracity and accusing them of confusion was a large part of the defence of their stance. Such criticism of Dio and the other sources is often excessive or unwarranted, and avowed suspicion is hardly an improvement over naïve trust. One naturally needs to be wary of errors and carefully analyse Dio's evidence, as one should when employing any source. An appraisal of Dio's history shows that it can be viewed positively with respect to ancient standards, and statements of his that have had doubt cast on them generally have some substance, even when they are mistaken in part.

Cassius Dio's annalistic work contains a detailed and mostly complete account of the last years of the Republic and the early Principate, for which few contemporary sources have survived. Other written sources, such as Plutarch, Suetonius and Appian, either do not cover the whole period or do not provide as much specific information. Dio's history is thus invaluable and the chief source for many important topics. Nevertheless, the weaknesses of Dio's work have long been highlighted. He was concerned that he should write in a high style that would be worthy of the genre of history, emulating the likes of Thucydides and Demosthenes.[19] With this came a willingness to add rhetorical embellishment and stock imagery to material he judged in need of greater literary impact.[20] Dio composed speeches that he attributes to various figures that probably bear little resemblance to their actual words and instead accord with what he thought appropriate to his account.[21] The most obvious example of this is the 'Constitutional Debate' of Book 52. Another flaw is Dio's tendency to concentrate on the wider significance of events at the expense of precise details or of mentioning the events in their correct place in the chronological framework.[22] Various errors or omissions can be found in his narrative. For instance, he does not mention the Conference of Luca, he gives the extension of Caesar's command as three years rather than five,

[15] North 1975: 172-173.
[16] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110. Syme 1939: 54 n. 4.
[17] Syme 1939: 54-55.
[18] E.g. Adcock 1932: 718-722; Balsdon 1970: 62-64; Scullard 1982: 149.
[19] Cary 1914: xiv, xvii; Millar 1964: 40-43; Lewis and Reinhold 1990: 30; Dillon and Garland 2015: 778.
[20] Cary 1914: xiii-xiv.
[21] Cary 1914: xiv-xv; Lewis and Reinhold 1990: 30; Dillon and Garland 2015: 778.
[22] Cf. Cass. Dio 73(72).18.3. Cary 1914: xiii-xiv; Millar 1964: 42-43.

and he incorrectly states that Augustus was censor.[23] One should note, however, that Augustus did in fact exercise censorial powers.[24] Of course, no one is above committing mistakes. Even the most diligent of modern historians can blunder occasionally, despite all the advantages he possesses over his ancient counterparts. Furthermore, the expectations of an ancient audience were not the same as those of modern scholars. Dio's flaws as a historian would have been considered very differently at the time and are hardly more grievous than those found in even some of the best ancient writers.[25] They do not provide grounds for discrediting his work in general.

Cassius Dio had a number of strengths that made him highly qualified to be a political historian. As a prominent Roman senator of Greek background, he naturally had a good understanding of both cultures and languages, and his experience in politics and provincial administration is evident in his confident handling of such matters in his writing.[26] Dio appears to have used a variety of sources, including letters, other historians' works and emperors' memoirs.[27] By his own testimony, he was very thorough in his research, spending 10 years collecting materials for his history and reading virtually all that was available on the subject of the Romans.[28] He demonstrates an awareness of the biases and inaccuracies that could be propagated in his sources and he attempted to unravel the truth as best he could.[29] This has perhaps resulted in an inconsistent approach to certain topics where he tried to reconcile partisan contemporary reports.[30] The lead-up to Caesar's assassination is one example.[31] In any case, Dio was at least drawing on a range of materials stretching back close in time to the events he was relating. For all his flaws, Dio should be seen as a conscientious and intelligent historian.

The most serious criticisms levelled at Dio with respect to Caesar's honours have concerned his cult title and his priest. Dio states that Caesar's name as a deity was to be Iuppiter Iulius.[32] Cicero writes, however, that it was Divus Iulius.[33] Cicero's evidence is to be preferred, not only because he was a contemporary but because the same cult title was used when the *triumviri* re-established the cult in 42 BC, an occasion on which other measures from 44 BC were re-affirmed.[34] Moreover, Iuppiter Iulius should, strictly speaking, signify a manifestation of Iuppiter who had Caesar as his special concern, rather than that Caesar was now a Iuppiter-like god.[35] There are good

---

[23] Cass. Dio 39.33.3, 52.42.1.
[24] See Conclusion.
[25] Cf. Millar 1964: 72.
[26] Cary 1914: vii-x, xvi.
[27] Cary 1914: xv-xvi; Millar 1964: 34-38; Dillon and Garland 2015: 778.
[28] Cass. Dio fr. 1.2, 73(72).23.5.
[29] Cass. Dio fr. 1.2, 53.19.2-6. Cary 1914: xvi.
[30] Cary 1914: xvi.
[31] Cass. Dio 44.1, 44.3, 44.7.2, 44.9.1-2, 44.11.1, etc.
[32] Cass. Dio 44.6.4.
[33] Cic. *Phil.* 2.110.
[34] See Chapter 1.
[35] Cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.66.

reasons why the term 'Divus' should have been chosen, so the matter can hardly be in doubt.[36] Dio's text is in error. Several suggestions have been put forward as to how the mistake occurred. The Greek text Δία Ἰούλιον is close to how one would transliterate Divus Iulius and it is reasonable to think that there may be corruption.[37] After all, Dio was well aware that Caesar and the deified emperors were worshipped as *Divi*. An alternative theory is that Dio has been confused by the presence of another honour that linked Caesar to Iuppiter.[38] Indeed, he had close ties to the god during his dictatorship.[39] There are precedents for titles associating Zeus with rulers from the Hellenistic East and many of the honours that Caesar received had Hellenistic origins. This theory is thus quite plausible. Another suggestion is that Dio records 'Iuppiter Iulius' as being the cult title offered by the Senate but that it was rejected by Caesar.[40] Whatever the case, the mistake in the cult title does not constitute grounds for treating Dio's account of Caesar's honours as generally unreliable.

In the same section, Dio says that Caesar was to have a temple shared with Clementia and that M. Antonius was to be their priest, similar to the *flamen Dialis*. Weinstock believed that Dio is wrong to imply that the new *flamen* would serve both deities, as such a priest traditionally belonged to a single god and this did not change until later.[41] Dio might well be wrong here. If so, it was probably because he did not consider the technicality particularly important. In truth, few readers outside the scholarly domain would feel differently. On the other hand, the temple never eventuated in this form and one cannot rule out some religious innovation simply because it only occurred later. Furthermore, the idea that *flamines* served a single deity is misleading, despite being found in the likes of Cicero.[42] The *flamines* did, in fact, participate in rituals for other gods.[43] For instance, the *flamines maiores* sacrificed to Fides.[44] Therefore, one cannot be certain that Dio is mistaken here. This is especially the case because of the very close relationship between Caesar and Clementia, as shown by Appian and a coin-type of 44 BC.[45] Dio's comparison of Caesar's *flamen* with the *flamen Dialis* has also been disparaged.[46] Instead, comparison with the *flamen Quirinalis* has been thought more apt, not least because Caesar identified himself with Romulus.[47] Yet there is no doubt that the *flamen Divi Iulii* was to be ranked alongside the three *flamines*

---

[36] See Chapter 1.
[37] E.g. North 1975: 175; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.64, cf. 66.
[38] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.66-67.
[39] See Chapter 1.
[40] Gradel 2002: 70-71. This seems unlikely. One reason is that 'Iuppiter Iulius' was not a very suitable cult title, as mentioned above.
[41] Weinstock 1971: 309.
[42] E.g. Cic. *Leg*. 2.20. Vanggaard 1988: 105.
[43] Vanggaard 1988: 107-114.
[44] Livy 1.21.4.
[45] *RRC* no. 480/21; App. *B Civ*. 2.106. See Chapter 1.
[46] E.g. North 1975: 176.
[47] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.63.

maiores, as is clear from the testimony of Cicero.[48] The *flamonium Diale* was associated with various taboos that would have been highly undesirable, particularly for a man like Antonius.[49] These taboos were presumably the chief reason the priesthood had been left unoccupied for decades. Iuppiter's priest did, however, have special privileges similar to those of a magistrate. It would seem quite natural for Caesar's priest to be given the same privileges when one considers the new cult's obvious importance and especially Caesar's links with Iuppiter.[50] There is some circumstantial evidence in support of this.[51] Dio's mention of the *flamen Dialis* should not then be characterised as a silly blunder. It could well be justified. If it is wrong, it is only to the extent that Antonius' priesthood was akin to the *flamines maiores* in general rather than one in particular.

The major attacks on Dio's credibility for this topic, which have just been discussed, relate to one section of his text. As has been shown, this section does have problems but is not worthy of being dismissed out of hand. It might yet hint at some information not present elsewhere. Moreover, Dio is correct in stating that Caesar became a god with Antonius as his priest and that this priesthood was a *flamonium* in character. This section of Dio actually bears a strong resemblance to the evidence of Cicero, and both might derive from the senatorial decree.[52] Appian's description of the plans to depict Caesar and Clementia as clasping hands could also have come from the senatorial decree, since the temple was never constructed.[53] Appian appears to have used a good source for Antonius' funeral oration for Caesar too.[54] These are some of the reasons for believing that historians had access to information on Caesar's dictatorship from high-quality sources well into the Principate. Suetonius cites contemporary, albeit hostile, writers in his biography of Caesar.[55] Such biased writers are of questionable reliability but it strongly suggests that a wide range of material survived, as Dio seems to indicate too.[56]

It should be heavily stressed that a great deal of Dio's information regarding Caesar's honours is corroborated by key extant sources, including Caesar's famous contemporary, Cicero. There are even occasional references in the official coinage.[57] The most significant honours are recorded by writers besides Dio, namely Cicero, Suetonius and Appian, so that if Dio's text had never survived, there would still be sufficient evidence that Caesar had been deified during his lifetime. Many of the lesser honours are recorded only by Dio but this is by no means surprising

---

[48] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110. Cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.63.
[49] See Chapter 1.
[50] See Chapter 1.
[51] Weinstock 1971: 307-308.
[52] Gradel 2002: 69-70. Note also Bauman's argument (1981: 167-172) that there are traces of the terminology of senatorial decrees in Dio's mentions of certain grants of sacrosanctity.
[53] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.62 n. 56.
[54] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 351-352.
[55] E.g. Suet. *Iul*. 9.2, 49.1-3, 77.
[56] Cass. Dio 53.19.2. Cf. Gradel 2002: 69-70.
[57] See Appendix 1.

since he goes into far more detail than any other source. This does not mean that any of these should automatically be held as highly suspect, as some scholars have intimated. Some of them are inherently plausible. One example is the creation of a Temple of Concordia Nova and an annual festival of the goddess. This measure is mentioned only by Dio but it is thematically connected, by way of the Roman hero Camillus, to Caesar's distinction of receiving a special extra day of the *ludi Romani*, which is attested by Cicero.[58] Another example is that gladiatorial combats were to include a day in Caesar's honour.[59] Caesar apparently had a particular enthusiasm for gladiators, so the voting of such a privilege is quite credible.[60]

Some further examples from Cassius Dio's account of Caesar's honours can be used to illustrate that there is good reason to believe that he is broadly accurate, even where doubt has been cast on the details he provides. After the Battle of Thapsus in April 46, Caesar received a bronze statue on the Capitol, according to Dio.[61] This same statue seems to be mentioned by Servius in a different context, and Servius thus might have had a different source of information to Dio.[62] Dio says that the inscription on the statue described Caesar as a ἡμίθεος, while Servius quotes the inscription as *Caesari emitheo*. The case for the Greek term being used is strengthened by a supposed similar statue of Romulus, Caesar's alter ego, with an inscription in Greek.[63] Even though the evidence is quite clear here, several scholars have argued that some Latin word must have been used that Dio has not recorded. Weinstock, contrary to accusations that he had almost blind faith in Dio, suggested *Deo Caesari*, among other possibilities.[64] Gradel has argued for *Divo Caesari*.[65] Fishwick thought that the inscription called Caesar Romulus but that Dio had attributed it to the wrong statue.[66] There are no strong grounds for disbelieving Dio on this point or for adopting anything other than a straightforward interpretation of his words, especially since there is support from other sources. The only real question should be whether ἡμίθεος appeared in Greek script or was transliterated, although this is not particularly important compared to other issues.

Although Dio's value as a source is being defended here, one must always be alert to the possibility of slips and confusion, which do occur in some places. Indeed, in this thesis it is argued that Dio is misleading in linking Caesar's and Octavian's sacrosanctity to the plebeian tribunes and their privileges.[67] Nevertheless, it is quite understandable that Dio did this. The tribunes were the most common examples of male sacrosanctity, and Caesar and Octavian did receive some of the

---

[58] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110; Cass. Dio 44.4.5. See Chapter 1.
[59] Cass. Dio 44.6.2.
[60] Hamlyn 2011: 65-66.
[61] Cass. Dio 43.14.6, 43.21.2.
[62] Serv. *Ecl*. 9.47. Servius cites Baebius Macer, at least for the preceding part of the passage.
[63] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.54.2; cf. Plut. *Rom*. 24.3. Hamlyn 2011: 72 n. 192.
[64] Weinstock 1971: 53.
[65] Gradel 2002: 61-65.
[66] Fishwick 1975: 625-628; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.57, 59-60.
[67] See Chapter 2.

same rights as they had.[68] On such occasions, Dio can be criticised with respect to the strict technical implications of his wording. This, however, is not always the case. When mentioning Caesar's images, for instance, Dio seems to accurately distinguish between an ἄγαλμα, which would be the object of cult, and an ἀνδριάς or εἰκών, which would not.[69] This is an indication of his capacity for precise and faithful reporting of the facts.

If one accepts that Dio is generally reliable in conveying the information available to him on Caesar's dictatorship, the valid question remains as to whether Dio has perhaps transmitted falsifications invented by others. Since he includes so much detail compared to other sources, one could imagine that fabrications from a hostile source could, directly or indirectly, have been included by Dio in his account. For instance, the honours of having a son succeed to the chief pontificate and of having 'Imperator' as a heritable name might conceivably have been concocted by Octavian or his supporters to strengthen his position.[70] Although this is possible, such theories present their own problems, since they are used to undermine the facts as they are transmitted to us without offering any concrete evidence of their own. This being the case, the best way forward seems to be to acknowledge such possibilities and their implications but to cautiously accept the information. Where ancient evidence is weighed merely against suspicion, then the ancient evidence deserves not to be dismissed.[71] Some particular considerations favour this approach towards Caesar's honours. As mentioned above, a range of sources seem to have survived long after Caesar's death.[72] Dio showed an awareness of the hazards of dubious sources and expressed a tendency to believe in information that could be corroborated by other writers or by public records.[73] On this basis, he would surely have hesitated to uncritically include anything from suspect sources, at least without some other evidence. Caesar's honours must have been easier to verify than many sorts of information, since they were a subject of intense political interest and were enacted through official decrees of the Senate. Thus, it is perhaps less likely that falsifications on this topic would succeed in going undetected than they would otherwise. These points lack proof, however, just like the criticisms they seek to counter. As a result, uncertainty is sometimes inevitable with the current state of evidence.

---

[68] Dio might also have been led astray by the legal terminology of the senatorial decrees, where the punishments for violation of Caesar's or Octavian's sacrosanctity were perhaps laid down as being the same as for the tribunes (cf. Bauman 1981: 167-172).
[69] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.58-59, 61.
[70] Cf. Simpson 1998: 420. Incidentally, the latter honour is also mentioned by Suetonius (see Appendix 1).
[71] There are various instances where the ancient sources were eventually proved correct, despite such suspicion (e.g. Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.13).
[72] The same was probably true of sources for Octavian-Augustus' honours after he died, if the evaluations of his life in Tacitus (*Ann*. 1.9-10) are any indication.
[73] Cass. Dio 53.19.2.

Other literary sources could be analysed in a similar manner to Dio's history and would be found to have different strengths and weaknesses.[74] Indeed, as the foundation of most of our knowledge, evaluation of the ancient writers has long been a concern of scholars. It would be tedious and unnecessary to provide an assessment of each of the ancient historians, biographers and other authors who are important for a study of Roman religion, Caesar and Augustus. Although opinion on some points will naturally vary, the chief sources are generally well understood and are invaluable when used critically. Nevertheless, with the criticism of the empirico-positivist approach that once dominated modern historiography, there has come a tendency from some quarters to denigrate a focus on evidence as narrow-minded and lacking sophistication.[75] Instead, an emphasis on theory and interpretation is presented as superior. Such a view is unwarranted.[76] Moreover, it implies that the opinion of modern scholars can have authority and insight that takes precedence over the testimony of the sources.[77] This can serve as a refuge against criticism: if the conclusions are mostly a matter of interpretation rather than particular evidence, then by their very nature they are more difficult to disprove, and the author can always charge detractors with not appreciating the nuances or intricacies of his theory and its application. This can especially be the case when the theory concerned derives from a figure with a strong following, such as Durkheim or Bourdieu.

The reaction against empirico-positivism has perhaps also helped to validate excessive scepticism towards ancient evidence as a means of attacking an argument, as was once common with respect to Caesar's deification in his lifetime.[78] Such is the nature of the ancient sources that it is easy to think of reasons why a particular statement could be wrong: an error, a misunderstanding, exaggeration, the invention of myth, literary embellishment, political invective, corruption in the manuscript tradition, and so on. Without doubt, there are instances where these things have occurred. Therefore, a certain level of scepticism is not only warranted but necessary. On the other hand, just because a statement cannot be proven or extensively corroborated does not mean that it is untrue. Dismissing all such material would be to ignore much that must be accurate.[79] There is also a dangerous temptation to resort to casting suspicion on the sources where their testimony does not suit one's own ideas. The number of possible theories and interpretations grows even larger if one is permitted to devalue the evidence, either in whole or in part, or to use it selectively. In any case, diverse approaches should generally be welcome in academia, and the traditional scholarship demonstrates, if nothing else, the tremendous contributions that have been made through evidence-based inquiry and a healthy level of caution.

---

[74] E.g. Duff 2003; Grant 2005.
[75] E.g. Phillips 1986: 2679, 2684, etc.; Phillips 2007: 11-12. See also 'Literature', below.
[76] See 'Literature', below.
[77] See also 'Literature', below.
[78] See above.
[79] Cf. Yavetz 1983: 56-57.

Literature

Roman religion emerged as a subject of serious modern study in the nineteenth century with the work of Hartung, published in 1836. In this period, it had been standard to conflate the Greek and Roman religions together, but Hartung differentiated the two and treated them as distinct entities.[80] The new perspective was swiftly adopted in subsequent literature. Certain attitudes already expressed in Hartung's research persisted in the most significant works of the following decades, and indeed they acquired such acceptance that they dominated the field well into the twentieth century. A brief summary cannot do justice to individuals' research or to the finer points but it can highlight the main elements. To understand Roman religion, it was deemed necessary to strip away the Greek and other foreign elements to reduce it to its pure native form, which existed at Rome's very beginnings. These archaic religious foundations appeared to consist of a simple primitive piety that was pragmatic and legalistic in nature, relying on ritual to address earthly rather than spiritual concerns. This early religion was supposedly very prosaic and lacked any sort of mythology or cosmological speculation like the Greeks had.[81] Foreign influences were thought to be at odds with the native religion and, in accordance with the idealised nature of its reconstruction, subsequent historical developments were considered in terms of decline and contamination. During the Republic, it was asserted that Roman religion grew increasingly cold, dreary and devoid of real religious sentiment or belief. The rituals became empty procedures and religion was more and more subject to manipulation by the elite for the sake of their own political interests.[82] Augustus revived the religion at a superficial level but it remained barren and moribund at its core. The populace were no longer able to satisfy their religious needs through the state religion and had to seek fulfilment elsewhere.

Roman religion was no longer simply assimilated to that of the Greeks but it was now contrasted against it in an effort to disentangle 'native' practices and beliefs, which were judged inferior in depth and imagination.[83] Moreover, the strong influence of Hegelian and other philosophical ideas on the leading German historians is readily apparent, especially in Mommsen.[84] These scholars operated under preconceived notions and prejudices as to what constituted a 'true' religion, namely one centred on intense personal emotion and belief.[85] They also believed that

[80] Rose 1934: 34; Scheid 1987: 304, 306-307; Bendlin 2000: 116; Scheid 2003: 6.
[81] Rose 1934: 35; Michels 1955: 25; Rose 1960: 165; Scheid 1987: 306-310; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.11; Rives 1998: 345; Bendlin 2000: 116; Scheid 2003: 5-8.
[82] Cf. Scheid 1987: 316-319; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.11; Rives 1998: 345; Bendlin 2000: 118.
[83] Rives 1998: 345; Phillips 2007: 11-12.
[84] E.g. Hartung 1836; Mommsen 1854-1856; Marquardt 1856; Wissowa 1912. Scheid 1987: 316-319; Rives 1998: 348; Bendlin 2000: 116-117; Scheid 2003: 5-6. The impact of Lutheranism is also evident.
[85] Rives 1998: 348; Bendlin 2000: 116-118.

religion, like the state, was a reflection of its people and their character.[86] This was used to explain the prosaic, practical and legalistic nature of Roman religion, as well as its close links to the political system. The apparent lack of genuine religious content as they conceived it and the Romans' emphasis on form also justified the antiquarian approach of these German and other historians, with their studies focussing on information related to rituals and institutions.[87] Indeed, their research privileged literary evidence to the exclusion of art, archaeology and other sources, and since most of this related to ritual and politics, it seemed to justify their negative pronouncements on the overall character of Roman religion.[88] Poetry, like art, was viewed as effectively foreign and thus excluded as well.[89] Little remained to suggest the presence of personal emotional experiences or deep connections to the divine. Treatises from the likes of Cicero furnished quotes to prove the elite's cynicism, which could be traced to Hellenistic philosophy, and the destruction of the original Roman piety.

Since Roman religion was viewed as being in perpetual decline and its later history disparaged, the principal works of research on the imperial period concentrated on the 'Oriental' or 'Eastern' cults, Cumont being the most prominent scholar in this area.[90] In their yearning for genuine religious experiences, people supposedly turned away from the lifeless and stagnant traditional practices to the worship of the Eastern deities, which foreshadowed the eventual triumph of Christianity over polytheism.[91] This focus was yet another symptom of the notions and prejudices that pervaded the scholarship. All the same, Cumont's work, particularly on the cult of Mithras, was meticulous and invaluable.[92] Ruler cult was an important topic of research for the imperial period but it was treated in political and not religious terms.[93] Emperor worship was portrayed as either being imposed from above as a political measure to encourage unity and demonstrate loyalty, or as being initiated from below as flattery and fawning to earn benefactions.[94] Little attention was given to regional differences, apart from the distinction between the Hellenistic East, long familiar with ruler cult, and the rest of the empire.[95] For Rome and Italy, moderate emperors avoided instituting direct worship of themselves, instead favouring cult towards the Genius.[96] Divinity was considered an absolute quality that a being either possessed or did not, and the question of whether worshippers believed an emperor to be actually divine was central to

[86] Bendlin 2000: 116-117; Rüpke 2011: 12-13.
[87] E.g. Mommsen 1854-1856; Marquardt 1856; Bouché-Leclercq 1871; Bouché-Leclercq 1886; Wissowa 1912; Latte 1960. Rives 1998: 348-349, 359.
[88] Rives 1998: 348, 356.
[89] Rives 1998: 345, 348.
[90] E.g. Cumont 1896-1899; Cumont 1906.
[91] Cf. Scheid 1987: 312, 316-319; Rives 1998: 345, 349-350; Scheid 2003: 5-6.
[92] Rose 1960: 166; Rives 1998: 356-357.
[93] E.g. Nock 1928; Nock 1930; Taylor 1931; Taeger 1957-1960; Weinstock 1971.
[94] Cf. Rives 1998: 345-346; Peppard 2011: 31, 37.
[95] Cf. Peppard 2011: 31.
[96] Cf. Peppard 2011: 31.

discussions.[97] Since ruler cult was concluded to be a political phenomenon, the answer to that question was overwhelmingly in the negative.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, a number of scholars, drawing from anthropology, began to make extensive use of comparative material in their studies.[98] Despite the different methodological approach, the fundamental attitudes prevalent in the field persisted in much of this research.[99] Tylor's theory of animism had a significant impact on many scholars, especially in Britain, and was used to account for the supposed primitivism and lack of sophistication seen in Roman religion. A posited pre-deist phase was thought crucial to understanding the Romans' religious practices, and thus the focus remained, as before, on their archaic origins.[100] Criticism and challenges to common assumptions did exist, most notably from the so-called Frankfurt School.[101] One example is Altheim, who denied that a pure religion native to Rome ever existed and believed foreign influences were important from the beginning.[102] The School was also exceptional for its use of archaeological evidence and its assertion that Rome did possess its own mythology. Nevertheless, these alternative views existed alongside the orthodoxy rather than managing to overturn it.

The next significant approach to Roman religion came from Dumézil, a comparative philologist influenced by British and French anthropology. He believed that, in addition to language, the Romans inherited a tri-functional ideology shared by other cultures of Indo-European origin.[103] He attempted to show that their religion, along with other aspects of their society, could be interpreted in terms of divisions corresponding to the concerns of priests, warriors and workers. Dumézil's research, like that of others before him, focusses on Rome's beginnings, presupposing that the archaic period was most crucial for understanding Roman religion. Contrary to the orthodoxy of the time, however, he did not dismiss Roman myth as foreign or derivative but considered it an important reflection of the community. Nor did he think Roman religion primitive or inherently inferior to the Eastern religions and Christianity. Comparativism's credibility within the field had been weakened because of the simplistic and overenthusiastic way it had often been employed. Dumézil's rigorous and sober analyses, however, demonstrated the value of

---

[97] Cf. Peppard 2011: 31, 35.
[98] Scheid 1987: 304-305, 310-311; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.13-14; Rives 1998: 349; Scheid 2003: 11-12; Phillips 2007: 20-21, 22-23.
[99] E.g. Usener 1896; Warde Fowler 1899; Frazer 1911-1915; Warde Fowler 1911; Deubner 1925; Rose 1926; Frazer 1929; Bailey 1932; Wagenvoort 1947; Rose 1948. It is worth noting that Frazer was one of the few who did not believe that Rome had no mythology of its own (cf. Rose 1960: 165).
[100] Cf. Michels 1955: 25-26, 27-29.
[101] Cf. Rose 1934: 33; Michels 1955: 29-30; Scheid 1987: 305, 315; Scheid 2003: 12.
[102] Altheim 1938. Cf. Rose 1934: 36-39; Michels 1955: 26.
[103] Dumézil 1970. Cf. Michels 1955: 26-27, 30-34; Rose 1960: 170; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.14-16; Rives 1998: 349; Scheid 2003: 9-11.

comparative material when used appropriately.[104] His work has yielded considerable insight into particular festivals and topics, whether or not one accepts the conclusions he draws. Despite the strengths of his research and its positive impact on scholarship, his central argument regarding a tri-functional ideology cannot be supported. The gods and social organisation of Rome simply do not conform to the three categories he describes.[105] His work also shares several of the flaws present in much of the literature proceeding into the second half of the twentieth century.

The emphasis of traditional scholarship on the origins of Roman religion critically diminished the importance of historical developments and contemporary concerns, which were crudely characterised as degeneration. In essence, centuries of history were simplistically judged to represent a single negative process. Moreover, it is now accepted that there was never a pure version of Roman religion formed in isolation.[106] Rome was exposed to foreign influences from its earliest days and their reception should not be viewed as mere copying. Outside practices and beliefs were taken up because of some sort of attraction or need, and they were transformed into a new Roman form. It was thus a matter of adapting and not merely adopting aspects of other religions.[107] The nature of the evidence makes reconstructing archaic Roman religion exceptionally difficult in any case. For example, the authors of even the earliest written sources lived hundreds of years after this time and there are clear anachronisms and inventions in their works. It did not help that modern scholars up to this point, with a few exceptions, paid little or no attention to evidence from disciplines like archaeology, which is crucial for the remote past. The roots of many of faults of the traditional scholarship lie with the negative conceptions of Roman religion, which in turn were a result of the biases common among the historians of the period.

A significant shift in attitudes towards Roman religion occurred from the 1970s as these negative conceptions and biases came under increasing attack. Three of the most prominent figures driving the shift were North, Beard and Price. The new approach was influenced by developments in anthropology and social theory, and it involved a much more comprehensive treatment of the available evidence than was typical earlier.[108] Religion was now considered in terms of its social function rather than its individual participants and their emotions. Religion and politics were asserted not to be independent concepts for the Romans but to be two aspects of the same sphere.[109] It was likewise argued that the criterion of belief should not be applied in scholarly analysis and that religious actions were what mattered.[110] The focus of modern historians on what people believed

[104] Scheid 1987: 305; Scheid 2003: 11.
[105] Rose 1960: 170; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.15.
[106] Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.12; Rives 1998: 353; Scheid 2003: 14.
[107] E.g. Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.79-98; Rives 1998: 354.
[108] E.g. Price 1984: 7-8. Cf. Rives 1998: 350, 357-358; Peppard 2011: 33-34.
[109] Cf. Rives 1998: 350; Bendlin 2000: 119; Peppard 2011: 33-34.
[110] Cf. Bendlin 2000: 119.

and how politics interacted and affected religion were, it was claimed, the result of 'Christianising' assumptions.[111] This is to say that historians were supposedly so conditioned by the Christian background of the Western world that they mistakenly sought to impose ideas on Roman religion that are simply not valid. The Romans' religious experiences and expectations were portrayed as being alien to our own.[112] The importance of belief was not eliminated entirely and a range of attitudes were argued to have been present across society.[113] Indeed, the excessive weight earlier placed on the apparent scepticism in Cicero, Varro and others was redressed as part of this shift in the scholarship.[114] The notion that the aristocracy cynically manipulated religion was overturned in favour of the view that they continually regarded it as highly important, even in the Late Republic.[115] Furthermore, Roman religion was no longer presented as stagnant and sterile. Instead, it was dynamic and showed a great capacity to adapt.[116] Foreign influences were not a sign of contamination or decline but a reflection of the relative openness of Roman society more generally. Rather than being fixed and dependent on its origins, a ritual's significance changed according to contemporary concerns and circumstances, and the ritual itself could change.[117] The Romans' mythology was acknowledged as being their own and, together with poetry, was seriously studied for the valuable insights it offered with regards to religion.[118]

The new approach was also applied to the imperial cult. Taking inspiration as it did from sociology, emperor worship was now interpreted as a means of conceptualising and responding to the ruler's power and ability to bestow benefactions. As such, it was portrayed as a genuine religious development.[119] The importance of the local elites in ruler cult was highlighted, as were the variations among different locations.[120] This directly contradicted the old orthodoxy and its characterisation of ruler cult as being primarily imposed from the centre and having broad consistencies across large areas. Similarly, the issue of whether worshippers believed the emperor to be a god was considered a false one. The conclusion offered was that the emperor's status was ambiguous and that this was reflected in the details of the cult.[121] It was also argued that direct worship of the living emperor did exist within Italy.[122] Such ideas were perhaps taken furthest by

---

[111] Beard 1980: 203; Price 1984: 10-14; Phillips 1986: 2680, 2767-2769; Rives 1998: 359; Gradel 2002: 3, 4-6, etc.; Peppard 2011: 33; Levene 2012: 42 n. 1. Cf. Bendlin 2000: 119-120.
[112] This argument was in fact earlier presented by Wissowa (Bendlin 2000: 117-118).
[113] Price 1980: 43.
[114] Peppard 2011: 33.
[115] Beard 1980: 204; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.104-108, 114-140.
[116] North 1976; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.61-72, 79-87.
[117] Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.7-8, 48. Cf. Bendlin 2000: 119.
[118] E.g. Bremmer and Horsfall 1987; Feeney 1998. Cf. Rives 1998: 359; Phillips 2007: 26.
[119] E.g. Price 1984. Cf. Rives 1998: 351; Peppard 2011: 38.
[120] Price 1984. Cf. Rives 1998: 352-356.
[121] Price 1980. Cf. Peppard 2011: 34-36.
[122] Price 1980: 34. Cf. Peppard 2011: 39, 43.

Gradel.[123] He argued that gods were only worshipped as such because of their great power and benefactions, and that divinity was a matter of relative status rather than nature. In addition, he contended that cult towards individuals was not alien to Republican Rome, although the evidence he cites is unpersuasive.[124]

There has been criticism of the new approach to Roman religion but it has been employed by other scholars, with variations and adjustments.[125] For example, Scheid and Rüpke each focus on ritual over personal beliefs, with the former stressing the importance of orthopraxy and the lack of any dogma, while the latter chooses to interpret ritual as a means of communication.[126] Both warn against 'Christianising' assumptions and characterise Roman religion as collective in nature and embedded in Roman society.[127] Ando argues that problems arise in the interpretation of Roman religion not through the impact of Christianity but of neo-Platonism.[128] He also employs social theory to assert that imperial cult was a form of communication and consensus between the centre and the peripheries of the empire.[129] Other scholars deviate more significantly, to the extent that they advocate an alternative approach. Alföldy asserts that the issue of belief must be considered in analyses and that emperor worship was in fact the most important part of Roman religion during the Principate, with the emperor genuinely thought by many to be a god.[130] Bendlin criticises what he aptly calls the 'new orthodoxy' established by Price and others for failing to account for various features of Roman religion and in fact paralleling the conclusions of the old orthodoxy.[131] He too maintains that belief and religion need to be restored as concepts independent of ritual, society and politics. Thus he proposes a market model for Roman religion, where different cults competed with each other for worshippers.[132] Such views mark a push to consider personal perspectives and emotions once more, redressing the focus on the collective in recent scholarship.[133]

The sociologically-inspired approach goes too far and evades problems in the traditional scholarship rather than really addressing them. It portrays the inhabitants of the Roman empire as fundamentally different in their psychology and feelings to modern peoples.[134] This is simply not

---

[123] Gradel 2002; cf. Peppard 2011: 36.
[124] *Contra* Gradel 2002: 27-53. E.g. there is no good reason to think that references in Plautus to divine honours (e.g. *Asin*. 712-713, *Capt*. 860-865, *Cas*. 230, 331, 406-408, 801, *Pers*. 99-100, *Pseud*. 326-329) show that cult towards living people was part of Roman culture (*contra* Gradel 2002: 44-53). Even if similar material did not appear in Plautus' models, it would hardly be surprising for the playwright to insert them himself as allusions to Greek practice. This would be partly to ridicule his characters, since the situations generally invert the normal social order, and partly to make fun of a custom that would have struck many Romans as odd or excessive.
[125] Cf. Bendlin 2000: 123.
[126] E.g. Scheid 2003: 18-20; Rüpke 2007: 87; Rüpke 2011: 22-29.
[127] Scheid 2003: 6, 18-20; Rüpke 2007: 5-15.
[128] Ando 2008: 21-42. Cf. Peppard 2011: 34.
[129] Ando 2000. Cf. Peppard 2011: 40.
[130] Alföldy 1996.
[131] Bendlin 2000.
[132] Cf. Stark 2006.
[133] Stevenson 1996; Mueller 2002: 19; King 2003. Cf. Rives 1998: 352; Ando 2009: 177.
[134] Cf. Bendlin 2000: 122.

plausible, amounting as it does to the depreciation of their humanity. Common sense would dictate that it is valid and desirable to consider individuals' sentiments and beliefs, and even if they are found not to be those widespread or familiar within the scholar's environment, it does not mean that they have to be explained by way of a distinct mental or emotional constitution any more than cultural differences are today. There is no reason to assume that ancient Romans could not distinguish religion from politics or earthly matters in general. With regards to divine honours, for example, several ancient writers separate these from secular honours.[135] Similarly, the characterisation of imperial cult as ambiguous or merely a response to a great disparity in power and status is inadequate, and the concept of divinity as an inherent quality should not be dismissed. Certainly, there was an awareness of supernatural beings within Roman religion, whether they be Iuppiter or lesser entities like the Lemures, and it is reasonable to question whether it was believed that the emperor possessed a supernatural aspect as well.

Biases and preconceptions were without doubt a serious problem in the traditional scholarship but it would be wrong to categorise them as assumptions derived from Christianity or neo-Platonism. To do so is to reduce thousands of years of history and intellectual discourse to virtual insignificance and to depict scholars' thinking, not to mention that of modern Western society, as static and homogeneous. To bring the roots of various biases closer to the present by identifying them with Protestantism or Schleiermacherian ideas is hardly any better, since it too depicts historians as being uniformly raised within and confined to these traditions.[136] In reality, prejudices and preconceived notions arise from a complex interaction of different factors, which vary from person to person. The impact of Protestant ideas or German philosophy certainly can be detected among several influential scholars. Modern notions of evolution and steady human advance across time are also important. This is especially evident in the theories expressed by the likes of the primitivists regarding the development of religion among human societies. The academic environment is another factor that influences bias within scholarship on Roman religion. Particular historians are frequently treated as being authoritative on a topic and such is their standing that their work directs the character of subsequent discourse, as well as shaping the way the subject is taught to students. Mommsen is an obvious example. Leading scholars can also affect the views of promising members of the next generation through mentoring and doctoral supervision. The degree to which this is the case is difficult to tell as like minds tend to come together. Nevertheless, it must be significant in some instances at least that so many notable scholars share the attitudes or approach of those under whom they studied. Thus the work of Cumont perhaps owes some of its substance to Usener and Mommsen, as does that of Wissowa to

[135] Cf. Stevenson 2003: 223; Wardle 2004: 127.
[136] *Contra* Bendlin 2000: 120.

Mommsen, Latte to Deubner, Deubner to Usener, Rose to Warde Fowler, Gradel to Price, and Price to North. Dissent from a favoured view may be actively discouraged, as occurred within the context of Anglo-German rivalry, although this would hopefully not be the case nowadays.[137] The list of possible factors that can contribute to bias and attitudes, whether positive or negative, could go on and on. The goal then is not so much to eliminate bias but to be able to identify it and understand it accurately, thereby being able to account for it and reduce its detrimental effects as much as practicable.

In analyses of scholarship on Roman religion, reference is sometimes made to the empirico-positivist approach and its alleged weakness compared to approaches that rely on theory.[138] It is supposed that much of the research within traditional scholarship, like that of Wissowa, was overly concerned with matters of fact and was deficient in interpretation. Despite the antiquarian focus of such work, this is not a fair appraisal. Indeed, the criticisms levelled at the old orthodoxy principally relate to the interpretations of Roman religion that permeate it. An example is the assertion that Roman religion was in decline from the Middle Republic, becoming cold and dreary and subject to political exploitation. An historian's objective should be to explain and seek the greater significance behind one's topic, but the adoption of large-scale theories and models is not necessary or inherently superior, despite what is implied. The privileging of theory among some scholars seems to rest on the belief that it carries a certain authority or scientific validity, thus raising their research above that produced by the typical 'theory-challenged classicist'.[139] Yet models are often imperfect when used in science to explain physical problems, and so can hardly claim to be more than a guideline in analyses of complicated phenomena founded on human behaviour. Scholarship can also risk becoming too focussed on theories rather than the evidence, with excessive discussion of semantics and definitions obfuscating the point that ancient history faces immense challenges in even uncovering enough information to form a limited understanding of complex issues. Theory can undeniably be of great value and it is worthwhile for scholars to educate themselves about ideas from disciplines like anthropology to become acquainted with different approaches and perspectives. At the same time, it is important to form conclusions that are rooted in evidence and not assumptions and ideology. Theory can introduce its own preconceptions and difficulties in addition to those of personal notions and bias, which are an inevitable result of being one's own person and living in a different age and culture. Therefore, historical analysis should consider the ancient evidence first and foremost, with the scholar's approach judged on its own merits, whether or not it employs theories from sociology, anthropology or elsewhere.

---

[137] Phillips 2007: 21.
[138] E.g. Phillips 1986: 2679, 2684, etc.; Phillips 2007: 11-12.
[139] Cf. White 1973 and the previous note.

An important challenge to traditional views that has occurred relatively recently concerns whether Augustus planned to establish the Principate. For a great deal of time, it was generally accepted as fact that he did set out to replace the Republic with his own leadership, to be inherited by his chosen heir.[140] There are solid points to support this position. Augustus undeniably possessed control of the Roman empire. Exceptional honours and monuments glorified him above all others and in practical terms his power was unassailable because he was the only one with sufficient wealth to pay the armies.[141] He made conspicuous efforts to promote his young relatives, such as Marcellus and Gaius and Lucius Caesar, and clearly wished for them to occupy important positions within the state.[142] The likes of Tacitus and Cassius Dio had no doubt as to what Augustus' intentions had been.[143] This is not to say that scholars who espoused this view characterised his power as a dictatorship.[144] They did not equivocate, however, as to the reality of his power and whether he ever planned to let the Republic return in its true form.

It has since been argued that Augustus never intended to establish the Principate as a formal dynastic system.[145] Augustus explicitly states in his *Res Gestae* that his superiority stemmed from his *auctoritas* more than formal legal powers.[146] He was not in complete command of every aspect of the state and had to adapt and react to changing conditions. For example, Augustus had to avoid occupying one of the consular positions so as not to rile senators wishing to attain the magistracy.[147] He made a conscious effort in 23 BC to show he was not engineering the succession of Marcellus to leadership of the state, going so far as to reveal his will in the Senate House.[148] Those who hold this point of view propose that Augustus was not setting out to be the first in a line of emperors but they do not deny that he was trying to leave Rome in safe hands. Augustus, it is argued, was in the difficult position of maintaining stability in the state and ensuring that it would not fall again into civil unrest while also avoiding so much as even the appearance of hereditary rule. The *tribunicia potestas* was the means he chose to symbolise his authority and to discreetly designate the next guardian of Rome's government, who was ultimately Tiberius.[149] As persuasive as the argument may be in political terms, it encounters difficulties when one considers Augustus and his family in terms of religion. Augustus was extensively worshipped as a god outside Rome. Within Rome, monuments like the Ara Pacis and measures like the transformed compital cults made him a figure of singular religious significance. This sheds light on Augustus' apparent political intentions and

[140] Cf. Galinsky 2005: 2; Eder 2005: 16; Stevenson 2013: 118.
[141] Cf. *RG* 34. Crook 1970: 113-115. Cf. Eder 2005: 22-23, 29; Gruen 2005: 34-35.
[142] Gruen 2005: 43-48.
[143] E.g. Tac. *Ann*. 1.1-3, 3.28; Cass. Dio 52.40.2.
[144] Eder 2005: 16.
[145] E.g. Gruen 2005: 33-51; Eck 2007: 148-150; Judge 2012: 2-7. Cf. Stevenson 2013: 118.
[146] *RG* 34. Eder 2005: 14.
[147] Cass. Dio 53.32.3. Eder 2005: 25; Gruen 2005: 36.
[148] Cass. Dio 53.30-31. Eder 2005: 25; Gruen 2005: 38.
[149] Gruen 2005: 36-41.

strongly indicates that his personal aspirations extended beyond stable government for Rome and were more elaborate and grandiose.

Even amongst those scholars who do not contest Augustus' plans to establish the Principate, there is a misleading emphasis on his supposed restraint and moderation. This accords with the image Augustus wanted to project, as is clear from the *Res Gestae*. It is with such an attitude that Augustus is argued to have proved himself different to Caesar.[150] The absence of a push to institute a public cult towards himself in Rome is the most frequently cited instance but there are many others. Some examples include: his alleged limiting of his association with Iuppiter; his refusal to have the Pantheon as a monument to own divinity; his joke about the growth of a palm on his altar in Spain; and the lack of mention of his divine honours in the *Res Gestae*, apart from his inclusion in the Salian Hymn.[151] Similarly, the cult of the *Lares Augusti* has been described as 'unobjectionable', and the laurels, oak-wreath and golden *clipeus virtutis* he received in 27 BC as 'modest and simple honours in the old Roman tradition'.[152] All this, however, is very selective and unbalanced.

Counterpoints can be raised to any proposed reluctance or restraint on Augustus' part. He hardly limited his identification and furthered it by many of his own actions, such as his visits to the Temple of Iuppiter Tonans, which he founded and built.[153] His statue appeared at the entrance of the Pantheon, and those of his forebears, Divus Iulius and Venus, were included among the gods.[154] The monument still served as an advertisement of his superhuman nature. Just as significantly, Augustus declining the more obvious promotion of his personal divinity was made public, plainly on purpose. Augustus' joke that the growth of a palm on his altar meant that his worship was not performed very often does not necessarily indicate that he did not care for his cult. Indeed, the more obvious interpretation would be that it was something of a rebuke.[155] There certainly is mention of other extraordinary honours suitable for ruler cult in the *Res Gestae*. These include quadrennial games for his welfare, his sacrosanctity, libations performed for him at feasts, and a festival named after him.[156] Statements that ignore or contradict these points, like those above, do not appreciate how much they contributed to Augustus' portrayal as a sacred father-figure upon whom Rome's safety and prosperity depended. The descriptions of the compital cults and honorary measures of 27 BC mentioned above are wrong for the same reason.[157] The *clipeus virtutis*, for instance, had clear implications of divinity and was thus far from modest. This is not to deny that

[150] E.g. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.72, 83; Levick 2009: 211-212.
[151] Taylor 1931: 166-167, 236; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.83; Galinsky 1996: 318.
[152] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.85; Zanker 1988: 92; cf. Yavetz 1983: 42.
[153] See next chapter.
[154] Cass. Dio 53.27.2-3.
[155] Quint. *Inst*. 6.3.77.
[156] *RG* 9-11.
[157] See Chapter 2.

Augustus did show restraint in various ways. Such behaviour, however, consisted of calculated gestures designed to minimise opposition to his dominance. At the same time, he implemented numerous measures over a long period of time to reinforce that dominance and to extend it across his close family. The real difference between Augustus and Caesar is that the former was far more successful in managing how he was perceived, a success that persists to the present day.

Among many scholars, even ones who focus on religion, there can be detected a tendency to downplay the importance of religious measures related to Octavian-Augustus. Two examples concerning the *Lares Augusti* and the honours of 27 BC have been mentioned above. The lack of attention given in much of the scholarship to Augustus' chief pontificate, despite its immense importance, appears to be another symptom of this.[158] In general, historians who propagate the image of Augustus' restraint and moderation implicitly depreciate the religious aspects of his principate. This is also true of those who do not believe he was attempting to establish a permanent autocracy. Ruler cult is not typically considered to form part of the foundation of Augustus' position, except inasmuch as it was a 'political necessity'.[159]

The 'new orthodoxy' did view ruler cult as genuinely religious but in the sense that it was a reaction to the *princeps*' incredible power and status. As a result, this interpretation minimises the contribution that belief in Augustus' divinity might have made to that power and status in the first place. Certainly, in the more general literature on Augustus, the focus is usually on his financial and military resources and his political and legal prerogatives.[160] These are presented as the foremost reasons for his autocracy. Yet Augustus' actions in the religious sphere, and those of Caesar, are a testament to its significance. Indeed, religion should be considered to have provided crucial building blocks in the construction of the Principate.

[158] Cf. Bowersock 1990: 381.
[159] E.g. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.83; cf. Liebeschuetz 1979: 68, 75-79.
[160] E.g. Scullard 1982: 211; Yavetz 1983: 15-16; Eck 2007: 148-150; cf. Stevenson 2013: 120.

Chapter 1: Augustus' Divinity

In many scholars' minds, Augustus' divine claims as *princeps* were distinct in key ways from those of Caesar and even himself as Octavian during the Triumviral Period. In particular, Augustus rejected outright worship in Rome during his lifetime and supposedly exhibited marked restraint and moderation in his behaviour. This is often considered clear evidence of a break from the policies of his adoptive father, Caesar. Yet Augustus closely followed Caesar in numerous ways. He extensively associated himself with certain gods and goddesses, much as Caesar did. In some cases, like that of Mars and Romulus, Augustus was directly imitating Caesar and continuing his plans. Augustus also resembled Caesar in his close ties to deified virtues such as Fortuna and Concordia, with the attachment of a personal epithet to the goddesses' names being adopted after Caesar's example. Augustus did not institute a public cult of himself at Rome while he was alive but he received extraordinary honours that raised him to a god-like status. He was portrayed as a saviour, new founder and descendant of a deity, just as Caesar was. Moreover, he was prolifically worshipped outside Rome. The differences between the approaches of Augustus and Caesar to their own divinity were only as great as was necessary for Augustus to avoid substantial opposition to his rule. The actions of Caesar and Augustus demonstrate that their divine associations were very much deliberately promoted by themselves. Despite what is often claimed, neither Cicero nor the Senate in general were responsible for the honorary measures of Caesar's dictatorship. This is important for showing that the Principate was intentionally established and was not created as a reaction to ongoing political instability. Eastern influence on ruler cult at Rome is obvious and has long been acknowledged, although the details have been the subject of extensive discussion and debate. The fact that ruler cult was introduced to Rome by powerful figures actively adapting foreign practices means that it should not be seen as inevitable or imposed by Rome's contact with the Hellenistic kingdoms.

Divine Honours at Rome before Caesar

There was not a native Roman or Italian tradition of conferring divine honours on living people in either public or private cult.[1] Cult was routinely paid to the Genius of the *pater familias* by his household but the Genius was considered a separate divine entity and this did not constitute worship of the man himself.[2] Romans did worship the dead, who were collectively referred to as

[1] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.51-55.
[2] See next chapter.

the *Di Manes* or *Divi parentes*.[3] The chief occasions for their cult were the Parentalia and Feralia.[4] The Lares were possibly deified ancestors originally, in which case they would be another example of posthumous worship in Roman religion.[5] One might expect Romans to have worshipped Romulus, Rome's founder, yet he does not appear to have been considered a god until the Middle Republic and only then under Greek influence.[6] The earliest testimony is from Ennius, who might have been inspired by Greek custom and the ideas of Euhemerus, whom he translated into Latin.[7] At any rate, Rome was becoming more and more exposed to Greek culture at this time. By the first century BC, the story of Romulus' apotheosis had gained widespread acceptance.[8] Instead of being worshipped directly, Romulus was identified with the god Quirinus. Similarly, Aeneas received cult as Iuppiter Indiges at Lavinium.[9] Attempts to show that the cult dates back to the fifth century BC lack decisive evidence, and even if it did exist at that time, its establishment was probably due to Greek influence in the region. That such influence was already significant at this early date is demonstrated by an archaic inscription referring to the Dioscuri.[10] The *gens Iulia* seem to have worshipped Vediovis as the deified Iulus-Ascanius but once again the clan's cult of their mythical ancestor probably began in the second century BC, when Greek ideas and practices had become familiar at Rome.[11] Therefore, while it was part of Roman custom to worship mortals after their deaths, even some posthumous cults developed only after contact with Greek and Hellenistic culture.

There were examples in the Late Republic that indicate that the idea of honouring living men as divine was gaining some sort of foothold at Rome. In gratitude for Marius' elimination of the Cimbri threat in 101 BC, people offered food and libations to him in their homes as they would to a god.[12] There were Greek precedents for this, though the household cult itself was of course a customary part of Roman religion.[13] In *c*. 85 BC, offerings were made to statues of Marius

---

[3] E.g. Cic. *Leg*. 2.22; Plut. *Quaest. Rom*. 14 (*Mor*. 267 B); August. *De civ. D*. 8.26. Weinstock 1971: 291. It is to this practice that Cornelia refers in a supposed letter to her son, C. Gracchus (Nep. fr. 2 W). Scullard 1981: 74-75.
[4] Varro, *Ling*. 6.13; Ov. *Fast*. 2.533-570; Festus 75 L. Scullard 1981: 74-75.
[5] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 291-292. This is perhaps reflected in the fact that the goddess involved in the Feralia was identified with the Lares' mother, and also that the Lares were honoured in the following festival of the Caristia (Ov. *Fast*. 2.571-634).
[6] Bremmer and Horsfall 1987: 45-46; cf. Weinstock 1971: 176-177.
[7] Enn. *Ann*. 63-64, 114-116 W; cf. Serv. *Aen*. 6.777.
[8] E.g. Cic. *Rep*. 2.20, *Leg*. 1.3, *Nat. D*. 2.62. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.53-54; cf. Weinstock 1960: 118; Weinstock 1971: 176-177; Bremmer and Horsfall 1987: 45-46.
[9] E.g. Livy 1.2.6; Verg. *Aen*. 12.794-795; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.64.4-5; Ov. *Met*. 14.581-608; Festus 94 L; Solin. 2.15; *OGR* 14.2-4; Serv. *Aen*. 1.259, 12.794; cf. Diod. Sic. 7.5.2; *ILS* 63. Weinstock 1971: 10; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.51-52; Hamlyn 2011: 58-59.
[10] Weinstock 1960: 112.
[11] JULIAN CULT OF VEDIOVIS AT BOVILLAE: *ILS* 2988 = *ILLRP* 270. Cf. Tac. *Ann*. 2.41, 15.23. Weinstock 1971: 8-12; Hamlyn 2011: 58-60.
[12] Val. Max. 8.15.7; Plut. *Mar*. 27.5.
[13] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 295.

Gratidianus that had been spontaneously erected across the *vici* of Rome.[14] This was the means by which the populace chose to express thanks for a measure enacted in his praetorship. These actions appear to have been inspired by the cults of the Lares at the crossroads rather than any particular Hellenistic practice.[15] Yet the fact that he was a living man and simply a *praetor* at the time strongly suggests that increasing Eastern influence played a fundamental role in the decision to use honours traditionally reserved for deities. In Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms, relatively minor benefactions could result in divine honours for individuals of comparatively modest status, as occurred here. There had been no such precedent or trend at Rome. The popular veneration of the Gracchi in *c*. 121 BC, similar to that of Gratidianus, was itself a significant departure from tradition.[16] Although posthumous, a Roman practice for worshipping deities had instead been used to honour recent political figures who had acted as benefactors. Therefore, these incidents are probably a symptom of the cultural exchange that had always existed at Rome but was only now having a noticeable impact with respect to divine honours. If the People were indeed adapting native religious customs to accord with the Hellenistic practice of ἰσόθεοι τιμαί, then the ideas behind it were being absorbed into the popular consciousness to some degree. In other words, Greek habits were being interpreted and not simply copied. Nevertheless, these incidents do not constitute firm evidence of a shift towards establishing public cults of living individuals at Rome. They were spontaneous and temporary actions from an unknown portion of the lower classes. They do not necessarily even indicate a widespread popular willingness to participate in divine honours for living people, since some resistance is evident at the end of the Republic.[17]

It has been argued that remarks of Lucretius and Cicero indicate a willingness to treat mortals as divine in the Late Republic.[18] Lucretius calls Epicurus a god in a line of *De rerum natura*, and on his return to Rome in 57 BC Cicero praised Cornelius Lentulus as a parent and god for helping to bring about his recall.[19] Neither case, however, demonstrates support for divine honours. Lucretius acknowledges elsewhere in his work that Epicurus, despite his genius, was a mortal man who is now dead and gone.[20] Moreover, Epicurus may deserve to be considered a god because of his intellectual achievements but one of these was his avowal that the worlds of humans and gods are completely separate.[21] Indeed, worship for human beings, whether alive or dead, was contrary to his school of philosophy.[22] One could assert that Epicureans were somewhat

[14] Cic. *Off*. 3.80; Sen. *Ira* 3.18.1; Plin. *HN* 33.132.
[15] See next chapter.
[16] See next chapter.
[17] See below.
[18] E.g. Weinstock 1971: 292-293; Gradel 2002: 52.
[19] EPICURUS: Lucr. 5.8, cf. 3.15, 6.7. LENTULUS: Cic. *Red. sen*. 8, *Red. pop*. 11, *Sest*. 144.
[20] Lucr. 1.66, 3.1042-1044.
[21] E.g. Lucr. 1.44-49, 2.167-181, 1090-1104, 5.82-90. Gale 1994: 79-80.
[22] E.g. Cic. *Nat. D*. 1.38, cf. 1.44. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 288, 290-291.

hypocritical on this point.[23] Epicurus was idolised by his followers long after his death, and he himself left orders in his will for measures that resemble divine honours.[24] Thus Lucretius' words could yet be considered part of the Greek tradition of viewing famous philosophers as divine on account of their wisdom and virtue.[25] Even if one follows this interpretation, *De rerum natura* is of limited value for determining contemporary attitudes towards divine honours at Rome. It serves as an exposition of Epicurus' school of Greek philosophy rather than a reflection of Roman culture and beliefs.[26] Greek philosophy did attract the interest of some Romans among the upper-classes in the Late Republic but one should not overstate its influence on Roman society, and there were of course competing schools and beliefs.[27]

Cicero used extravagant and effusive language in paying tribute to a key supporter in Lentulus but he made no assertion that he was actually divine or superhuman in any way. More importantly, Cicero made no move to treat him as such, neither offering cult to Lentulus nor proposing any divine honours. His expressions of thanks to the Senate and individuals like P. Sestius were hardly less ardent than those to Lentulus.[28] He even stated that he ought to worship the senators collectively as gods.[29] Cicero's use of the words *deus* and *parens* with respect to Lentulus can be attributed to the intense emotion he evidently felt on his return, having been forced into exile by his arch-enemy, Clodius. They were intended to reflect the depth of his gratitude, not to be taken literally. In fact, Cicero made much of his own importance in the speeches he gave to the Senate and People on his return. As on so many other occasions, he explicitly portrayed himself as a figure essential to the Republic's existence and as its saviour for suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy.[30] He averred that a chief motive for Lentulus aiding him was his patriotism and sense of duty to the fatherland, so essential was Cicero to its safety.[31] As a consequence, he effectively paid tribute to himself as much as anyone else. Therefore, these particular statements of Lucretius and Cicero offer little insight into the sort of opinions concerning divine honours that may have been prevalent at Rome at this time.

Cicero does provide useful evidence for his own attitudes towards this topic elsewhere. He demonstrates a readiness to consider divine honours as legitimate under certain circumstances. This has important implications for how he wished himself to be viewed and treated. Cicero adopted the stance that statesmen of great virtue who had rendered exceptional service to their country were

---

[23] Cf. Cic. *Fin*. 2.99-103; Plin. *HN* 35.5.
[24] Diog. Laert. 10.18, cf. 6.101; cf. Philodemus, *Anth. Pal*. 11.44; Ath. 7.298 D. See also the previous note.
[25] Cf. Gale 1994: 192.
[26] Cf. Warren 2007: 19.
[27] Cf. Cic. *Fin*. 1.1, *Tusc*. 1.5-6, *Nat. D*. 1.7-8, *Off*. 2.2. Weinstock 1971: 2-3; Jocelyn 1977: 323-366.
[28] E.g. Cic. *Red. sen*. 1-3, 20, 30, *Red. pop*. 15, *Sest*. 144, *Planc*. 25, cf. 95.
[29] Cic. *Red. sen*. 30, cf. *Red. pop*. 18, 25.
[30] Cic. *Red. sen*. 4, 12, 24-25, 26, 27-28, 29, *Red. pop*. 5, 11, 16, 17, 21, *Sest*. 38, 49, 129, 145.
[31] Cic. *Red. sen*. 8, 24, *Red. pop*. 11, cf. *Sest*. 32-33, 129.

worthy of being thought divine and ranked among the gods, even at Rome. He principally referred to Romulus in this regard but included others like Camillus, Scipio Africanus, Scipio Aemilianus and Marius.[32] Cicero was undoubtedly drawing on Greek philosophy and ideas, as would be natural given his education and intellectual pursuits. For example, he quoted Ennius with regards to the divinity of Romulus and Scipio Africanus, and one of his arguments in favour of divine honours resembles Euhemerus' assertion that the Olympians were originally mortal kings and their family.[33] Plato was a strong influence, as is evident from the *De re publica* and *De legibus*, and Cicero's opinion recalls a passage where Socrates is portrayed as advocating divine honours for those who acted as guardians of the state.[34] Moreover, Cicero's view that saving the state was akin to re-founding it and deserved veneration was shared with Hellenistic ruler-cult, as was his emphasis on virtue.[35] Thus Greek influence was a significant factor in Cicero's stance towards divine honours.[36] This point is important when it comes to considering Cicero's place in the introduction of ruler cult to Rome.

A strong motivation for Cicero endorsing the divinity of great statesmen was that he thought he deserved to be ranked so highly himself. Most of the evidence for Cicero believing in the potential divinity of mortals, and certainly the strongest, dates to the Catilinarian conspiracy and afterwards. Cicero repeatedly claimed that he had saved Rome by foiling the plot, which would put him among Rome's leading figures who had earned recognition as divine, according to his own criteria.[37] He even compared himself to Romulus by asserting that the date on which the Catilinarians were condemned should be treated as Rome's new birthday, as though he had re-founded the city.[38] This recalled cult towards those hailed as σωτήρ ('saviour') and κτίστης ('founder') in the East. Moreover, he celebrated himself and his consulship in prose and epic poetry and he encouraged others to promote his achievements as well.[39] In *De consulatu suo*, he went so far as to say that Iuppiter had summoned him to the council of the gods and that Minerva had taught

---

[32] E.g. Cic. *Cat*. 3.2, *Sest*. 143, *Rep*. 1.64, 2.17, 6.13, 6.16, cf. 1.12, *Leg*. 2.19, cf. *Tusc*. 1.28-29, *Nat. D*. 2.62. MARIUS: e.g. Cic. *Rab. perd*. 29-30, cf. *Sest*. 50, *Prov. cons*. 32. Weinstock 1971: 179-180.

[33] ENNIUS AND ROMULUS: Cic. *Tusc*. 1.28. ENNIUS AND SCIPIO: Cic. *Tusc*. 5.49; Sen. *Ep*. 108.34; Lactant. *Div. inst*. 1.18.11-13. EUHEMERIST ARGUMENT: Cic. *Consol*. fr. 5 OBH (Lactant. *Div. inst*. 1.15.19-20), *Tusc*. 1.28-29.

[34] Pl. *Resp*. 7.540 B-C.

[35] See above.

[36] Cf. Cic. *Q Fr*. 1.1.28-29.

[37] E.g. Cic. *Cat*. 3.2-3, *Fam*. 5.2.7, *Dom*. 26, 72, *Sest*. 129, *Prov. cons*. 23, *Pis*. 6-7, *Rep*. 1.7, cf. *Leg*. 2.6, *Att*. 9.10.3. Furthermore, he resembles the person described in Plato's *Republic* (7.540 B-C) as deserving divine honours: one who studies philosophy, holds office to serve the state, and helps to educate those who would succeed him.

[38] Cic. *Flac*. 102, cf. *Cat*. 3.2, *Att*. 1.19.6, *Red. sen*. 12, *Fam*. 1.9.12; cf. Brutus ap. Cic. *Ad Brut*. 1.17.1; Cass. Dio 46.21.4. Cf. Cic. *De consul*. fr. 12 B ap. [Sall.] *In Cic*. 7; etc. Weinstock 1971: 189.

[39] CICERO'S LETTER TO POMPEIUS: see below. CICERO'S ACCOUNT OF HIS CONSULSHIP IN GREEK: Cic. *Att*. 1.19.10, 1.20.6, 2.1.1-2; Plut. *Crass*. 13.3, *Caes*. 8.3. CICERO'S POEM ON HIS CONSULSHIP: Cic. *Att*. 1.19.10, 2.3.4, *Div*. 1.17-22, *Off*. 1.77; [Sall.] *In Cic*. 5; Serv. *Ecl*. 8.105; *Schol. Bob*. 165.7-9 St; etc. Blänsdorf 2011: 159-165. ARCHIAS: Cic. *Arch*. 28, *Att*. 1.16.15. ATTICUS: Cic. *Att*. 2.1.1; Nep. *Att*. 18.6. LUCCEIUS: Cic. *Fam*. 5.12, cf. *Att*. 4.6.4, 4.9.2, 4.11.2. Tatum 2011: 176-179.

him *artes*.[40] Cicero asserted in his speeches too that he had acted with the gods' guidance and aid, and he paid cult to Minerva.[41] His boasts were not well-received by a number of people.[42] Pompeius Magnus, for one, resented Cicero for claiming his accomplishments rivalled his own.[43] Clodius attacked him for having divine aspirations, saying he was in the habit of calling himself Iuppiter and Minerva his sister.[44] Although most likely untrue, one can see how Clodius came up with the allegations.[45] Ego and a desire for everlasting glory thus significantly contributed to Cicero's support for a god-like status being granted to certain Romans.

There are some points that could be raised to suggest that Cicero did not support the concept of divine honours but this is not the case. Cicero twice refused divine honours in the East, in 60 and 50 BC.[46] Nevertheless, this was not because of any aversion to the practice.[47] He declined the honours as a display of upright conduct and moral superiority, which supposedly brought him praise at Rome.[48] Indeed, he explicitly acknowledged that political considerations played a role on the former occasion.[49] He did not criticise the proposal of divine honours for himself, nor did he advise his brother to refuse them. On the contrary, he expressed great concern that Quintus should be seen as worthy of such acclaim and even the father of Asia.[50] Here again, one can see an emphasis on divine honours being suitable reward for virtue. In *De natura deorum*, composed in 45 BC, Cicero writes sceptically as to whether heroes, those descended from gods or other human beings can be considered deities.[51] Yet he ascribes these words to Cotta as an example of a sceptical argument that could be presented by an Academic. Although Cicero was of an Academic persuasion himself, it acted as a method of inquiry rather than a firm philosophical position, and this passage has little value as evidence for his own views.[52] Indeed, Cotta mentions the decision to grant Oropus certain privileges on the basis that Amphiaraus, a hero worshipped there, was a god, which was opposed by the *publicani*.[53] Cicero actually acted as one of the advisers for this decision and presumably supported it.[54] At any rate, denial of the possible validity of divine honours is inconsistent with the attitudes Cicero repeatedly expressed elsewhere. He did speak out against such honours for Caesar,

---

[40] [Sall.] *In Cic*. 3, 7; Quint. *Inst*. 11.1.24. Cf. Harrison 1990: 458-459.
[41] Cic. *Cat*. 2.29, 3.1, 3.15, 3.18, 3.22, *Mur*. 82, *Sull*. 40, *Dom*. 144, cf. *Att*. 1.16.6. MINERVA: Cic. *Leg*. 2.42, *Fam*. 12.25.1, cf. *Dom*. 144; Plut. *Cic*. 31.5; Cass. Dio 38.17.5, 45.17.3. Weinstock 1971: 303.
[42] Cf. Plut. *Cic*. 24.1-2; cf. Cic. *Har. resp*. 17, *Off*. 1.77.
[43] Cic. *Fam*. 5.7.3; *Schol. Bob*. 167.22-30 St; cf. Cic. *Cat*. 4.21, *Sull*. 67, *Att*. 2.17.2, *Planc*. 85. Kaster 2006: 364-365; Tatum 2011: 176; cf. Allen 1954: 134-135.
[44] Cic. *Dom*. 92.
[45] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 303.
[46] Cic. *Q Fr*. 1.1.26, *Att*. 5.21.7.
[47] *Contra* Weinstock 1971: 291.
[48] Cic. *Q Fr*. 1.1.26.
[49] Cic. *Q Fr*. 1.1.26.
[50] Cic. *Q Fr*. 1.1.31.
[51] Cic. *Nat. D*. 3.39-60.
[52] *Contra* Weinstock 1971: 290. Cf. Cic. *Att*. 2.3.3, 13.25.3, *Tusc*. 1.17, 2.5, 4.47, 5.33. Rawson 1975b: 234, 236.
[53] Cic. *Nat. D*. 3.49.
[54] *Syll*.^{3} 747.

only in private before the Ides of March but publicly also afterwards.[55] It is clearly important, however, that he resented the recipient, a man he characterised as a tyrant after his assassination. There is no way that he would have considered Caesar worthy of veneration.[56]

The death of his daughter Tullia in 45 BC demonstrates his true feelings as to whether mortals could be treated as divine. He ardently wished to build her a shrine to bring about her apotheosis, and he was concerned that it should be prominent and stand the test of time.[57] In his *De consolatione*, he sought to justify his project by claiming that a number of former mortals, male and female, had come to be worshipped as gods.[58] This was in keeping with statements he had made before Tullia's death, such as in *De legibus*.[59] In actual fact, therefore, Cicero's opinion on the issue seems to have been fairly consistent.[60]

One should not doubt Cicero's conviction that divine honours could be justifiably awarded to mortals. There is good reason to question, however, whether he believed humans could actually become gods in the sense of the Olympians like Iuppiter and Iuno. It appears that Cicero did not think they could. Rather, he imagined the souls of virtuous people residing in the heavens after death.[61] There is no mention of them having any agency or effective power. Although the likes of Hercules and the Dioscuri were once mortal, he seems to treat them differently. They are able to intervene in human affairs.[62] In some places, Cicero does show uncertainty as to the existence of an afterlife and states that immortality lies with everlasting fame.[63] For him, this was presumably another purpose of divine honours. They served to preserve the memory of outstanding individuals, who would act as examples for others. In Cicero's mind, therefore, divine honours were rewards for virtue and great achievements rather than an acknowledgement of power.

Cicero thought such veneration could be suitable for Romans even at Rome, yet it is unclear whether in his opinion this would be acceptable while they still lived. For the most part, the people he discusses are already dead, such as Romulus, Scipio and Tullia. He did not oppose the practice in the East, provided that the honours were well-deserved, but it does not necessarily follow that he thought the same should occur at Rome.[64] When he mentions the honours accorded to Marius

---

[55] Cic. *Att*. 12.45.3, 13.28.3, 13.44.1, 14.14.1, 14.19.3, 15.3.2, *Phil*. 1.13, 2.110-111.
[56] Cf. Cic. *Off*. 2.84.
[57] Cic. *Att*. 12.12.1, 12.18.1, 12.19.1, 12.20.2, 12.36, 12.37.2, 12.37a, 12.41.2-3, 12.43, etc., *Consol*. fr. 5 OBH (Lactant. *Div*. *inst*. 1.15.19-20). Weinstock 1971: 291.
[58] Cic. *Consol*. fr. 5 OBH (Lactant. *Div*. *inst*. 1.15.19-20), cf. *Tusc*. 1.28-29.
[59] Cic. *Leg*. 2.19. See above.
[60] *Contra* Weinstock 1971: 290-291.
[61] Cic. *Rep*. 6.13, 6.16, *Consol*. fr. 6 OBH (Lactant. *Div*. *inst*. 3.19.6), cf. *Rab*. *perd*. 30, *Sest*. 143, *Tusc*. 1.66.
[62] Cic. *Tusc*. 1.28-29, cf. *Nat*. *D*. 3.11-13.
[63] UNCERTAINTY: Cic. *Arch*. 29-30, *Sest*. 131, cf. *Marcell*. 27. IMMORTALITY THROUGH FAME: Cic. *Rab*. *perd*. 29-30, *Arch*. 28-30, *Mil*. 97-98, cf. *Cat*. 4.21, *Red*. *sen*. 3, *Sest*. 143, *Balb*. 49, *Pis*. 7, *Rab*. *Post*. 42, *Marcell*. 27-30. Note, however, the contrary attitude shown in *De re publica* (6.23).
[64] Cic. *Q Fr*. 1.1.31, cf. *Verr*. 2.2.51, 154, 2.4.151, *Mil*. 80.

Gratidianus within the city, he does not signal any disapproval.[65] His focus, however, is on the deviousness with which Gratidianus gained popular favour, so the absence of negative comment on the statues and offerings should not be interpreted as support or acceptance.[66] Cicero definitely did not approve of Caesar's divine honours, both before and after his death. This does not mean that he would have resisted the grant of similar honours to a living man he believed had earned them. Therefore, Cicero possibly considered at least some divine honours to a living honorand as permissible in Rome, although the evidence is far from decisive. He certainly presented himself as deserving of such treatment.

Some scholars have envisaged Cicero as a crucial and even an essential figure in the introduction of divine honours to Rome.[67] If one places him in his proper historical context, however, it can be seen that this greatly exaggerates his importance. The trend towards the divinisation of individuals had long been under way at Rome, as is evident from Scipio Africanus, Marius and Sulla.[68] Pompeius' efforts to connect himself with the likes of Dionysus and Alexander can be discerned by 79 BC, well before Cicero was prominent.[69] Such powerful men were more than capable of conceiving and pursuing their own ideas and agendas. Moreover, spontaneous popular actions showed that the trend was not confined to the upper classes.[70] In fact, one could argue that Cicero's attitudes and language were reflecting the environment at Rome rather than shaping it. Certainly, to some extent he was following the lead of others and not taking the lead himself. Where he talks about Caesar's good fortune, for example, Cicero probably reproduces Caesar's presentation of himself, or at least his growing reputation.[71] The same is likely true for Pompeius.[72] At any rate, part of the divinising trend at Rome was that successful commanders were increasingly associated with *fortuna* and *felicitas*.[73] In addition, there is little to suggest that Cicero placed any importance on divine lineage, which sets him apart from earlier figures like Alexander and Scipio and later ones like Caesar and Augustus.[74] As a result, his conception of the grounds for divine honours was at least partly distinct from theirs, indicating again that his influence was limited.

It must be highlighted that Cicero's support for divine honours can be clearly traced to famous philosophers and poets, such as Plato and Ennius, as well as widespread Hellenistic

---

[65] Cic. *Off*. 3.80.
[66] *Contra* Charlesworth 1935: 23.
[67] Esp. Cole 2013: *passim*, e.g. 2, 10-11, 25-26, 49, 198. See also below.
[68] Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.143-147.
[69] E.g. Plin. *HN* 7.95-96, 8.4; Plut. *Pomp*. 13.4, 14.4. Weinstock 1971: 37.
[70] See above.
[71] Cic. *Prov*. *cons*. 35, *Rab*. *Post*. 41. See also below.
[72] Cic. *Leg*. *Man*. 47-49.
[73] Weinstock 1971: 113-114.
[74] Cf. Cole 2013: 142, 193. Cicero does not, however, necessarily deny the divine parentage of Hercules or the Dioscuri by calling them the sons of Amphitryon and Tyndareos, and it was normal to identify the father of Ino as Cadmus (*contra* Cole 2013: 142-143, cf. 1-2).

practices, like cult towards city-founders and saviour-figures. Far from being unique to him, the notions he discusses were freely accessible for others to draw on too. Even in those matters that concerned him most, the influence of others can be detected. He explicitly acknowledges that his wish to build a shrine to Tullia is based on the advice of some authors he had read.[75] The title *pater patriae* and the *corona civica* that were intended as rewards for his actions against the Catilinarians were proposed by Q. Catulus, L. Gellius and Cato.[76] It is not necessary to presume that they did so entirely at Cicero's behest or that the honours were solely of his devising. Curio had apparently called Cicero's consulship an ἀποθέωσις, and so Cicero was not the only one who used divinising language with respect to it.[77]

The view that Cicero was fundamental to the development of cult towards mortals at Rome appears to have been partly induced by the fact that he dominates the surviving literary evidence for the period.[78] There is very little extant from other intellectuals and orators. In particular, we do not have the opposing speeches that would have provided arguments contesting and contrasting with those of Cicero. Therefore, one must be wary of forming unbalanced assessments on the basis of his testimony. Moreover, it should not be assumed that his contemporaries studied his works and speeches with anything like the closeness that modern scholars do and, even if they did, that they would necessarily be sympathetic or receptive to his ideas. Depreciating the rhetorical nature of his speeches carries particular danger.[79] There is a considerable difference between praising humans as gods or god-like and actually worshipping them. One may lead to the other but this cannot be assumed or treated as a small step. In Cicero's case, his words were never followed by any actions to the same ends, with the exception of posthumous honours for his daughter, which may never have come to fruition. Furthermore, his words are often not consistent from one place to the next. Pompeius, a man whose qualities Cicero had praised so highly, is a noteworthy example.[80] Cicero resented that his achievements might be considered greater than his own and he even called him 'Sampsiceramus', which is to say a petty Eastern potentate, in private.[81] It is with some justification that Cicero gained a reputation for political expediency and equivocation, which could well have undermined his influence.[82] Thus, Cicero's words, like any surviving ancient evidence, should be carefully considered in their historical context in order to assess their implications.

---

[75] Cic. *Att*. 12.18.1. Thus, Cicero is not really being 'innovative' (*contra* Cole 2013: 2, 134-135). Furthermore, the deification of women is explicitly mentioned in Plato (*Resp*. 7.540 B-C) and goddesses were originally mortal women according to Euhemerus (e.g. Lactant. *Div*. *inst*. 1.14.2-7).
[76] See next chapter.
[77] Cic. *Att*. 1.16.13.
[78] Cf. Cole 2013: 10-11, 198. See also below.
[79] Cf. Cole 2013: *passim*, e.g. 12, 33-34, 187, cf. 70, 85, 173-174.
[80] E.g. Cic. *Leg*. *Man*. 33, 42, 48.
[81] Cic. *Att*. 2.14.1, 2.16.2, 2.17.2-3, 2.23.2, cf. *Cat*. 4.21.
[82] E.g. Sen. *Controv*. 7.3.9.

Caesar's Dictatorship

Caesar's hegemony over Rome was without doubt the single most important phase in the introduction of divine honours to Rome. Caesar received a great many distinctions, both secular and religious in nature. The first implying some divine status on his part were conferred after the Battle of Thapsus in April 46 BC, and they increased in number and degree after his victory at Munda in March 45 until they peaked in early 44 with his deification. Certain themes and aims dominate Caesar's honours, such as identifying him with Romulus, glorifying him as a *triumphator* and portraying him as the protector of Rome and its people. The honours themselves were a mix of traditional Roman awards and privileges with Greek and Hellenistic ones, some copied from those bestowed on Alexander and Demetrius Poliorcetes. The bulk of these honorary measures should be assigned to the agency of Caesar and not the Senate. Caesar's intention was to create a new autocratic style of government where he would be invested with supreme power in both politics and religion by way of his dictatorship, chief pontificate and other prerogatives. The justification for his control of the state rested on his ancestry, with the extensive links it provided to Rome's key institutions, and his personal excellence, upon which Rome depended for its security and success.

One of the principal themes of Caesar's honours was that he was an outstanding military commander.[83] This served to exalt his *virtus*, which was a key virtue for a Roman statesman, and highlight his superiority. It also implied that Caesar had exceptional divine favour. This is because the religious foundations of *imperium* and the auspices effectively meant that the gods supported his victories, and the likes of Sulla and Pompeius had previously taken pains to portray their success in this way. In fact, it was a point Caesar strongly made himself. The first honour that fits this theme was the dedication of a chariot on the Capitol in 46, along with a bronze statue of Caesar atop a representation of the inhabited world, which was probably a globe.[84] The following year, after his victory at Munda, Caesar attained the right to wear the triumphal dress at the games and sacrifices, and the laurel crown wherever he pleased.[85] This privilege was later upgraded to being permitted to use the triumphal dress throughout Rome.[86] Moreover, Caesar was able to use Imperator as a hereditary part of his nomenclature.[87] Thus, through these measures, Caesar effectively became a perpetual *triumphator*, as others had attempted in the past. Further distinctions to this end include the *corona aurea*, the purple *toga* used by early *triumphatores*, and the right to dedicate the *spolia*

[83] Hamlyn 2011: 79-80.
[84] Cass. Dio 43.14.6, 43.21.2; cf. Serv. *Ecl*. 9.47. Weinstock 1971: 40-59.
[85] Suet. *Iul*. 45.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 43.43.1.
[86] Cass. Dio 44.4.2.
[87] Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 43.44.2-3, 52.41.4. Cf. Cic. *Parad*. 33, 41; *Syll*.^{3} 763.6; Josephus, *AJ* 16.6.2 (162); etc. Gelzer 1969: 307; Weinstock 1971: 105-111; Rawson, *CAH*^{2} 9.461.

opima.[88] This was not all. It was voted in 45 that supplications would be held in Caesar's honour whenever there was a Roman military victory.[89] Caesar was, therefore, to be seen as the source of Rome's success, whether or not he personally commanded the forces in battle.

For several of the honours praising Caesar's *virtus*, there are precedents in the career of Pompeius Magnus, who had previously been considered Rome's greatest general. For example, the Capitoline statue of Caesar dominating the world is strongly reminiscent of images used to glorify Pompeius.[90] Likewise, the *corona aurea* voted to Caesar had previously been given to Pompeius, as had the right to wear the triumphal dress. This was not simply a case of the Senate adapting recent honours to suit the new political situation. Caesar's actions demonstrate that he personally felt the need to compete with Pompeius and surpass his achievements. Thus, he celebrated four triumphs over four days, following and exceeding the prior example of Pompeius, whose third triumph lasted three days. He belittled Pompeius' conquests in the East, especially through his famous statement *veni*, *vidi*, *vici*.[91] Clearly, it was important to Caesar that he be acknowledged as superior to Pompeius Magnus. Yet these honours also served to reinforce Caesar's dominance at Rome and establish his autocracy, and this was no less important as a motive.

Another major theme of Caesar's honours was that he was compared and identified with famous figures from myth and history, the most obvious being Romulus. The report of Caesar's victory at Munda was timed to reach Rome on the 20th of April, 45 BC.[92] This was the day before the Parilia, the festival that was by now interpreted as the anniversary of Romulus' foundation of Rome.[93] To honour Caesar, games were permanently added to the festival and a statue of him was conveyed with those of the gods in the *pompa circensis*.[94] Soon afterwards, another statue of Caesar was erected in the temple of Quirinus as a votive offering.[95] There were a number of other measures that closely associated Caesar with Romulus.[96]

A key aim of this was to portray Caesar as a second founder of Rome, on the basis that he had ended the Civil War, thereby freeing the state from strife, and had re-established peace and prosperity. As noted above, the concept of honouring a benefactor as a new founder was a prominent one in the Hellenistic East. In order to further promote this image, Caesar received other

---

[88] *CORONA AUREA*: *RRC* no. 480/2; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 2.85; Cass. Dio 44.6.3, 44.11.2. Crawford, *RRC* 1.488 n. 1; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.68-69; *contra* Weinstock 1971: 272. PURPLE *TOGA*: Cic. *Div*. 1.119, *Phil*. 2.85; Nic. Dam. 71; Val. Max. 1.6.13; Plin. *HN* 11.186; Plut. *Caes*. 61.3, *Ant*. 12.1 ('triumphal'); Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.11.2, 46.17.5 ('royal'). Hamlyn 2011: 79-80. *SPOLIA OPIMA*: Cass. Dio 44.4.3. Weinstock 1971: 233.
[89] Cass. Dio 43.44.6. Gelzer 1969: 307; Weinstock 1971: 64.
[90] E.g. *RRC* no. 426/4; cf. Cass. Dio 37.21.2. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 38-39, 43.
[91] Plut. *Caes*. 50.2; Suet. *Iul*. 37.2, cf. 35.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.91; Cass. Dio 42.48.1.
[92] Cass. Dio 43.42.3. Weinstock 1971: 175-176.
[93] Varro, *Rust*. 2.1.9; Prop. 4.4.73-78; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.88.3; Ov. *Fast*. 4.806-863; Vell. Pat. 1.8.4; Plut. *Rom*. 12.1. Weinstock 1971: 184-185; Scullard 1981: 104.
[94] Cic. *Att*. 13.28.3, 13.44.1; Cass. Dio 43.42.3, 43.45.2. Cf. Cic. *Att*. 14.14.1, 14.19.3; Cass. Dio 45.6.4. Weinstock 1971: 133, 175, 185; Hamlyn 2011: 75.
[95] Cic. *Att*. 12.45.3, 13.28.3, cf. 12.47.3; Cass. Dio 43.45.3. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.58-59; Hamlyn 2011: 75.
[96] Hamlyn 2011: 74-77.

exceptional distinctions. In 45, after defeating the Pompeians at Munda, he was hailed as 'Liberator' and a temple of Libertas was planned in his honour.[97] Two more statues of Caesar were set up, this time on the Rostra.[98] One was adorned with the *corona civica* to represent the idea that he had saved the lives of Rome's citizens, and the other wore the *corona obsidionalis*, which was awarded for saving the city from siege. Yet another statue of him was placed on the Capitol alongside those of the kings and L. Brutus, the man who had freed Rome from the tyranny of Tarquinius Superbus.[99] Each of these statues therefore portrays Caesar as a liberator and champion of freedom in the face of civil discord and oppression. Most significant of all was the title voted to Caesar of *parens patriae*. This officially enshrined his position as the preserver of the state and the source of its safety and success. Caesar's divine ancestry greatly reinforced his image as a new founder. Aeneas had established the beginnings of the Roman people in Italy, and so Caesar could claim to be continuing his famous forebear's legacy by renewing the state.

The second figure with whom Caesar was identified was Camillus. Once again, this served to depict Caesar as the liberator and saviour of Rome. M. Furius Camillus was a great hero of Republican history. His most famous achievement was rescuing Rome from the Gauls in 390 BC.[100] He was also credited with defeating the Gauls in 367 BC.[101] He was, then, like Caesar a renowned conqueror of one of the Romans' most feared foes. It was voted in 44 BC that a temple be built to Concordia Nova, with a festival to be held annually for the goddess.[102] Dio explicitly states that this was on account of peace being brought about by Caesar. Camillus had vowed and built the first temple to Concordia in 367 BC after he resolved internal discord between patricians and plebeians.[103] In addition, the *ludi Romani* were extended by a day to honour the gods.[104] This same measure was repeated in 44 BC as well, except on this occasion it was to honour Caesar.[105] There were other parallels between Camillus and Caesar.[106] The link was sufficiently strong that Camillus was subsequently called *parens patriae*, the saviour and second founder of Rome and even another Romulus, just like Caesar.[107]

The third person associated with Caesar was Alexander the Great. The enormous stature of his achievements in the ancient world made Alexander a natural target for imitation by powerful individuals. Among the Romans, Pompeius Magnus had already compared himself to the

---

[97] Cass. Dio 43.44.1. Weinstock 1971: 133, 142.
[98] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.4.5. Weinstock 1971: 133, 148, 163.
[99] Cic. *Deiot*. 33; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1, 80.3; Cass. Dio 43.45.3-4. Weinstock 1971: 133, 145.
[100] E.g. Diod. Sic. 14.117.2-5; Livy 5.43-49; Val. Max. 4.1.2; Plut. *Cam*. 23-30. *MRR* 1.95.
[101] E.g. Livy 6.42.4-8; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 14.8-10; Plut. *Cam*. 40.1-42.1. *MRR* 1.113.
[102] Cass. Dio 44.4.5. Weinstock 1971: 260, 265.
[103] Ov. *Fast*. 1.639-644; Plut. *Cam*. 42; cf. Livy 6.42.9-14. Weinstock 1971: 260.
[104] Livy 6.42.12; Plut. *Cam*. 42.5.
[105] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110. Weinstock 1971: 265.
[106] Hamlyn 2011: 78-79, 90.
[107] Livy 5.49.7-8, cf. 7.1.9-10. Weinstock 1971: 202.

Macedonian and so too perhaps had Scipio Africanus. Tales of Caesar's horse are similar to those regarding Alexander's Bucephalus, and Caesar set up a statue of himself mounted on this horse in front of the Temple of Venus Genetrix.[108] This equestrian statue, created by Lysippus, originally depicted Alexander but had been modified to bear the likeness of Caesar.[109] Caesar's statue in the Temple of Quirinus was inscribed with 'to/for the unconquered god'.[110] Alexander had received the same honour in Athens, or it had at least been proposed.[111] Moreover, the choice to depict him as master of the world on the Capitol evoked Alexander's conquests.[112] In 45, Caesar's friends prevailed upon Cicero to write a work of advice to him, just as Aristotle and Theopompus had done for Alexander.[113] The list of parallels could be continued.[114] Caesar being cast as a second Alexander greatly suited his military plans in the East.

The principal theme of Caesar's honours was his divinity. This is implicit in his links to Romulus and Alexander, since they came to be worshipped as gods, but there were many honours where it was their primary significance. Initially, the distinctions voted to Caesar did not treat him as a god but implied a superhuman status. They escalated, however, in 45 BC and culminated in his official deification as a high-level deity in early 44.[115] The first honour indicating that Caesar was in some way divine was the statue erected on the Capitol in 46. This had an inscription describing him as a demigod.[116] Caesar was granted the right to use white horses in his triumph that year.[117] White horses had divine associations and this may have motivated the measure.[118] Camillus, one of Caesar's alter egos, had supposedly caused popular ill-feeling by using white horses in his triumph in 396 BC.[119] This may have been added to the historical tradition as a reaction to Caesar's honour.[120] At the Parilia in May 45, an image of Caesar appeared alongside those of the gods for the *pompa circensis*. This occurred again at the *ludi Apollinares* in July.[121] Such public gestures clearly represented a move towards equating Caesar with traditional deities. Nevertheless, they fell

---

[108] CAESAR'S HORSE AND EQUESTRIAN STATUE: Plin. *HN* 8.155; Stat. *Silv*. 1.1.84-87; Suet. *Iul*. 61; Cass. Dio 37.54.2. BUCEPHALUS: Diod. Sic. 17.76.6; Curt. 6.5.18; Plin. *HN* 8.154; Plut. *Alex*. 6; Arr. *Anab*. 5.19.5; Aul. Gell. *NA* 5.2. Weinstock 1971: 86-87.
[109] Stat. *Silv*. 1.1.84-87.
[110] Cass. Dio 43.45.3; cf. Cic. *Att*. 12.45, 13.28.3. Weinstock 1971: 186; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.58; Gradel 2002: 62, 69; Hamlyn 2011: 73-74. The inscription is generally thought to have been in Latin (i.e. *deo invicto*), although Greek should be considered a real possibility (cf. Hamlyn 2011: 72 n. 192).
[111] Hyp. *Dem*. 32. Nock 1930: 2 n. 1; Weinstock 1957: 212; Weinstock 1971: 188.
[112] Weinstock 1957: 232-233; Weinstock 1971: 42; Hamlyn 2011: 72-73.
[113] Cic. *Att*. 12.40.2, 12.51.2, 13.7, 13.26.2, 13.27.1, 13.28.2-3. Weinstock 1971: 182, 188.
[114] Hamlyn 2011: 74, 82, 85.
[115] That Caesar would be a high-level deity is chiefly indicated by the decree of a *tensa*, the character of his priesthood (a *flamonium maius*) and the use of 'Divus' in the cult title (see below).
[116] Cass. Dio 43.14.6, 43.21.2; cf. Serv. *Ecl*. 9.47. Weinstock 1971: 40, 54-59; Gradel 2002: 54, 61; Hamlyn 2011: 74.
[117] Cass. Dio 43.14.3.
[118] E.g. Livy 5.23.6; Ov. *Am*. 2.1.24; Suet. *Aug*. 94.6. Weinstock 1971: 68-75; Hamlyn 2011: 74; cf. North 1975: 173.
[119] Diod. Sic. 14.117.6; Livy 5.23.5-6; Plut. *Cam*. 7.1-2; Cass. Dio 52.13.3; *De vir. ill*. 23.4; Zonar. 7.21.
[120] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 74.
[121] Cic. *Att*. 13.28.3, 13.44.1; Cass. Dio 43.45.2. Ramsey and Licht 1997: 25-40; Hamlyn 2011: 75, 81; cf. Weinstock 1971: 110, 133, 175, 185, 271.

short of actual worship or recognition of godhead. This is confirmed by Dio referring to the image as an ἀνδριάς, an honorary statue, and not an ἄγαλμα, or cult effigy.[122] Thus, the inclusion of Caesar's image in the procession was not yet a divine honour in the strict sense of the term. Similarly, even though his statue in the Temple of Quirinus called him a god, it was a votive offering and not a cult object.[123] At this point, therefore, Caesar had been honoured as god-like but not technically a god.

Caesar attained further distinctions that were the privileges of gods. He was permitted to have his portrait on Roman coinage and the month Quintilis was renamed Iulius in his honour.[124] At Rome, it was deities who typically appeared on the obverse of coins, and months had never been named after mortals, only gods.[125] The Senate moreover decreed that Caesar was to have a quadrennial festival.[126] This was a common part of the cult paid to traditional deities, particularly in the Greek East, where such festivals were also instituted for mortals as a divine honour. In Caesar's case, it is somewhat ambiguous as to whether this was to be a part of his own cult. Dio comments that the festival was ὡς ἥρωι ('as to a hero'), yet Appian suggests that its purpose was that the priests and Vestals should undertake vows for Caesar's safety. Certainly, there was a great emphasis on his welfare during his dictatorship as part of a deliberate strategy for establishing his autocracy.[127] At any rate, other measures passed in late 45 or 44 explicitly created a state cult of Caesar as a major god.

It was decreed that a jewelled, golden crown and a golden chair, each belonging to Caesar, were to be carried into the theatres, just as was done for the gods.[128] Caesar was also given a ceremonial chariot (*tensa*) and a hand-barrow (*ferculum*) to carry his divine symbols in the *pompa circensis*, along with a sacred cushion (*pulvinar*).[129] These items could only belong to gods, and the *tensa* apparently was the prerogative of the Capitoline deities, Iuppiter, Iuno and Minerva.[130] The effigy of Caesar that had already been part of the *pompa circensis* probably now became one of his *simulacra*, or divine images.[131] Cicero and Suetonius confirm that such images were part of the cult.[132] Caesar was granted the other particulars necessary to complete his deification. These were a priest, a cult name and one or more temples. The type of priest chosen was a *flamen*, and a *flamen*

---

[122] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.58-59.
[123] Cass. Dio 43.45.3; cf. Cic. *Att*. 12.45, 13.28.3. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.58-59; Hamlyn 2011: 75.
[124] COINAGE: Cass. Dio 44.4.4; cf. *RRC* nos. 480/2-20. Weinstock 1971: 274-275. MONTH: Plut. *Num*. 19.4; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Flor. 2.13.91; Cass. Dio 44.5.2; Censorinus, *DN* 22.16; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.34. Weinstock 1971: 152.
[125] Weinstock 1971: 153, 275.
[126] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.2. Weinstock 1971: 310; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.61; Hamlyn 2011: 92.
[127] See next chapter.
[128] Cass. Dio 44.6.3, cf. 45.6.5; cf. Cic. *Att*. 15.3.2; *RRC* no. 497/2; Nic. Dam. 108; Plut. *Ant*. 16.2; App. *B Civ*. 3.28. Weinstock 1971: 281-283; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.61-62.
[129] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.3. Weinstock 1971: 284-285; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.62.
[130] Weinstock 1971: 285; cf. Crawford, *RRC* 1.362-363.
[131] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 285.
[132] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.

maior at that, with M. Antonius selected for the position.[133] Caesar's cult name was to be Divus Iulius and his temple in Rome was to be shared with Clementia, the personification of the virtue for which Caesar was renowned.[134] As an additional mark of his divinity, he received a temple pediment (*fastigium*) on his home.[135] It should be noted that the title *parens patriae* had divine connotations too.[136]

Caesar was therefore the first living man to be worshipped as a god at Rome, although his assassination prevented the full establishment of his cult at that time. The themes of Caesar's honours, including his divinity, were reinforced by his own actions. This strongly suggests that he was the driving force behind the honorary decrees enacted during his dictatorship. Caesar's responsibility for the measures is critical when it comes to assessing their significance and the reasons behind them. This background, in turn, provides important insights into Augustus' actions and attitudes, particularly regarding ruler-cult.

The creation of Caesar's cult in 44 BC could only have occurred with his participation. As *pontifex maximus*, it was Caesar's prerogative to select the *flamines maiores*, and so only he could have designated M. Antonius as the *flamen Divi Iulii*.[137] Moreover, Antonius was not actually eligible to be the *flamen*, not least because he was not patrician. Only Caesar had the power, conferred by the *lex Cassia*, to give him that status.[138] Caesar would also need to waive the other traditional criteria.[139] Thus, Caesar must have at the very least had a hand in implementing his own deification. This would not be surprising given that Caesar had long cultivated a strong personal relationship with the goddess Venus.[140] This relationship was based on the Iulii's mythical Trojan ancestry and their descent from her son, Aeneas.[141] He thus carried divine blood in his veins and he emphasised this by giving the Venus worshipped in his temple the epithet Genetrix.[142] His divine descent could be used to justify his own deification, since the famous individuals who had achieved apotheosis – Hercules, Dionysus, the Dioscuri (or at least Pollux), Romulus and Alexander – had all

---

[133] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111, 13.41, 13.47; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.4. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.62-63; Hamlyn 2011: 82-83; cf. Weinstock 1971: 287, 306-308.
[134] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 57.3; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.4. Cf. *RRC* no. 480/21. Taylor 1931: 68-71; North 1975: 175; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.62-64; Hamlyn 2011: 82-83; cf. Weinstock 1971: 241, 287, 309; Gradel 2002: 70-71.
[135] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111; Plut. *Caes*. 63.6; Suet. *Iul*. 81.3; Flor. 2.13.91; Obseq. 67. Alföldi 1975: 171; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.60; Hamlyn 2011: 83; cf. Weinstock 1971: 280-281.
[136] See next chapter.
[137] Weinstock 1971: 306; Hamlyn 2011: 86.
[138] Weinstock 1971: 307; Hamlyn 2011: 86.
[139] Hamlyn 2011: 86; cf. Weinstock 1971: 307.
[140] Hamlyn 2011: 69-71. For example, he claimed he had received the bloom of youth from the goddess (Cass. Dio 43.43.3; cf. Cicero ap. Suet. *Iul*. 49.3; Vell. Pat. 2.41.1), he wore a ring bearing her image (Cass. Dio 43.43.3), he gave her name as the watchword in perilous situations (App. *B Civ*. 2.76, 104; Cass. Dio 43.43.3; Serv. *Aen*. 7.637), he issued coins with her portrait (*RRC* nos. 458/1, 468/1-2, cf. 465/3-4, 465/6-7, 480/3-5, etc.), and he vowed and built a temple to her (see below).
[141] Cf. Suet. *Iul*. 6.1.
[142] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.48, 134-135. App. *B Civ*. 2.102, cf. 68; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 61, 84.1; Cass. Dio 43.22.2; Serv. *Aen*. 1.720.

carried the blood of a god in their veins. Caesar had always shown marked pride in his mythical heritage, and the fact that they he took further actions to this end as dictator strongly suggests that he was actively promoting his bloodline to reinforce both his divinity and his status as a new founder.

Caesar personally promoted his identification with Romulus.[143] The delay of the news of his victory at Munda reaching Rome until the eve of the Parilia in 45 BC must have been arranged with his permission and almost certainly at his behest.[144] As a result, the honours that were quickly put into effect after this 'coincidence' must also be ascribed to Caesar, even if they were perhaps designed in consultation with his inner circle.[145] From this time, the links between Caesar and Romulus were made increasingly explicit.[146] One measure was that Caesar would have a new college of *luperci* named in his honour.[147] These priests performed at the Lupercalia and were connected to Romulus.[148] It was Caesar who arranged the financial support for his *luperci*.[149] This demonstrates that he had a personal interest in the measure. It was clearly not a privilege foisted upon him by others. The Lupercalia of 44 BC was where, according to the most plausible interpretation of the incident, Caesar and Antonius tried to defuse rumours that he coveted the kingship.[150] On this occasion, Caesar was wearing the golden crown and purple costume voted to him, as well as his red shoes.[151] Each of these recalled Romulus, who had supposedly worn such items. Caesar's ostentatious refusal of the diadem was intended to publicly and unequivocally demonstrate that his emulation of Romulus did not extend to assumption of the kingship. Other actions of Caesar's that linked himself to Romulus include enlarging the *pomerium* and establishing new colonies, one of which he named after his model.[152] Romulus had created the *pomerium* and was, of course, a famous city-founder.[153]

Caesar personally drew parallels between himself and Alexander the Great. It was he who repurposed the equestrian statue made by Lysippus and it is not impossible that the likening of his

---

[143] In this thesis, terms such as 'identification', 'connection', 'comparison' and 'assimilation' are used quite flexibly and almost interchangeably. This is intended to indicate that ambiguity in such relationships was desirable so that the divinisation of individuals like Caesar would be more easily accepted (cf. Stevenson 1996: 16-18).
[144] Hamlyn 2011: 85; cf. Weinstock 1971: 175-176.
[145] Hamlyn 2011: 85.
[146] Hamlyn 2011: 74-78.
[147] THE *LUPERCI IULIANI*: Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.2, cf. 45.30.2; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 13.31. Weinstock 1971: 332-333; Hamlyn 2011: 75-76.
[148] Livy 1.4.6-1.5.3; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.79.6-8, 1.80.1-2; Ov. *Fast*. 2.361-422; Val. Max. 2.2.9a; Plut. *Rom*. 21.3-8; *OGR* 20.3-22.1. Scullard 1981: 76-78.
[149] Cic. *Ad Caes. Iun*. 2, fr. 19 (Non. 418 L), *Phil*. 13.31, cf. 7.1. Taylor 1931: 67 n. 25; Weinstock 1971: 332.
[150] Carson 1957: 51; Rawson 1975a: 149; Hamlyn 2011: 89; cf. Rawson, *CAH*^{2} 9.464. *Contra* Weinstock 1971: 338-340.
[151] THE LUPERCALIA INCIDENT: Cic. *Phil*. 2.85-87, cf. 13.31; Livy, *Per*. 116; Vell. Pat. 2.56.4; Suet. *Iul*. 79.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.109; Flor. 2.13.91; Cass. Dio 44.11.2-3; cf. Nic. Dam. 71-75; Plut. *Caes*. 61.1-4, *Ant*. 12.
[152] EXTENSION OF THE *POMERIUM*: Aul. Gell. *NA* 13.14.4; Cass. Dio 43.50.1, 44.49.2. COLONIA IULIA ROMULENSIS or ROMULA: Plin. *HN* 3.11; Isid. *Etym*. 15.1.71; cf. Strabo 3.2.1; ILS 6920.
[153] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.88; Ov. *Fast*. 4.819-836; Plut. *Rom*. 11; Tac. *Ann*. 12.24; Aul. Gell. *NA* 13.14.2.

horse to Bucephalus originated with him. Similarly, the anecdote of Caesar in Gades lamenting his lack of achievements compared to Alexander may well be a later invention but one cannot rule it out as being historical.[154] Caesar probably directed his friends to ask Cicero to write the letter of advice that recalled those to Alexander. They certainly knew it would appeal to him, as Cicero did.[155] According to Strabo, Caesar was fond of Alexander, and this comment is verified by his actions.[156] Caesar visited Ilium and showed favour to the city.[157] Although this obviously suited his enthusiasm for his Trojan heritage, it also emulated Alexander, whose favourite work was the *Iliad*.[158] Moreover, Caesar devised a geographical survey, completed later under Augustus, which imitated Alexander and his interest in that field.[159]

Caesar developed links to Dionysus. This would have been partly motivated by his identification with Alexander the Great. Yet it also served to strengthen his status as the ultimate *triumphator* and to augment his claims to divinity. In 46, after dinner on the fourth and final day of his successive triumphs, Caesar entered the forum he had built, garlanded and wearing slippers. He then proceeded home accompanied by a great crowd and with elephants bearing torches.[160] Caesar thus appears to have organised a Dionysiac procession.[161] As with other Romans before him, this enhanced the divine associations of the triumph and further glorified his achievements. Elephants were a fitting element of the procession, being linked to both Dionysus and Alexander, and the animals had been included in Caesar's Gallic triumph as well.[162] Servius, commenting on Virgil's fifth *Eclogue*, states that Caesar brought the *sacra* of Dionysus-Liber to Rome, so it seems that he made a conscious effort to promote Dionysus' cult.[163] Certainly, Virgil's lines suggest a strong public relationship between Caesar and the god.[164] In light of his forthcoming Eastern expedition, one of his aims was evidently to cast himself as a new Dionysus or Alexander. Indeed, because of the Macedonian's close ties to the god, Caesar could hardly recall one without the other. Identification with those two figures had obvious advantages in terms of legitimacy and prestige

---

[154] Suet. *Iul*. 7.1; Cass. Dio 37.52.2; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 11.3.
[155] Cf. Cic. *Att*. 13.27.1, 13.28.2-3.
[156] Strabo 13.1.27.
[157] Strabo 13.1.27; Luc. 9.961-1003. Gelzer 1969: 244; Weinstock 1971: 84.
[158] ALEXANDER AND ILIUM: Diod. Sic. 17.17.3, 17.18.1; Just. *Epit*. 11.5.12; Strabo 13.1.27; Plut. *Alex*. 15.4-5; Arr. *Anab*. 1.11.7-1.12.1. ALEXANDER AND THE *ILIAD*: Strabo 13.1.27; Plut. *Alex*. 8.2, 26.1. Hamlyn 2011: 70.
[159] Wiseman 1992: 22-42 (with the evidence); cf. Rawson 1985: 112-113. ALEXANDER: e.g. Strabo 15.1.25; Curt. 9.1.3, 9.9-10; Plut. *Alex*. 44.1, 66.1-2, 68.1; Arr. *Anab*. 6.1, 6.19, 7.1.1-3, 7.16.1-4, 7.19-21, cf. 5.26.1-3. Hammond 1994: 176, 207, 216-217, 231-232, 239.
[160] Cass. Dio 43.22.1.
[161] Pailler 1988: 740; Wardle 2009: 105; Hamlyn 2011: 73; cf. Weinstock 1971: 78.
[162] DIONYSUS: e.g. Callixeinus ap. Ath. 5.200 D; Diod. Sic. 3.65.7, 4.3.1; Plin. *HN* 8.4; Nonnus, *Dion*. 26.329-332. ALEXANDER: e.g. Callixeinus ap. Ath. 5.202 A; Diod. Sic. 18.27.1; Arr. *Anab*. 4.30.6-8, 6.2.2, 6.5.5, 6.16.2, 6.28.7. GALLIC TRIUMPH: Suet. *Iul*. 37.2. Toynbee 1973: 32, 37-38, 39; Scullard 1974: 124-125, 194, 197; Hamlyn 2011: 71; Östenberg 2014: 502-505. One could add that the first coin-type Caesar minted during the Civil War featured an elephant (*RRC* no. 443/1) and that Caesar's name was said to resemble the Punic for 'elephant' (Serv. *Aen*. 1.286; SHA *Ael*. 2.3).
[163] Serv. *Ecl*. 5.29. Turcan 1977; Pailler 1988: 725-743; Wardle 2009: 105; Hamlyn 2011: 73.
[164] Verg. *Ecl*. 5.29-31, cf. *Aen*. 6.804-805.

when seeking to assert authority over regions in the East. For this reason, the same policy had been employed by various Hellenistic rulers before Caesar, as it was by Antonius later.

Caesar had numerous associations with Rome's patron god, Iuppiter, and many of these followed from his own individual actions. Accordingly, as in the other cases, the initiative should be ascribed to him personally. Caesar wore the triumphal dress and laurel crown that had been voted to him, and thus was portrayed in the same fashion as Iuppiter Capitolinus. His golden crown seems to have belonged to the god too.[165] He presumably used the white horses he had been permitted when he triumphed in 46 BC. This was a privilege that had been explicitly criticised in relation to Camillus on the basis that it properly belonged to Iuppiter. Caesar celebrated an *ovatio* in January 44 BC, although there was no traditional justification for it.[166] The *ovatio* entailed a sacrifice to Iuppiter Capitolinus, in addition to those he would have performed during his triumphs.[167] Moreover, he held his *ovatio* directly following his performance of the Feriae Latinae on the Alban Mount.[168] This annual festival involved sacrifices to Iuppiter Latiaris in his temple there.[169] His Alban ancestry seems to be at the heart of these events. The Alban Mount is explicitly mentioned in the Fasti Triumphales Capitolini alongside Caesar's *ovatio*.[170] He appears to have been promoting his achievements in connection with his family's mythical heritage.[171] It is even possible that his wearing of the red shoes of the Alban kings came about from being appointed to the dictatorship of Alba, which still existed.[172] In any case, his ancestry meant that Caesar was supposedly a descendant of Iuppiter through both parents of Aeneas, who himself came to be worshipped as Iuppiter Indiges. This may have been a motive for his links to Iuppiter more generally. Caesar had, moreover, chosen to re-hold the Feriae Latinae as dictator in 49 BC, in spite of being in the midst of civil war.[173] This was intended as a demonstration of his piety and religious correctness in contrast to the Pompeians.[174] It may also have been inspired by Camillus, who had

---

[165] Tert. *De coron. mil.* 13.1. Note also the golden crowns sent as gifts to Iuppiter Capitolinus (Livy 2.22.6, 36.35.12-13, 43.6.5-6, 44.14.3) and the use of golden crowns in the triumph (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.47.3; Plin. *HN* 33.11; App. *Pun.* 66; Zonar. 7.21.9; cf. Livy 26.21.9, 39.29.6; Plut. *Aem.* 34.3; etc.). The matter is complicated by the debate and uncertainty surrounding the details of Caesar's golden crown (e.g. Weinstock 1971: 272; Crawford, *RRC* 1.488 n. 1; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.68-69).

[166] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.86-87. Cass. Dio 44.4.3, 44.10.1; cf. Plut. *Caes.* 60.2; Suet. *Iul.* 79.1; App. *B Civ.* 2.108. Weinstock 1971: 326-330; Hamlyn 2011: 80-81.

[167] There were several distinctions between a triumph and an *ovatio* but the deity and place of the sacrifice were not among them (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5.47.3; Plut. *Marc.* 22; Aul. Gell. *NA* 5.6.20-23, 27; cf. Plin. *HN* 15.125; Serv. *Aen.* 4.543).

[168] Weinstock 1971: 320-325; Hamlyn 2011: 80-81.

[169] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.49.2-3; cf. Cic. *Planc.* 23; Varro, *Ling.* 6.25; Livy 32.1.9, etc. Warde Fowler 1899: 95-97; Weinstock 1971: 320; Scullard 1981: 111-115.

[170] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.86-87.

[171] Weinstock 1971: 321-324; Hamlyn 2011: 80-81.

[172] Weinstock 1971: 323-324; Hamlyn 2011: 80-81; *contra* Alföldi 1975: 174.

[173] Caes. *B Civ.* 3.2; Luc. 5.400-402. Weinstock 1971: 321.

[174] Caes. *B Civ.* 1.6; Cass. Dio 41.14.4. Stewart 1997: 178; cf. Weinstock 1971: 321-322.

repeated the festival as dictator.[175] The addition of a day in Caesar's honour to the *ludi Romani*, again recalling Camillus, associated him with Iuppiter as well. The games belonged to Iuppiter Capitolinus but now Caesar gained a share in them.[176]

Caesar's relationship with Iuppiter did not end there. Among the honours Caesar received in 46 were a chariot dedicated to Iuppiter on the Capitol, along with a statue of himself nearby.[177] At the same time, his name was to be inscribed on the temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus instead of Catulus', as though Caesar had restored it.[178] The deity who would receive the *spolia opima* that Caesar was to dedicate was Iuppiter Feretrius.[179] The senatorial decrees conferring Caesar's honours in 44 were set down in silver and gold and placed beneath the statue of Iuppiter Capitolinus.[180] These honours accord with his actions, and not merely those already mentioned. When Caesar refused the diadem at the Lupercalia in 44, he stated that Iuppiter was the only king of the Romans and sent the diadem to his Capitoline temple.[181] He had similarly demonstrated his piety by climbing the steps of this temple on his knees during his Gallic triumph in 46.[182] Caesar's title of *parens patriae* evoked Iuppiter as Rome's patron and the father-god whose name was cognate with *pater*. The *corona civica*, which was an associated honour for Caesar as one of his statues on the Rostra shows, had been made from the oak sacred to the deity.

Caesar's cult was organised in such a way as to give him links to the god. If *tensae* had indeed belonged exclusively to the Capitoline Triad, then the only male deity to have possessed one before Caesar was Iuppiter. Dio states that the cult name was Iuppiter Iulius, although Cicero's evidence shows that it was Divus Iulius, as it was when Caesar's consecration was finally enacted in 42 BC. Various explanations have been offered for Dio's error.[183] If it is not a case of corruption in the text, then Dio may have been misled by some part of the new cult that made reference to Iuppiter. This may have been a separate honour or perhaps some justification for the choice of 'Divus'. This word appears to have been chosen because Varro believed that it represented eternal gods, whereas *deus* could refer to those who had been deified like the Di Manes.[184] In other words, the cult name was designed to put Caesar in the same category as the highest deities, like Iuppiter.

---

[175] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.146-147; cf. Livy 5.17.2, 5.19.1-2; Plut. *Cam.* 4.4-5. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 322.
[176] IUPPITER AND THE *LUDI ROMANI*: Livy 2.36.2, cf. 22.9.10, 22.10.7, 36.2.2-4; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 7.68.3, 7.69.1; Festus 109 L. Warde Fowler 1899: 216-218; Scullard 1981: 183-184. THE EXTRA DAY FOR CAESAR: Cic. *Phil.* 2.110. Weinstock 1971: 265.
[177] Cass. Dio 43.14.6, 43.21.2.
[178] Cass. Dio 43.14.6.
[179] Cass. Dio 44.4.3; cf. Livy 1.10.5-6, 4.20.3; Plut. *Rom.* 16.4-7, *Marc.* 8.1-5; Festus 204 L; etc. Weinstock 1971: 233; Hamlyn 2011: 75.
[180] Cass. Dio 44.7.1.
[181] Nic. Dam. 73; Plut. *Caes.* 61.4; Suet. *Iul.* 79.2; Cass. Dio 44.11.3; cf. Livy, *Per.* 116. *Sella* in the epitome of Livy should possibly be *cella* (Weinstock 1971: 331 n. 3; cf. North 2008: 158).
[182] Cass. Dio 43.21.1-2, cf. 60.23.1; cf. Plin. *HN* 28.21; Suet. *Iul.* 37.2. Gelzer 1969: 286; Alföldi 1975: 161; *contra* Weinstock 1971: 76-77.
[183] See Introduction.
[184] Serv. *Aen.* 5.45. Gradel 2002: 66-67, 330-331. For an alternative explanation, see Wardle 2002.

Moreover, *divus* was closely related to *divum*, meaning 'sky', which Varro had derived from Diovis, an old name for Iuppiter.[185] As a result, Caesar's cult title was etymologically linked to the god. It could be significant too that the word *divus* was thus also connected to Vediovis, the subject of the Julian gentilician cult. This god had come to be interpreted as the deified Iulus-Ascanius, who in turn was then the son of Iuppiter Indiges, the deified Aeneas. Therefore, the title Divus Iulius more closely associated Caesar with not only Iuppiter but his divine ancestors as well.

Caesar received a new *flamen maior*, as Cicero makes clear.[186] Dio compares his priest to the *flamen Dialis* specifically.[187] If this were apt, Caesar's priest would be another example of his links to Iuppiter. It has been thought, however, that this comparison is inappropriate and stems from Dio's mistake in reproducing Caesar's cult title.[188] After all, the creation of the priesthood somewhat resembles that for Romulus-Quirinus, who received a *flamen maior* after his apotheosis.[189] Caesar's identification with Romulus would further make the *flamen Quirinalis* a more obvious model, especially as the *flamonium Diale* was encumbered with serious restrictions that Caesar would not have forced upon Antonius.[190] Yet Dio's comment may not be unfounded, whether or not a good reason lies behind his mistake in the cult name. The *flamen Dialis* had certain privileges resembling those of a magistrate, such as a seat in the Senate and a curule chair.[191] It is possible that Caesar's *flamen* was to receive some or all of these privileges.[192] This could be the grounds for Dio's remark. Such measures would augment the priesthood's prestige, and Caesar perhaps felt it appropriate since he himself had been the last choice to be the *flamen Dialis*.

In any case, Caesar's deification clearly did nothing to counter the notion of him having a special relationship with Iuppiter. Considering that Caesar was to be a high-level god worthy of a *tensa* and *flamen maior*, and that the *flamonium Diale* had fallen into obsolescence decades ago, Caesar perhaps intended his priest to replace that of Iuppiter within the pontifical college.[193] On this basis alone, he would appear to be some sort of heir or counterpart to the god. Weinstock believes that the image of Caesar used in processions wore triumphal dress and was kept in the *cella* of Iuppiter's Capitoline temple.[194] He makes these assumptions following reports concerning Scipio Africanus, which may have been influenced by the controversy surrounding Caesar's honours.[195] If Weinstock is correct, Caesar's links to Iuppiter would have been made even stronger.

---

[185] Varro, *Ling*. 5.66. Taylor 1931: 69-71.
[186] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110. Alföldi 1975: 172; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.63.
[187] Cass. Dio 44.6.4.
[188] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.63; cf. North 1975: 173, 175-176; *contra* Weinstock 1971: 287, 306-308.
[189] Hamlyn 2011: 83; cf. Weinstock 1971: 306.
[190] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.63; Hamlyn 2011: 83; cf. Weinstock 1971: 306, 307-308.
[191] Livy 1.20.2, 27.8.7-10; Plut. *Quaest. Rom*. 113 (*Mor*. 291 B); Festus 82 L. Weinstock 1971: 307.
[192] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 306-308.
[193] Hamlyn 2011: 83; cf. Vanggaard 1988: 85-86.
[194] Weinstock 1971: 36, 110, 185, 303.
[195] Livy 38.56.12-13; Val. Max. 4.1.6a, 8.15.1; App. *Hisp*. 23.

Among the literary works of C. Oppius, Caesar's friend, was a biography of Scipio, which included details of his divine conception and conversations with Iuppiter on the Capitol.[196] Oppius quite possibly wrote about Scipio's statue, perhaps even as justification for that of Caesar. This gives credence to Weinstock's argument.[197] Scipio was supposedly a son of Iuppiter along the same lines as Alexander the Great.[198] Caesar's association with the Macedonian king would thus have brought some secondary links to Iuppiter as well. Indeed, Caesar's deification inevitably tied him to the god, since the mortals who had achieved godhead before him had often been sons of Zeus-Iuppiter. Therefore, it was not only the details of his cult but the creation of the cult itself that gave Caesar a relationship with Iuppiter. Since Caesar played a crucial role in his deification, it follows that he was behind his associations with Iuppiter as well, as his other actions indicate.

Some pieces of evidence for Caesar's ties to Iuppiter relate to his death. Naturally, he was not directly responsible for these but they nevertheless confirm that a strong public relationship existed. On the eve of his murder, he supposedly had a dream where he flew among the clouds and held Iuppiter's hand.[199] During his funeral, some people demanded that his body be burned in the *cella* of Iuppiter's Capitoline temple.[200] Suetonius adds that two men bearing swords and javelins suddenly set fire to the bier. This appears to be a reference to the Dioscuri, the 'sons of Zeus', who had manifested themselves on other occasions. They had earned their elevation to godhead through their outstanding achievements and virtues, in addition to their divine descent, as Caesar was meant to have. Lastly, Iuppiter and Divus Iulius were invoked together in 42 BC as the gods who would punish those who did not celebrate Caesar's birthday.[201] All in all, Caesar promoted his connections with Iuppiter to justify his hegemony and deification. The intended effect appears to have been to portray him as the god's favoured representative and fellow divinity. Despite the very brief time between his ultimate honours and his assassination, this portrayal left an indelible mark, as the information surrounding his death illustrates. There would surely have been signs of it too in the poetry and art of his dictatorship, had they survived.[202]

A number of divine personifications became closely and explicitly linked to Caesar under his dictatorship. These were Fortuna, Felicitas, Concordia, Libertas, Victoria and Clementia. Once again, Caesar promoted these associations himself. He was thus undoubtedly the author of at least

---

[196] Aul. Gell. *NA* 6.1.2-6; cf. Charisius, *Gramm*. 1.17 (147 K).
[197] Weinstock 1971: 36; cf. Rawson 1975a: 149 n. 13.
[198] ALEXANDER: e.g. Diod. Sic. 17.49-51, 17.108.3; Just. *Epit*. 11.11.3-9, 12.16.2; Strabo 15.1.68, 17.1.43; Plut. *Alex*. 2.2-4, 3.1-2, 4.2, 28.1, 33.1, 50.6; Arr. *Anab*. 3.3-4, 7.8.3. Fredricksmeyer 1981: 146; Fredricksmeyer 2003: 270-274; Ogden 2009: 31-39. SCIPIO: Livy 26.19.7; Sil. *Pun*. 13.615, 628-644; Aul. Gell. *NA* 6.1.1-4; Cass. Dio fr. 57.39; *De vir. ill*. 49.1; cf. Val. Max. 1.2.2 (Paris). Ogden 2009: 41-44.
[199] Suet. *Iul*. 81.3; Cass. Dio 44.17.1; cf. Ov. *Fast*. 3.703. Weinstock 1971: 304.
[200] Suet. *Iul*. 84.3; App. *B Civ*. 2.148; Cass. Dio 44.50.2. Weinstock 1971: 304.
[201] Cass. Dio 47.18.5.
[202] Caesar was apparently depicted as Iuppiter in statuary but the evidence is late and of questionable value for his lifetime (*Anth. Pal*. 2.92-96; cf. Taylor 1931: 71). Cf. Ov. *Fast*. 3.703; [Sen.] *Oct*. 500-502.

some of the related honours he received. Caesar assigned great significance to fortune and believed that he was blessed with good luck.[203] This belief existed by the time he achieved his Gallic conquests and must have only grown stronger as his military success continued. Others such as Cicero agreed that he possessed extraordinary good fortune and it appears to have been accepted by the public at large.[204] When Caesar writes of fortune, it is generally ambiguous as to whether he means it in the broad sense, *fortuna*, or in the form of the goddess, Fortuna. There is explicit evidence, however, that Caesar did ascribe his luck to divine favour. Caesar sacrificed to Fortuna in December 49 BC.[205] At Thapsus in 46, he gave 'Felicitas' as the call for battle and planned a temple to that goddess which was completed by Lepidus after his assassination.[206] Fortuna, Felicitas and their respective symbols, the cornucopia and caduceus, appear on multiple Caesarian coin-types.[207] The story of Caesar in the fishing boat offers an important insight into how he may have viewed his relationship with Fortuna. In 48, Caesar made a successful crossing of the Adriatic from Brundisium with the aid of good luck.[208] He then attempted to return to Brundisium in the face of dangerous weather conditions. When the pilot decided to turn back, Caesar told him to be brave since he carried 'Caesar and Caesar's fortune', or rather perhaps 'Caesar's Fortune'.[209] In either case, when considered with the other evidence, this anecdote indicates that he conceived of himself as having a special divine protection and that he fostered this relationship publicly. He may even have thought of his luck as being due to Fortuna acting as a personal tutelary deity or to a separate Fortuna of his own.

A cult of Concordia Nova was decreed in honour of Caesar. This aligns with the appearance of symbols of peace and concord on his coinage, clearly in an attempt to portray his dominance in a positive light.[210] The fact that he founded colonies with Concordia in their names, including his re-establishment of Carthage, would further indicate that he deliberately aimed to make the concept and its goddess part of his public image.[211] There is evidence for Caesar doing likewise with Libertas. He had publicly justified his role in the Civil War as being necessary to protect the

---

[203] Caes. *B Gall*. 4.26, 6.30, 6.35, 6.42, *B Civ*. 3.10, 3.26-27, 3.68, 3.73; Caes. ap. Cic. *Att*. 10.8b.1; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 2.64. Gelzer 1969: 194, 236, 326-327; Weinstock 1971: 115-116; cf. Wardle 2009: 110.
[204] Cic. *Prov*. *cons*. 35, *Fam*. 1.9.7, *Att*. 7.11.1, *Marcell*. 7, 19, *Deiot*. 19, 21; *B Alex*. 43; Vell. Pat. 2.51.2, 2.55.1, 2.55.3; Plut. *Caes*. 53.2, 57.1, *De fort*. *Rom*. 5 (*Mor*. 319 B); App. *B Civ*. 2.88, 97, 149; Flor. 2.13.29-30, 78-79. Gelzer 1969: 327; Weinstock 1971: 115.
[205] Cass. Dio 41.39.2-3; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 59. Cf. *RRC* no. 494/24. Weinstock 1971: 116.
[206] THAPSUS: *B Afr*. 83. TEMPLE: Cass. Dio 44.5.2. Weinstock 1971: 117-118.
[207] *RRC* nos. 448/1, 449/5, 450/2, 451/1, 464/3, 465/8, 473/3, 474/7, 480/6, 480/25, 480/27.
[208] Caes. *B Civ*. 3.26-27, 3.73; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.51.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.59; Cass. Dio 41.44.4. Weinstock 1971: 116-117.
[209] Plut. *Caes*. 38, cf. *Reg*. *et imp*. *apophth*., Gaius Caesar 9 (*Mor*. 206 C-D), *De fort*. *Rom*. 6 (*Mor*. 319 B-D); App. *B Civ*. 2.57, 150; cf. Val. Max. 9.8.2; Luc. 5.504-677; Suet. *Iul*. 58.2; Flor. 2.13.37; Cass. Dio 41.46.2-4. Gelzer 1969: 228-229; Weinstock 1971: 121-127; North 1975: 174.
[210] *RRC* nos. 450/2, 451/1, 480/6, 480/24.
[211] CARTHAGE (COLONIA IULIA CONCORDIA): *CIL* 8.15205, 15529, 23820, 26615; *ILS* 9469. APAMEA (COLONIA IULIA CONCORDIA): *ILS* 314. NERTOBRIGA (COLONIA CONCORDIA IULIA): *CIL* 14.2613; Plin. *HN* 3.14. Gelzer 1969: 311; Weinstock 1971: 264; Hamlyn 2011: 78.

freedom (*libertas*) of himself and the Roman People from being oppressed by the faction of a few.[212] Some Caesarian coins feature the head of Libertas on the obverse in support of this statement.[213] Therefore, Caesar perhaps designed the honours concerning *libertas* and its homonymous deity as a further effort to validate his crossing of the Rubicon and to cast his hegemony as a boon to the state. With regards to Victoria, Caesar's statue accompanied hers in the procession of the gods, and the goddess featured on his and his supporters' coinage.[214]

The last abstraction, Clementia, is particularly significant since virtue served as a key justification for the worship of worthy mortals. Caesar consciously adopted a policy of clemency towards his enemies during the Civil War and he became renowned for this quality.[215] He not only sought to spare Romans' lives but did not exact any punishment from those who had opposed him. For example, he allowed Pompeians like L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, L. Afranius and M. Petreius to go free and permitted M. Claudius Marcellus, a bitter adversary, to return to Rome.[216] So significant was Caesar's clemency that a temple to him as a god was to be shared with the goddess Clementia.[217] As with so many other honours, this temple was advertised on Caesarian coins.[218] The goddess was possibly the personification of Caesar's own clemency, rather than the virtue in general. The legend on the coins suggests that the temple was to the Clementia Caesaris. At any rate, she was clearly very closely tied to Caesar. Appian mentions that Caesar and Clementia were to be depicted clasping hands, a piece of information that may well have come from the senatorial decree.[219] This represents their close connection and also indicates that they were to share the temple as συννάοι θέοι. Moreover, the clasping hands called to mind concord and peace, two other positive characteristics Caesar wished to have associated with his dominance.

Caesar's deification is not only significant as the introduction of the cult of a living ruler to Rome but also because it accorded with a well-developed theology.[220] This theology was largely the same as that in the Hellenistic East, to which it was obviously heavily indebted. The key justifications for worship of living mortals were virtuous conduct, outstanding benefactions to the

---

[212] Caes. *B Civ*. 1.22, cf. 1.9; cf. [Sall.] *Ad Caes. sen*. 2.4. Weinstock 1971: 139.
[213] *RRC* nos. 449/4, 473/1. Weinstock 1971: 140; cf. Crawford, *RRC* 1.465, 483.
[214] Cic. *Att*. 13.44.1. *RRC* nos. 448/1, 449/4, 464/4-6, 465/3-7, 472/3, 473/3, 474/6, etc., cf. 453/1, 454/3.
[215] E.g. Caes. ap. Cic. *Att*. 9.7c, 9.16.2; Cic. *Att*. 8.16.2, *Marcell*. 1, *Lig*. 6, 19, 29; *B Afr*. 89, 92; Vell. Pat. 2.56.3, 2.57.1; Sen. *Ira* 2.23.4; Plin. *HN* 7.93-94; Plut. *Caes*. 48.2, 57.3; Suet. *Iul*. 75. Weinstock 1971: 237-239; Dowling 2006: 21-26. See also next chapter.
[216] AHENOBARBUS: Caes. *B Civ*. 1.23; Livy, *Per*. 109; Plut. *Caes*. 34.3-4; Suet. *Iul*. 34.1, *Ner*. 2.2-3; App. *B Civ*. 2.38; Cass. Dio 41.11.3. AFRANIUS AND PETREIUS: Caes. *B Civ*. 1.84-87; Livy, *Per*. 110; App. *B Civ*. 2.43; Cass. Dio 41.23.1. MARCELLUS: Cic. *Marcell. passim*; cf. Marcellus ap. Cic. *Fam*. 4.11.
[217] See above.
[218] *RRC* no. 480/21.
[219] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.62 n. 56.
[220] This is not to suggest that such a theology was prescribed or universal, especially as this might have caused resistance (cf. Stevenson 1996: 16-18). Instead, beliefs would have varied from individual to individual (see immediately below). As a result, there would in effect have been a range of theologies, where the features highlighted in this paragraph were the most common.

state, divine favour and divine lineage. Power in itself does not appear to have been a reason, except insofar as it enabled the bestowal of benefactions. Each of these points is present in Caesar's honours. It will be seen that the same theology continued into Augustus' principate and formed the foundation of his honours and public image. Such continuity is a clear demonstration of Augustus' dependence on previous history. It is vital to acknowledge, however, that not everyone subscribed to the same outlook on divine honours. There is not the space here to survey all the evidence but it is clear that there was a range of attitudes at Rome, ranging from enthusiastic support to wholehearted opposition. No doubt there were other views in-between. For examples of the former, there is the popular worship of Marius, Marius Gratidianus and Caesar after his murder.[221] The latter can be seen in Cicero's condemnation of Caesar's deification and probably the removal of the inscription calling Caesar a demi-god.[222] The People supposedly did not applaud Caesar's statue when it appeared in the procession.[223] His statue on the Capitol was alleged to have caused resentment, and the ill-feeling caused by Camillus' white horses might really have related to Caesar.[224] Suetonius' negative view of Caesar's divine honours probably reflects contemporary criticism.[225] If one looks further in time, the same variety of attitudes is apparent. The crowd applauded Neptunus' statue in the circus procession in 40 BC, implying support for Sex. Pompeius' divine pretensions.[226] Writers like Valerius Maximus seem to have had no qualms about treating Divus Iulius as a god.[227] On the other hand, Tacitus records censure of the *princeps* for appropriating the honours of the gods and his comment labelling ruler cult as Greek flattery (*Graeca adulatio*) is often highlighted.[228] Similarly, Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and Vespasian's joke about his impending apotheosis are frequently cited as examples of scepticism and mockery.[229] It is impossible now for different attitudes then to be statistically quantified. Nevertheless, there was certainly not universal and unqualified support for divine honours among the Roman people. Moreover, it is evident that opinion was often based on religious feeling. This is not to say that political reasoning was absent or that there was never a mix of the two. Indeed, this no doubt varied as well. It does show, however, that ruler cult at Rome was religious to a significant degree.

The evidence for Caesar's actions in relation to his honours overwhelmingly indicates that he was the driving force behind them and did not merely accept them from others. Some further

---

[221] CAESAR: e.g. Suet. *Iul*. 84-85; App. *B Civ*. 2.148; Cass. Dio 44.51.1. For Marius and Marius Gratidianus, see above and next chapter.
[222] See below.
[223] Cic. *Att*. 13.44.1.
[224] STATUE ON THE CAPITOL: Cic. *Deiot*. 33-34. See below. WHITE HORSES: Cass. Dio 43.14.3 (Caesar); cf. Diod. Sic. 14.117.6; Plut. *Cam*. 7.1-2; Cass. Dio 52.13.3; Cass. Dio 6 (1.72 B) = Zonar. 7.21.3 (2.148 D); *De vir. ill*. 23.4 (Camillus). Cf. Weinstock 1971: 74.
[225] Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.
[226] Cass. Dio 48.31.5. See also below.
[227] E.g. Val. Max. 1 praef., 3.2.19, 5.1.10, 8.9.3, 9.2.4. Cf. Mueller 2002: 102-103, 153-154, 166-167.
[228] Tac. *Ann*. 1.10, 6.18.
[229] Suet. *Vesp*. 23.4.

considerations corroborate this view. In the few cases where the identity of the person who proposed the measures is recorded, it is a relative and supporter of Caesar, namely M. Antonius or L. Aurelius Cotta.[230] Thus, it can be expected that they acted in accordance with Caesar's wishes. Caesar typically acted autocratically and as he saw fit during his control of Rome, even though it frequently contravened Republican tradition and ideals. For example, he took up irregular positions of authority, including a sole consulship, an extended and ultimately perpetual dictatorship, and the oversight of public morals.[231] He appointed the magistrates and priests and selected Senate members.[232] He had senatorial decrees fabricated and exacted oaths from the magistrates that they would not oppose his measures.[233] This is to name only a few examples. Caesar was certainly not one to be manipulated, coerced or constrained by others. The civil war is testament to this. Caesar had enjoyed years of acting as a *de facto* military ruler, and his leadership had resulted in the conquest of Gaul and the defeat of Pompeius Magnus. He had secured his place as one of the most famous figures of human history. In light of his mythical ancestry and claims to divine favour, he probably saw himself as a man of destiny and even as much more than a man. Certainly, one can detect considerable haughtiness in his behaviour.[234] Some examples are the famous three-word report of his victory over Pharnaces, the triumph he celebrated over Romans at Munda and his reception of the Senate when they approached him at the Temple of Venus Genetrix in 44 BC.[235] Therefore, it is eminently plausible that he designed his honours and had them implemented by his adherents through the Senate and assemblies. With his keen educated mind and broad range of intellectual interests, Caesar was well capable of conceiving his honorary measures, especially since

---

[230] Antonius proposed that the month Quintilis be renamed Iulius (Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.34) and that a day be added to the *ludi Romani* in Caesar's honour (Cic. *Phil*. 2.110). Cotta appears to have played a role in Caesar's statue joining those of the gods in the *pompa circensis* (Cic. *Att*. 13.44.1). It was rumoured that Cotta would report to the Senate that Caesar should be given the kingship on the grounds of a passage in the Sibylline Books (Suet. *Iul*. 79.3; cf. Cic. *Div*. 2.110; Plut. *Caes*. 60.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.110; Cass. Dio 44.15.3-4). Although the rumour itself was probably unfounded (Rawson 1975a: 149-150; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.69-70; Hamlyn 2011: 89), it was clearly credible that Cotta would propose honours for Caesar. One may also note that it was Lepidus who enabled Caesar to gain his first dictatorship (Caes. *B Civ*. 2.21; Cass. Dio 41.36.1, 43.1.1; *MRR* 2.256-257) and his fourth, sole consulship (Cass. Dio 43.33.1), and L. Antonius who passed a bill allowing Caesar to appoint half the magistrates below the consuls (Cic. *Phil*. 7.16; *MRR* 2.323).

[231] SOLE CONSULSHIP: *Inscr. Ital*. 13.1.56-57, 242, 273-274; Cass. Dio 43.33.1, 43.46.2. *MRR* 2.304. PERPETUAL DICTATORSHIP: *RRC* nos. 480/6-16; Cic. *Phil*. 2.87; *Inscr. Ital*. 13.1.170-171; Livy, *Per*. 116; Josephus, *AJ* 14.10.7 (211); Plut. *Caes*. 57.1; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.8.4. *MRR* 2.317-318. OVERSIGHT OF MORALS: Cic. *Fam*. 9.15.5; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 43.14.4. *MRR* 2.295.

[232] APPOINTED MAGISTRATES: e.g. Cic. *Att*. 14.6.2; Suet. *Iul*. 41.2, 76.2-3; App. *B Civ*. 2.128, 138; Cass. Dio 42.20.4, 42.51.3-4, 43.47.1, 43.51.3. Yavetz 1983: 127-132. APPOINTED PRIESTS: App. *B Civ*. 2.128, 138; Cass. Dio 41.36.3, 42.51.3-4, 43.51.9. SELECTED SENATORS: Cic. *Div*. 2.23; Suet. *Iul*. 41.1, 76.3, 80.2; Cass. Dio 42.51.5, 43.27.2, 43.47.3; Macrob. *Sat*. 2.3.11. Yavetz 1983: 168-172.

[233] DECREES FABRICATED: Cic. *Fam*. 9.15.4. OATHS: App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.1. Weinstock 1971: 222.

[234] Hamlyn 2011: 100.

[235] *VENI*, *VIDI*, *VICI*: Plut. *Caes*. 50.2; Suet. *Iul*. 37.2, cf. 35.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.91; Cass. Dio 42.48.1. TRIUMPH FOR MUNDA: Livy, *Per*. 116; Plut. *Caes*. 56.4; Suet. *Iul*. 37.1, cf. 78.2; Cass. Dio 43.42.1; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.56.2. He even held the celebratory banquet twice (Suet. *Iul*. 38.2; cf. Plin. *HN* 14.97; Cass. Dio 43.42.1). THE INCIDENT WITH THE SENATE: Livy, *Per*. 116; Nic. Dam. 78-79; Plut. *Caes*. 60.3-5; Suet. *Iul*. 78.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.107; Cass. Dio 44.8; Eutr. 6.25.

they drew so extensively on history and precedent.[236] He might well have consulted his trusted friends and associates, yet there is little reason to doubt that he was the principal creator of his honours.[237]

One of the arguments used to deny Caesar's authorship of his honours is that the measures are inconsistent and do not appear to serve any coherent policy or aims.[238] Yet this is hardly the case. The honours are pointed and meaningful with certain themes being clearly discernible, as discussed above. Moreover, the honours are extensively interlinked and reinforce each other. Thus, for example, the identification of Caesar with Alexander supported his claims to divinity as well as the celebration of his outstanding *virtus*. Caesar's connections to Romulus underlined his paternal standing in the state, like an earthly Iuppiter, and his crucial importance as a liberator and second founder. Being a second founder also recalled his Trojan ancestry, of which he was so proud, and his divine descent, again justifying his deification. The list could go on and on. The fact that the honours can be complex and multi-faceted does not make them inconsistent or incoherent. Their objective is likewise quite plain: to establish Caesar as a divine autocrat on a model fusing Roman and Hellenistic elements.

Another objection against Caesar designing his honours is that he was not in Rome when they were decreed.[239] This is only true for the honours conferred after Thapsus and Munda, and by no means did he leave the city to its own devices. Key Caesarians administered Rome in his absence and he kept in continual contact by letter.[240] Most tellingly of all, Caesar was in Rome throughout the time his most excessive honours were decreed in late 45 and early 44 BC. The objection thus cannot stand. Nevertheless, it is pointed out in support of this argument that Caesar erased the inscription calling him a demigod from his statue on the Capitol when he returned to Rome in 46.[241] This is supposed to show that it was against his wishes.[242] It was, however, almost certainly a result of a negative reaction from some quarters, as occurred in relation to other matters at the time.[243] The statue itself remained and the escalation of honours resumed within a year, with Caesar deliberately timing the news of his victory at Munda to justify a connection to Romulus. A further critical flaw in the idea that the statue was unwanted is that its imagery was employed by Caesar both before and after its erection. Not only did the globe appear on his coinage, even in

---

[236] See below.
[237] Cf. Cic. *Att*. 10.4.9, *Fam*. 4.9.2. Cf. Yavetz 1983: 172-173.
[238] Gradel 2002: 58; cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.71-72.
[239] Gradel 2002: 58.
[240] Cf. Cic. *Att*. 11.6.3, 7, 11.7.2, 11.14.2, 11.18.1, *Fam*. 9.6.1, cf. 4.9.2; Aul. Gell. *NA* 17.9.1; Cass. Dio 43.28.2; etc. Yavetz 1983: 173; Hamlyn 2011: 85.
[241] Cass. Dio 43.21.2.
[242] Taylor 1931: 65; Balsdon 1967: 151; Alföldi 1975: 160; Gradel 2002: 58-59; Cole 2013: 186; cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.71.
[243] App. *B Civ*. 2.101; Cass. Dio 43.19.2-4, 43.27.2-3.

conjunction with his patron-goddess, Venus, but it was to apparently feature on his temple.[244] Dio comments that Caesar did not initially notice the honours set up on the Capitol in 46, which is a strange remark given that it speaks to Caesar's private thoughts and observations.[245] Dio's source obviously tried to distance Caesar from the poorly-received inscription, probably as part of a propaganda battle waged during his lifetime or in the aftermath of his assassination.

It has been stated that Caesar's honours were not implemented before his imminent departure for the East in March 44 and that this would not have been the case had he been their author.[246] Once again, this completely mischaracterises the situation. Most of Caesar's main honours had indeed been put into effect, including ones used by Caesar himself. He had, for instance, used his golden throne, golden crown and purple toga. His image had been included with those of the gods in processions since 45. Prominent statues of him had already been installed in major public places like the Rostra and the Capitol. The *fastigium* had been added to his home. One could not realistically expect any more of his significant measures to have been enacted than there already were. The building of his temple obviously could not be done in so short a period of time. The inauguration of Antonius as his *flamen* was not difficult, as Cicero was at pains to emphasise.[247] It was also not a matter of urgency. The ceremony might have been planned for just before Caesar left or for some time thereafter.[248] The question is of little consequence since it in no way reflects a lack of interest on Caesar's part in his deification, the importance and reality of which is clear from the other related measures. Therefore, there is no strong evidence against Caesar being the source of his raft of honours.

The alternative interpretation put forward by those who would minimise Caesar's responsibility is that he was pressured into accepting the honours from the Senate, who created them either from some supposed need to define his position or because of the senators' ulterior motives.[249] These motives were to ingratiate themselves with Caesar, thus avoiding potential proscriptions and encouraging benefactions, or to incite ill-will towards him and thus bring about his downfall.[250] It undoubtedly was a concern for Caesar that he maintain a necessary level of support within the Senate and across the population in general. After all, he had consciously decided not to pursue the bloody tactics used by the likes of Sulla. Caesar thus employed priesthoods and magistracies as rewards and promoted a considerable number of men to the Senate.[251] He also tried to defuse the issue of the kingship when it threatened to rouse discontent.[252]

---

[244] *RRC* nos. 449/4, 464/3, 465/8, 480/3, 6, 15. TEMPLE: *RRC* no. 480/21.
[245] Cass. Dio 43.21.2.
[246] Gradel 2002: 59; cf. Cole 2013: 186.
[247] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110.
[248] Cf. Ehrenberg 1964: 154; Alföldi 1970: 175.
[249] E.g. Alföldi 1975: 170, 178-179; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.71-72; Gradel 2002: 58-60.
[250] Nic. Dam. 67, 69, 80; Plut. *Caes*. 57.2-3; Cass. Dio 44.3, 44.7.3-4, 44.8.4.
[251] Cf. Cic. *Fam*. 12.18.2.

Refusing honours, so it is argued, would appear to be a rejection of the senators' goodwill and would be contrary to his policy of conciliation and moderation.[253] This point might be valid if losing senatorial support was a serious fear for Caesar but it does not appear to have been so. He did refuse honours proposed by the Senate where he saw fit, although just how many is impossible to tell.[254] His general behaviour is particularly telling. It is more than evident that Caesar was not greatly worried about his popularity since he committed numerous insensitive acts that predictably offended many people. Some examples include the triumphs he celebrated over Roman forces, his affair with Cleopatra, his expansion of the Senate, his bestowal of short-term consulships on supporters, and his appointment of magistrates.[255] This is not the behaviour of a man who felt he needed to do all he could to pander to public opinion, especially as he knew of the resentment towards him regarding various issues and even that there had been plots against him.[256]

If excessive honours like his deification had been driven by the sycophancy and malice of the senators, then it would have been completely against Caesar's interests to accept them. It would have been playing right into their hands and would have been exceptionally weak and foolish on his part. Caesar was only too well aware of such considerations, and it was even the grounds for his removal of the two plebeian tribunes, C. Epidius Marullus and L. Caesetius Flavus.[257] He would have had no difficulty in justifying his refusal, given the measures' departure from tradition, and indeed such a refusal would have to be expected. The lesser honours that were successfully conferred were so numerous that he would have no need to worry about appearing contemptuous of the Senate's supposed goodwill. He would also earn the *gloria recusandi*, the renown for refusal, which he explicitly stated he aimed at acquiring in relation to the kingship.[258] This would benefit his public image and better match his attempts to appear moderate and benevolent.

The explanation of Caesar being coerced into allowing the senatorial decrees is flawed and so megalomania has been added to buttress the argument. This can be found in ancient and modern authors alike.[259] Dio, who subscribes to the Senate-centred interpretation, asserts that the senators had not initially expected that Caesar would acquiesce to extreme honours but that the measures

---

[252] E.g. Nic. Dam. 69-70; Suet. *Iul*. 79.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.107, 108; Cass. Dio 44.9.1-2, 44.10.1; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 60.2. Hamlyn 2011: 88-89. This was probably also his intention with what transpired at the Lupercalia in 44 BC.
[253] Gradel 2002: 59; cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1982: 37. Cf. Cass. Dio 44.3.3.
[254] Cass. Dio 42.19.3-4, 43.14.7, cf. 44.3.2-3, 44.7.2; cf. App. *B Civ*. 2.107. The various statements are somewhat contradictory.
[255] TRIUMPHS: Plut. *Caes*. 56.4; App. *B Civ*. 2.101; Cass. Dio 43.19.2-4, 43.42.1-2. CLEOPATRA: Cass. Dio 43.27.3, cf. 43.20.2; cf. Cic. *Att*. 15.15.2-3; Suet. *Iul*. 52.1. EXPANSION OF THE SENATE: Suet. *Iul*. 76.3, 80.2; Cass. Dio 43.27.2, 43.47.3; Macrob. *Sat*. 2.3.11. SHORT-TERM CONSULSHIPS: Cic. *Fam*. 7.30.1-2; Suet. *Iul*. 76.2, 80.3; Macrob. *Sat*. 2.2.13, 2.3.6. APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES: Cic. *Att*. 14.6.2; Suet. *Iul*. 76.2-3.
[256] Cic. *Marcell*. 21-23, 32, *Deiot*. 33-34, *Att*. 14.1.2, 14.2.3; Suet. *Iul*. 86.2; App. *B Civ*. 2.109; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.57.1.
[257] Cf. Suet. *Iul*. 75.5; Cass. Dio 43.15.1. CAESAR'S ACCUSATION AGAINST MARULLUS AND FLAVUS: Livy, *Per*. 116; Nic. Dam. 69; App. *B Civ*. 2.108; Cass. Dio 44.10.1; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.68.4-5; Val. Max. 5.7.2.
[258] Suet. *Iul*. 79.1.
[259] ANCIENT: e.g. Suet. *Iul*. 76.1-79.1; Cass. Dio 43.41.3, 44.3.1, 44.8.4; Eutr. 6.25. MODERN: e.g. Collins 1955: 445-465; Rawson 1975b: 257.

escalated as he continued to react to the decrees with delight.[260] This is despite the dismissive attitude he was meant to have exhibited towards the high honours voted in 44 BC.[261] If Caesar really had such a lust for honours from the Senate, then it is difficult to explain why he had not spent more time in Rome and why he was leaving for the East seeking further military achievements.[262] It was these that he truly valued, as he attempted to emulate and even surpass Alexander. In fact, he would not have remained in Rome as long as he did if it were not for his concern that his laws would not be followed.[263] Therefore, explanations for Caesar's honours that focus on the Senate require a gross deterioration in the way he managed and perceived his power and achievements. One cannot deny that his assassination represents an obvious political failure but there is no need to ascribe it to weakness or delusion. Instead, it is far more likely that Caesar was the driving force behind his honours as a part of his deliberate plans for Rome and his position. In order to build a new autocratic system of government and finally resolve the long-term ills of the Republic, it would be reasonable for him to undertake the risk of creating significant opposition by implementing such honorary measures. Their suitability to such an agenda and Caesar's visible involvement in supporting them clearly suggests that this was the case.

This is not to say that the senators never put forward their own proposed honours. They very probably did. Dio, who provides the greatest detail as to Caesar's honours, states that there were many that he omits because they were either not worthy of mention, being common and unremarkable, or were refused by Caesar.[264] It would be reasonable to assume that the majority of these had been suggested by senators on their own initiative. Besides sycophancy and malice, one should not rule out individuals acting out of sincere gratitude and admiration. Caesar had bestowed favours on many people and they could well wish to show their thanks. Some may have been enthusiastic supporters who simply believed that he was deserving of a superior status. It is possible to detect two proposals that were probably made without Caesar's prompting or backing. The first is that he should hold the consulship for the next ten years.[265] This was refused as it would be unnecessary with his other powers and would monopolise one of the political positions he would otherwise need to give to his chosen subordinates. The second is that he could marry as many

---

[260] Cass. Dio 44.7.2.
[261] Such disinterest or even contempt for the honours is one interpretation of his failure to acknowledge the senators when they approached him at the temple of Venus Genetrix (Livy, *Per.* 116; Nic. Dam. 78-79; Plut. *Caes.* 60.3-5; Suet. *Iul.* 78.1; App. *B Civ.* 2.107; Cass. Dio 44.8; Eutr. 6.25). Other interpretations include an arrogant sense of superiority over the senators (Eutr. 6.25; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 79.1), that Caesar was frustrated with senatorial interference in his measures (Hamlyn 2011: 87; cf. Plut. *Caes.* 60.3), and, although extremely unlikely, being overcome with joy at the honorary decree (Cass. Dio 44.8.2).
[262] Cf. Plut. *Caes.* 58.2.
[263] Cic. *Att.* 13.7.1, cf. 13.31.3.
[264] Cass. Dio 42.19.3-4, 43.14.7, cf. 43.46.1, 44.3.2-3, 44.7.2.
[265] App. *B Civ.* 2.106, 107; Cass. Dio 43.45.1; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 76.1.

women as he wished in order to produce a natural heir.[266] The motion was allegedly drafted by Helvius Cinna, who helped Caesar to remove the plebeian tribunes Marullus and Flavus.[267] If the proposal really was made, Cinna probably aimed to further ingratiate himself with Caesar. For the most part, however, completely independent proposals from the Senate were probably minimal, especially in the latter part of his dictatorship. This is because the senators would have had no need to invent their own measures. They would merely need to support proposals that had been initiated at Caesar's behest, perhaps making additions or modifications to strengthen them further. In the absence of such proposals, they could put forward measures in a similar vein to ones passed earlier. Any of this would serve their ends, whatever they were, just as well or even better than if they had created their own motions. Flatterers and admirers could have greater confidence that they would please Caesar, while his enemies would be more sure that he would accept and become a greater target of resentment. As a result, the Senate's involvement in Caesar's honours programme was most likely limited, generally taking the form of emulating or tampering with measures he instigated.[268]

Some scholars have argued for Cicero having a heavy influence on Caesar's honours. In fact, it is supposed that Cicero took a leading role in proposing them in the Senate.[269] This is almost certainly not the case. Plutarch, it is true, states that Cicero moved certain honorary measures in Caesar's favour.[270] However, he is also explicit that these were the ones first proposed in the Senate and that they were not excessive. This would then rule out Cicero having had a hand in any of the more significant measures that were decreed. Moreover, Plutarch appears to have been confused or led astray in writing that Cicero was ever involved at all. When Cicero gave his speech praising Caesar for pardoning M. Marcellus in September 46 BC, he unequivocally said it was the end of a long silence during which he had deliberately abstained from an active part in public affairs.[271] He also mentions this in his letters.[272] Yet Caesar's first major honours had been conferred before his return to Rome earlier in the year.[273] As a result, it is not possible that Cicero suggested or advocated any of these measures in the Senate. It would have been highly unlikely in any case, since it was Caesar's clemency towards Marcellus that inspired such hope and positivity

[266] Suet. *Iul*. 52.3; Cass. Dio 44.7.3. Cinna supposedly claimed that he had been directed by Caesar to propose this in his absence. This, or indeed the whole story of the proposal, could, however, have been a malicious rumour.
[267] Cass. Dio 44.10.3.
[268] This could explain his apparent frustration with the senators, as demonstrated at the Temple of Venus Genetrix in 44 BC (Hamlyn 2011: 87). Cf. Cic. *Att*. 10.4.9.
[269] Meyer 1922: 517; Alföldi 1971: 85-86; Weinstock 1971: 166-167, 202-203; Wallace-Hadrill 1990: 166; Stevenson 1998: 264, cf. 267 n. 50; cf. Cole 2013: 111-131.
[270] Plut. *Caes*. 57.2, *Cic*. 40.4.
[271] Cic. *Marcell*. 1-2, cf. 13.
[272] Cic. *Fam*. 4.4.4.
[273] Cf. Cass. Dio 43.14.2-7, 43.21.2.

as Cicero displayed in his subsequent speech. Even after that, in late 46 BC, he professed that he scarcely had any influence at all in public affairs.[274]

There are a few likely explanations for Plutarch's mistake. First, he may have wrongly assumed from Cicero's praise of Caesar in his speeches from 46 and 45 that he also contributed to Caesar's early honours. There is some support for this in Plutarch's own accounts. In his *Cicero*, he describes his subject's relative lack of public activity at this time.[275] He writes that Cicero rarely visited Rome except to pay court to Caesar, to praise him and to advocate honours for him. Plutarch then provides the example of Cicero commending Caesar's restoration of Pompeius' statues as also securing his own.[276] If this is what Plutarch considers flattery and the promotion of honorary measures, then this indeed accords with the facts as known from the surviving evidence of Cicero, despite the misleading language Plutarch uses. A condensed version is given in his *Caesar* where he mentions the Senate's honorary decrees.[277] Here, Plutarch deviates more still in having Cicero actually propose Caesar's first honours. Therefore, it could be that he conjured in his mind an exaggerated role for Cicero from the information in his sources. Second, it is possible that Plutarch saw that Cicero was listed, albeit falsely, as having moved or supported certain honorary decrees. In late 46, Cicero complained that his name was being used for decrees forged by Cornelius Balbus at Caesar's behest.[278] Perhaps this or something similar occurred with some of Caesar's early honours too. Finally, in the propaganda that doubtlessly existed during Caesar's dictatorship and after his murder, Cicero may have been accused of maliciously and deceitfully flattering Caesar and voting him honours. The aim of this would be to distance Caesar from the measures or to discredit Cicero, who vociferously championed the Republicans' cause after the assassination. Plutarch may have used such a propagandistic source in composing his account.

Some other excerpts from the sources have been interpreted as references to Cicero promoting honours to Caesar. Antonius told A. Hirtius and Octavian in early 43 BC that Cicero had deceived them with the same *ornamenta* with which he deceived Caesar.[279] This is taken as further evidence that Cicero voted honours to Caesar in the Senate.[280] The aforementioned *ornamenta*, however, are not 'distinctions' or 'honours' but 'compliments' or 'praises'. Such is clear from the fact that those Cicero gave to Caesar are meant to be the same type as he gave to Hirtius and Octavian. Hirtius was yet to receive any honours from the Senate, while Cicero at this point had only proposed that Octavian receive *imperium*, a necessary tool in the fight against Antonius, and

---

[274] Cic. *Fam*. 9.15.3-4.
[275] Plut. *Cic*. 40.3-4.
[276] Cf. Suet. *Iul*. 75.4; Polyaenus, *Strat*. 8.23.31; Cass. Dio 43.49.1-2.
[277] Plut. *Caes*. 57.2, 4.
[278] Cic. *Fam*. 9.15.4. Balbus is not named explicitly but the identity of the decrees' forger can be inferred.
[279] Cic. *Phil*. 13.40-41.
[280] Alföldi 1971: 85; Weinstock 1971: 203; Wallace-Hadrill 1990: 166.

relatively minor distinctions like Senate membership.[281] There is nothing that is remotely of the magnitude conferred on Caesar. Indeed, Cicero denied any of it to be much of an honour at all.[282] Cicero had, however, expressed glowing praise of Octavian, much as he had done for Caesar in 46.[283] It would not be surprising if Cicero had lauded Hirtius as well, given the Republicans' efforts to attach him to their cause.[284] Thus, the *ornamenta* to which Antonius referred are not hard to find. A similar piece of literary evidence has also been called upon to support the argument of Cicero's involvement in Caesar's honours.[285] Brutus accuses Cicero of encouraging Octavian to be a despot with his thanks in the same way as he did with Caesar. Once again, this is a reference to verbal praise, not the vote of honours. More to the point, the letter is probably not authentic.[286] Cicero does defend himself in a genuine letter against a charge from Brutus of being too free with honours.[287] The honours at issue here are, however, solely those for Octavian and others like D. Brutus. There is no mention of or comparison with Caesar.

Weinstock interprets a sentence in Cicero's speech for Q. Ligarius in 46 BC as an explicit call for monuments to Caesar's clemency.[288] The context is Cicero praising Caesar's forgiveness of Ligarius' accuser, Q. Aelius Tubero, and Cicero himself, whose cases were supposedly less deserving than that of the defendant. The point is that Ligarius must be worthy of pardon as well. When Cicero declares that such *clementia* should be glorified (*decorandam*) with, among other things, *monumenta*, he does not mean physical memorials like statues and buildings but rather intangible reminders. This is shown by *monumenta* being listed alongside praise (*laus*), commendation (*praedicatio*) and literature (*litterae*). It is confirmed by Cicero's parallel use of the word in his speech for Deiotarus, where he declares the greatest *monumentum* of Caesar's clemency to be freedom from harm for those he granted safety.[289] Moreover, the honours for Caesar's *clementia*, like the title *parens patriae* and the statue on the Rostra with the *corona civica*, came in the latter part of 45 BC, when Cicero almost certainly could not have proposed them.[290] There is, in

---

[281] Cic. *Phil*. 5.45-46, 13.41, *Ad Brut*. 1.15.7.
[282] Cic. *Ad Brut*. 1.15.7, cf. *Phil*. 5.45.
[283] E.g. Cic. *Phil*. 3.3-5, 4.3-4, 5.23, 5.43, 12.9, 13.18-19, 13.25, cf. *Fam*. 12.25.4, *Ad Brut*. 1.3.1; cf. D. Brutus ap. Cic. *Fam*. 11.20.1.
[284] Cic. *Att*. 14.20.4, 14.21.4, 15.6.1, cf. *Fat*. 2.
[285] Brutus ap. Cic. *Ad Brut*. 1.16.2-3. Meyer 1922: 517; Alföldi 1971: 85; Weinstock 1971: 203.
[286] Shackleton Bailey 1980: 10-14.
[287] Cic. *Ad Brut*. 1.15.3-9.
[288] Cic. *Lig*. 6. Weinstock 1971: 166-167.
[289] Cic. *Deiot*. 40.
[290] The reasons for this statement are discussed below. One further reason could be added. Cicero directly addressed Caesar in 45 BC about the supposed popular resentment of his statue on the Capitol among those of the kings and L. Brutus (Cic. *Deiot*. 33-34). He dismissed the allegation, giving the feeble arguments that there were already so many statues and that the Rostra was a position of greater distinction. It would be exceedingly strange then for Cicero to soon propose the very honour (a statue on the Rostra) that he had implied to Caesar himself would provide stronger grounds for ill-feeling among the People.

any case, obvious danger in taking such rhetoric as a literal statement of Cicero's feelings or as a guide to his actions.

Finally, Dio writes that only Cassius and a few others opposed Caesar's distinctions.[291] It has been supposed by implication that Cicero voted in their favour.[292] However, Dio specifically states that this was in relation to a decree of particularly numerous and significant honours made in a single day in early 44. These honours apparently included the title *parens patriae*, sacrosanctity and the permanent dictatorship.[293] Cicero could well have been absent from the Senate on this occasion, as on many others, perhaps deliberately so. At worst, he may have thought opposition futile and acquiesced to the decree, which was presumably supported by the likes of Brutus as well. Yet there are difficulties with Dio's information and with the sources related to this issue in general. The opponents of the decree became famous for their dissent, according to Dio, but the only name provided is that of Cassius and no other writer mentions there being votes against the honours at all. Moreover, Dio points out that Cassius and the others who opposed the decree were not harmed by Caesar, a clear sign of his clemency. There is thus a deliberate contrast between Caesar and his murderers. Dio may have gleaned this information from a source that aimed to condemn the assassins by highlighting this contrast. The source may also have been responding to denials that the conspirators were the ones responsible for Caesar's excessive distinctions and perceived haughtiness. This charge is found in Dio and others.[294] If there was a pro-Republican assertion that many of the conspirators had refused to collaborate in conferring honours on Caesar, Dio's source perhaps sought to counter it by downplaying their numbers and emphasising Caesar's moderation. The insinuation in Dio's account is that the vast majority of senators supported the honorary decree. The writers who imply it had universal senatorial support, such as the pro-Caesarian account of Nicolaus Damascenus, may have omitted mention of opposition altogether in their own attempt to incriminate the enemies of Caesar for the blame levelled at the dictator.[295] On the other hand, it may be right that there was no dissent against the decree. After all, those who hated Caesar are reported to have advocated his honours, supposedly to incite popular ill-will towards him.[296] The biases and agendas of contemporary sources have strongly impacted the information left to posterity and obfuscate the truth of the matter.[297] At any rate, Dio's testimony is not sufficient to draw any firm conclusions regarding Cicero's actions in the Senate. As a result, there is no evidence in the sources for Cicero putting forward any of Caesar's honorary measures.

---

[291] Cass. Dio 44.8.1.
[292] Rawson 1975b: 256.
[293] Livy, *Per.* 116; cf. Cass. Dio 44.8.4. Cf. Balsdon 1967: 152.
[294] Nic. Dam. 67, 69, 80; Plut. *Caes.* 57.2-3; Cass. Dio 44.3, 44.7.3-4, 44.8.4.
[295] Nic. Dam. 78; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 78.1.
[296] Bellemore (1984: 103) suggests that this might have been an excuse for their flattery and complicity.
[297] Such is also the case with accounts of Caesar's reception of the senators at the Temple of Venus Genetrix in early 44 BC.

There are other reasons for believing that Cicero never proposed or supported Caesar's honours. He engaged in very little public activity during this time, deliberately devoting himself to intellectual pursuits instead.[298] From 46 to 44, Cicero produced a very high literary output, writing such works as the *Brutus*, the *Hortensius*, *De finibus*, *Tusculanae disputationes*, *De natura deorum* and *De divinatione*. A large part of this time he was not at Rome, staying at locations like Tusculum and Astura. He also had upheaval in his domestic affairs to contend with.[299] Cicero divorced two wives in quick succession.[300] The death of his daughter in early 45 left him overcome with grief and he devoted himself to seeking consolation for his loss.[301] He did not begin to improve until May that year and thus he could not possibly have taken part in the voting of the major honours decreed by the Senate in April. These formed the next significant batch of distinctions after those conferred in 46. The speech he had made thanking Caesar for Marcellus' pardon was the peak of his hopes and his positive attitude towards him. This optimism did not last long. Cicero reacted bitterly to the honours Caesar received in 45, rejoicing that the People did not applaud Caesar's statue in the procession and sardonically remarking that he preferred Caesar to share a temple with Quirinus than with Salus ('Safety').[302] He had enormous difficulty trying to write a flattering letter of advice to Caesar at this time.[303] He could hardly have brought himself to propose or even support honours from the Senate. Atticus had persuaded Cicero to take on the project as a gesture of co-operation with the dictator.[304] This would not have been necessary if Cicero had espoused any of Caesar's distinctions.

Cicero continued to be courteous to Caesar, who had, after all, shown much respect for him. Nevertheless, he did not shy away from subtle criticisms or actions that might offend. Thus, he published an encomium of Cato, Caesar's bitter enemy, and, in his speech for Deiotarus, he referred to the unaccustomed circumstances of Caesar personally judging in his own home an accusation of attempted murder where he was supposedly the intended victim.[305] Even in his address concerning Marcellus' pardon, Cicero's praise was not unqualified or unmitigated. He urged Caesar to reinvigorate the Republic and secure its future, for only then could the favourable judgement of posterity be assured. Otherwise, one might find fault with his achievements or attribute them to factors like fate and fortune rather than Caesar himself.[306] If Cicero only gave hints as to his

---

[298] E.g. Cic. *Fam*. 4.4.4, 5.13.5, 7.33.2, 9.6.5. Stockton 1971: 269-270; Rawson 1975b: 209-216, 230-247.
[299] Stockton 1971: 262-264, 275-276; Rawson 1975b: 222-229.
[300] Plut. *Cic*. 41.2-5.
[301] E.g. Cic. *Att*. 12.13, 12.14.3, 12.16, 12.20, 12.28.2, 12.38a.1, 12.40.2-3, 12.46.1, *Fam*. 4.6.2, 5.15.3-4.
[302] Cic. *Att*. 12.45.3, 13.44.1, cf. 13.28.3.
[303] Cic. *Att*. 12.40.2, 13.27.1, 13.28.2-3, 13.31.3.
[304] Cic. *Att*. 12.51.2, 13.26.2. Rawson 1975b: 248.
[305] CICERO'S *CATO* OFFENDING CAESAR: Cic. *Att*. 13.27.1; Plut. *Caes*. 54.2-3. THE UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF DEIOTARUS' TRIAL: Cic. *Deiot*. 4-7.
[306] Cic. *Marcell*. 23-30.

feelings in public, they were made plain in private.[307] He joked about the famously short consulship of Caninius Rebilus, whom Caesar had elected for less than a day at the end of 45 BC, but confessed he could only bear to live in Rome with the support of philosophy and his friendship with Atticus.[308] Caesar was apparently under no illusions as to his sentiments, stating that he did not doubt that Cicero hated him.[309]

After Caesar's death, Cicero openly and explicitly declared his disdain for Caesar's honours.[310] This would be ridiculous if Cicero had played any sort of role in their implementation and would have left him open to attack. Instead, Antonius apparently asked Cicero if he supported Caesar's divine honours.[311] Clearly, Cicero had not demonstrated in any way that he did. Cicero also displays contempt for Caesar's title of *parens patriae*.[312] This decisively disproves the unlikely notion that Cicero himself had proposed it.[313] Could Brutus, furthermore, have shouted Cicero's name over Caesar's dead body if he could have been seen as a supporter of the tyrant?[314] Cicero surely could not have become the figurehead of the Republican cause in opposition to Antonius that he did either. Therefore, there are multiple clear signs that Cicero did not personally contribute to Caesar's honours from the Senate or even advocate them.

Part of the reason that Cicero has been implicated in Caesar's honorary measures, either directly as their proposer or indirectly as their main inspiration, is a tendency to view Cicero as the most prominent and influential intellectual figure of his day. One could certainly make a reasonable argument for this being the case. Caesar's praise of Cicero's achievements shows that such a view was possible at the time, even if his comment was calculated to appeal to its subject.[315] Yet on no account should it be thought that Cicero had no rival or was the sole person capable of conceiving the kind of nuanced and meaningful distinctions that were conferred on Caesar. That is far from true. Among Cicero's contemporaries were numerous individuals who devoted serious efforts to intellectual pursuits. Varro is a famous example, being described by Quintilian as 'the most learned of Romans'.[316] Nigidius Figulus, a Pythagorean, was renowned for his interest in such topics as

---

[307] E.g. Cic. *Att*. 13.40.1, *Fam*. 4.6.2, 4.14.1, 6.1; Plut. *Caes*. 59.3, cf. *Cic*. 42.1; Macrob. *Sat*. 2.3.10-12. Stockton 1971: 276-279.
[308] Cic. *Fam*. 7.30.1-2; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 58.1; Cass. Dio 43.46.4; Macrob. *Sat*. 2.3.6.
[309] Cic. *Att*. 14.1.2, cf. 14.2.3.
[310] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111, cf. 1.12-13.
[311] Cic. *Phil*. 2.111.
[312] Cic. *Phil*. 13.25.
[313] Note also that the title had been foreshadowed early in the civil war with the appearance of the oak-wreath on Caesarian coinage (*RRC* nos. 448/1, 452/1-2).
It may be significant that Caesar was specifically called *parens patriae* rather than *pater patriae* like Cicero (although both terms were used in relation to the latter). There could be a deliberate distinction between Caesar's use of clemency and Cicero's use of capital punishment. Even if this contrast was not intended, it could easily be interpreted that way. Therefore, it is hardly likely that Cicero proposed the title for Caesar (Alföldi 1971: 86-92; Stevenson 1998: 267 n. 50; *contra* Weinstock 1971: 202-203).
[314] Cic. *Phil*. 2.28, 30; cf. Cass. Dio 44.20.4.
[315] Plin. *HN* 7.117.
[316] Quint. *Inst*. 10.1.95. Rawson 1985: *passim*; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.152, 153.

astrology and divination.[317] Ap. Claudius Pulcher (*cos*. 54 BC) was an expert in antiquities and augury in particular, which he staunchly defended as a valid practice.[318] L. Caesar (*cos*. 64 BC), a cousin of the dictator and uncle of M. Antonius, was another augur who published a treatise on the subject.[319] Beyond experts or devotees like these, there must have been many more who were familiar with antiquarian and religious matters, whether through interest, their education, or the performance of legal or cult duties. Tradition was, after all, a major part of Roman culture. Elite families frequently employed mythology and antiquarianism to enhance their family reputations and prestige. This testifies to these subjects' importance. Likewise, the significance of many of Caesar's honours presume a certain level of knowledge, and indeed belief, among the population for them to have been effective. Perhaps such knowledge was uneven, as it seems to have been with Greek philosophy, but it was there.

With regards to Caesar's honours, it is crucial to note the intellectual capacity of the dictator himself. There should be no doubt that he was capable of designing his distinctions or that he had the inclination. His *Commentarii* attest to his literary talents, and he composed a number of other works, including poetry, plays and a treatise on the Latin language, that have not survived.[320] His oratory was of such a high standard that it was said to rival that of Cicero.[321] Indeed, his education and rhetorical training were similar to those of Cicero.[322] Caesar and Cicero were thus exposed to much the same background and influences, as too were many members of the elite. Caesar demonstrated a particular interest in history, culture and antiquities, as with his observations on the Gauls and his actions against C. Rabirius, to name but two examples.[323] Caesar hardly needed the assistance of someone like Cicero to form his plans and measures. This is especially true for his honours because they draw so heavily on historical precedents. Generally, it was merely a matter of adapting earlier examples from Rome and the Hellenistic East rather than creating distinctions that were wholly novel. It is possible that Caesar drew inspiration from Cicero in some instances, namely the title *parens patriae* and its associated elements. Nevertheless, even here Cicero's example followed earlier precedents and was not essential.[324]

Besides the evidence of his dictatorship, there were earlier signs that Caesar was not only capable of formulating his honours but actually inclined to do so. In his youth, Caesar wrote a work

---

[317] E.g. Cic. *Fam*. 4.13.3; Luc. 1.639-672; Suet. *Aug*. 94.5; Cass. Dio 45.1.3-5; Serv. *Aen*. 10.175. Rawson 1985: 94, 309-312; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.153-154.
[318] E.g. Cic. *Brut*. 267, *Tusc*. 1.37, *Div*. 1.105, 132; cf. Val. Max. 1.8.10; Luc. 5.120-236. Rawson 1985: 93, 302; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.152-153.
[319] E.g. Festus 154 L; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.16.29; Prisc. *Inst*. 6.86, 8.15. Lewis 1955: 38; Rawson 1985: 93, 302.
[320] E.g. Cic. *Brut*. 253; Suet. *Iul*. 56.
[321] Plut. *Caes*. 3.1-4.2; Suet. *Iul*. 55; cf. Cic. *Brut*. 252-253, 261-262; Vell. Pat. 2.43.3.
[322] E.g. Plut. *Caes*. 3.1; Suet. *Gram*. 7; Macrob. *Sat*. 3.12.8. Cf. Rawson 1985: 109-110.
[323] GAULS: Caes. *B Gall*. 6.13-20. RABIRIUS: e.g. Cic. *Rab. perd*. 10-13; Suet. *Iul*. 12; Cass. Dio 37.26-28; cf. Livy 1.26. Hamlyn 2011: 66.
[324] See next chapter.

entitled *Laudes Herculis* ('Praises of Hercules'), the titular hero being a prime example of a mortal deified for his virtue, achievements and divine lineage.[325] The mythical heritage of the Iulii, promoted by his relatives before him and to which he was so strongly devoted, provided links to the deification of mortals through Aeneas and Ascanius.[326] He had won the *corona civica* in the traditional manner in 80 BC and so had the privilege of wearing an honorary crown for many years before the civil war.[327] He had also apparently adopted unusual dressing habits long before he received honours like the triumphal costume and red shoes, so he was perhaps accustomed to making himself stand out.[328] Caesar had supported special honours for Pompeius Magnus in 63 and 62 BC, showing at the very least that he could countenance such measures.[329] In his first consulship, Caesar re-introduced the obsolete practice of an *accensus* preceding him in the months he did not have the *fasces*.[330] This perhaps seemed rather trivial to many but to him it must have been worthy of implementation.

The most plausible explanation for Caesar's honours is that they were driven by Caesar with the aid of his inner circle. It is significant that his distinctions, including his deification, came 'from above' and were not initiated from below, from the senators or the general populace. This is in contrast to civic cults in the Hellenistic kingdoms. The apparent variety of attitudes at Rome towards the kinds of honours conferred on Caesar suggests that any movement backing them within the general population would have had difficulty gaining a sufficiently broad base. This is especially the case for the creation of an official cult, whether enacted through the Senate or a bill in the assembly. The nature of Roman government, being dominated by the wealthy elite, means it was necessary to have the support, or at least acquiescence, of most of the upper classes. This posed a significant obstacle, since the concentration of power and prestige in one man openly conflicted with the engrained ideals of the aristocracy, which valued free competition and rule by consensus. Yet such hurdles were by no means insurmountable, as subsequent history proves. All this provides essential context and background for Augustus' honours and the establishment of his principate. Caesar's hegemony had thrown into sharp relief the issues Augustus would face in the not-too-distant future.

Caesar's aim must have been to establish a new political arrangement based on one-man rule. Some scholars have seen Caesar as essentially introducing Hellenistic monarchy to Rome, while others have believed he was attempting to recreate Roman kingship, whether or not it was to

---

[325] Suet. *Iul*. 56.7.
[326] See above.
[327] Suet. *Iul*. 2. Gelzer 1969: 22.
[328] Suet. *Iul*. 45.3; Cass. Dio 43.43.2-5; Macrob. *Sat*. 2.3.9. Paterson 2009:129-130.
[329] Cass. Dio 37.21.4, 37.44.1-2; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.40.4.
[330] Suet. *Iul*. 20.1.

be called by that name.[331] Each of these views relies on highlighting particular features of Caesar's regime. The truth is that his autocracy was an amalgam of Roman and Hellenistic elements.[332] Several honours were imitations of those that had previously been conferred in the Greek East, particularly on Alexander and Demetrius Poliorcetes. Some examples are his crown being displayed on a chair, his image being included in the procession of the gods, having his portrait on the coinage, having his own quadrennial festival, and having a month and tribe renamed after him. A number of other honours were distinctly Roman. Among them were the statues with the oak- and grass-crowns, the right to wear the triumphal dress, an *ovatio*, having the Vestals pray for his safety, and having his own college of *luperci*. Other honours still do not fit wholly in either category. Caesar received a statue on the Capitol to portray him as a liberator, just like L. Brutus, who was commemorated by the Romans in the same way. Yet the Athenians had also erected statues in the Agora of the tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton, alongside which they later added ones of Antigonus and Demetrius Poliorcetes.[333] A fifth day was added to the *ludi Romani* for Caesar. This was done in replication of an act from Camillus' time but days had been added to festivals in the East to honour Hellenistic kings too.[334] Caesar's deification was very much a fusion of different cultural characteristics. Official cult of a living individual was itself an obvious Hellenistic import, being routine in the East but having never occurred at Rome. Such is also the case for Caesar sharing a temple with Clementia as a σύνναος θεός. The creation of a cult title accorded with foreign practice as well, though it was in keeping with Roman tradition that those who had been deified, albeit posthumously, received new names. The actual form of the cult title was manifestly Roman, as was the character of Caesar's priest. Therefore, it is impossible to describe the nature of Caesar's autocracy as being predominantly Roman or Hellenistic. There were major elements that could be attributed to each culture. Since Caesar was the driving force behind his honours, the foreign aspects were being deliberately adapted and introduced to Rome. It was not a case of slow cultural contamination corrupting Rome's system of government.

Between Caesar's Murder and the Battle of Actium, 44-31 BC

Divine honours continued to be a subject of critical importance after Caesar's murder and into the Triumviral Period. The Republicans would naturally have opposed the implementation of divine honours decreed to Caesar, since a figure thought worthy of cult could hardly be cast as a

[331] HELLENISTIC MONARCHY: e.g. Meyer 1922; Taylor 1931; Weinstock 1971. ROMAN KINGSHIP: e.g. Alföldi 1953. Other views have, of course, been put forward, including the denial that Caesar had any such aims at all (see Introduction; cf. Yavetz 1983: 10-56).
[332] Cf. Ehrenberg 1964.
[333] Weinstock 1971: 145-146.
[334] Weinstock 1971: 265-266.

tyrant. It was, however, part of the amnesty agreed to on 17 March that Caesar's acts would stand.[335] This suited many of the conspirators, who would otherwise lose the important positions Caesar had promised them. Strictly speaking, Caesar's deification was an act of the Senate rather than one of his own.[336] All the same, it too was apparently confirmed. This must be the basis of Plutarch's statement that the Senate voted divine honours to Caesar at this meeting.[337] At the very least, they must not have been rescinded, since both M. Antonius and Octavian attempted to make use of them at various times thereafter. These two men adopted different approaches to Caesar's divinity in accordance with the particular circumstances they each found themselves in. After accepting his inheritance as laid down in the dictator's will, it was in Octavian's best interests to support Caesar's worship. It would glorify himself, making him the son of a god, and help to earn the loyalty of the most ardent Caesarians, including a great many veterans. Antonius, on the other hand, attempted to plot a more difficult course in the hope of maintaining an advantage over both Octavian and the Republicans. Since Caesar's divine honours would favour Octavian, who already owed so much to being Caesar's heir, Antonius sought to impede their performance. This also helped him to an extent in his dealings with the Republicans. Yet he needed to be seen as paying due respect to Caesar's memory if he were to have the support of Caesarians.

As a result of all this, Caesar's divinity was contested between the two leading Caesarians after his death, as well as between Caesarians and Republicans. Antonius did not hesitate to praise Caesar or refer to his honours when it suited him. He aroused popular sympathy for Caesar and incited hatred against the conspirators with his conduct at the funeral, which included having the senatorial decrees read out that had honoured Caesar as *parens patriae* and as 'superhuman, sacred and inviolable'.[338] Later, when announcing the *ludi Apollinares*, he used July as the name of the month in which they would be held, thus putting into effect the honour he had himself proposed when Caesar still lived.[339] He permitted supplications to be performed in Caesar's honour.[340] Antonius also erected a statue on the Rostra with the inscription 'to the parent most deservedly'.[341] This paralleled the column set up by the People to worship Caesar that was inscribed 'to the parent of the fatherland' (*parenti patriae*).[342] Nevertheless, Antonius actively obstructed the implementation of other honours belonging to Caesar that were more explicitly divine. He prevented Octavian from displaying Caesar's golden throne and crown in the theatre at least twice

[335] E.g. Cic. *Phil*. 2.100; App. *B Civ*. 2.135. Weinstock 1971: 385.
[336] Cf. Balsdon 1970: 63.
[337] Plut. *Caes*. 67.4.
[338] App. *B Civ*. 2.143-147; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 84.2; Cass. Dio 44.35-50. Weinstock 1971: 351-352.
[339] Cic. *Att*. 16.1.1, 16.4.1; cf. Cass. Dio 44.5.2; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.34. Weinstock 1971: 369. See also above.
[340] Cic. *Phil*. 1.13; Cass. Dio 45.7.2. Weinstock 1971: 385.
[341] Cic. *Fam*. 12.3.1. Weinstock 1971: 385-386.
[342] Suet. *Iul*. 85.

in 44.[343] He may have been involved in the destruction of the altar to Caesar spontaneously created by the People.[344] Cicero ascribes the action solely to his consular colleague, Dolabella, and even accuses Antonius of collapsing with grief when he learned of the demolition.[345] Yet according to Appian, Antonius had executed the false Marius who was apparently involved in the altar's construction, and he put down the popular protests that followed.[346] Similarly, Dio states that it was the consuls who dealt with the altar.[347] There is no reason to doubt that Cicero is correct in stating that Antonius failed to celebrate the fifth day of the *ludi Romani* that belonged to Caesar.[348] The most obvious sign of Antonius' resistance to Caesar's worship was, as Cicero also pointed out, his evasion of being inaugurated as the *flamen Divi Iulii*. This he would delay even after the Triumvirate had re-enacted Caesar's deification.

Octavian did not give up in the face of Antonius' opposition. He celebrated the *ludi Veneris Genetricis* in July at his own expense and in conjunction with funerary games dedicated to Caesar.[349] In this, he was no doubt emulating the dictator, who had combined the games for Venus Genetrix with ones for his daughter in 46 BC.[350] For Octavian, it served to emphasise publicly his link to his adoptive father and demonstrate his *pietas* towards him. Moreover, Octavian was reinforcing his relationship with his divine ancestress by taking over responsibility for the festival from the college of which he was a member. Therefore, he was already making full use of his new name and its mythical origins. Octavian may have been prevented from exhibiting Caesar's crown and throne but exceptionally fortuitous circumstances gave an incredible boost to his efforts to promote Caesar's divinity. During the festival, a comet appeared that was visible for seven days.[351] There were competing interpretations of its significance, including that it portended looming disaster or the coming of a new age. Indeed, a comet was often taken as a baleful omen.[352] The People came to believe, however, that it was the star of Caesar and that he was taking his place among the heavens as a god. Whether they formed this conclusion at Octavian's urging or independently, it is easy to see why this view became widespread. It would have been an astonishing coincidence that the comet or 'star' had shown itself during games for Venus Genetrix and her recently-deceased descendant, which had just been moved to the month now named in his

---

[343] Nic. Dam. 108; App. *B Civ*. 3.28; cf. Cass. Dio 45.6.5. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.74.
[344] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 364.
[345] Cic. *Phil*. 2.107, cf. 1.5, 1.30, cf. *Att*. 14.15.1-2, 14.16.2, *Fam*. 9.14.1, 12.1.1; cf. Lactant. *Div. inst*. 1.15.30.
[346] App. *B Civ*. 3.3; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 1.5.
[347] Cass. Dio 44.51.2.
[348] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110.
[349] E.g. C. Matius ap. Cic. *Fam*. 11.28.6; Nic. Dam. 108; Suet. *Aug*. 10.1, cf. *Iul*. 88; App. *B Civ*. 3.28; Cass. Dio 45.6.4; Serv. *Ecl*. 9.47, *Aen*. 1.287, 6.790, 8.681. Ramsey and Licht 1997: 1-8; cf. Weinstock 1971: 368.
[350] Cass. Dio 43.22.2-3; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.56.1; Plin. *HN* 19.23; Plut. *Caes*. 55.2; Suet. *Iul*. 26.2, 39; App. *B Civ*. 2.102. Weinstock 1971: 89; Hamlyn 2011: 65.
[351] E.g. Augustus ap. Plin. *HN* 2.94; Plut. *Caes*. 69.3; Suet. *Iul*. 88; Obseq. 68; Serv. *Ecl*. 9.47, *Aen*. 1.287, 6.790, 8.681. Ramsey and Licht 1997: *passim*.
[352] Weinstock 1971: 371; Ramsey and Licht 1997: 135-136; cf. Pandey 2013: 408-411.

honour. One could hardly expect a more explicit sign of his apotheosis. All this might have been aided by the use of the star on Caesar's coins before his death, probably as a reference to Venus.[353] To further propagate the view that the comet was the astral translation of his divine father, Octavian fixed a star to the head of Caesar's statue in the Temple of Venus Genetrix.[354] Pliny asserts that in private Octavian rejoiced at the thought that the comet was connected to himself and was a sign of his own coming greatness.[355] If true, this would be a strong indication of his sense of destiny and self-importance at such an early stage. He was perhaps influenced by other events too, such as a consultation with an astrologer.[356] Nevertheless, the comet became famous as the star of Caesar and was celebrated by the likes of Virgil and Ovid.[357]

In November 44 BC, Octavian swore in a public speech that he would attain his father's honours, which probably meant that he would implement the measures that had been decreed for his official deification.[358] It was only with the formation of the Triumvirate in late 43 BC that he achieved his wish and the matter was finally settled. With the chief Caesarians now acting in concert, Caesar's deification was re-enacted by the Senate on 1 January, 42 BC.[359] This time, however, Caesar's temple in Rome was to be dedicated to him alone as Divus Iulius and it was to be built on the spot where his body had been burned. As a memorial to his clemency, the temple would have the right of asylum. Other stipulations for Caesar's worship were much the same as those before his death. For example, his image was to be included with those of the gods in the *pompa circensis*, where it is explicitly stated that he would accompany Venus. There were also additional measures, such as punishment for those who did not celebrate his birthday. Despite all this, Antonius still did not take up Caesar's priesthood. This only occurred after the Pact of Brundisium in 40 BC.[360] Evidently, he continued to be concerned about appearing inferior to Octavian. As for Caesar's heir, he did not hesitate to remind people of his father's divinity. During the Perusine War, one of his legions used missiles inscribed with *divom Iulium*, and he reportedly sacrificed a number of his enemies to the god on the fourth anniversary of his murder.[361] Divus Iulius frequently appears on coins minted for Octavian from around 40 BC, when he also began to call himself *Divi filius*.[362] Since his claims to authority ultimately relied on his inheritance from Caesar, it was very important for him to promote Caesar's greatness and his own ability to carry on

---

[353] *RRC* no. 480/5, cf. 468/2, 480/11. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 376-378.
[354] Augustus ap. Plin. *HN* 2.94; Cass. Dio 45.7.1; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 88; Serv. *Aen*. 8.681, cf. *Ecl*. 9.47. Cf. Ramsey and Licht 1997: 159 n. 3.
[355] Plin. *HN* 2.93-94.
[356] Suet. *Aug*. 94.12. Wardle 2014: 530-532.
[357] Verg. *Ecl*. 9.47, *Aen*. 8.681; Hor. *Carm*. 1.12.46-48; Prop. 3.18.33-34, 4.6.59; Ov. *Met*. 15.748-749, 843-850.
[358] Cic. *Att*. 16.15.3. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.73.
[359] Cass. Dio 47.18-19; cf. App. *B Civ*. 2.148.
[360] Plut. *Ant*. 33.1.
[361] *ILLRP* 1116. Sen. *Clem*. 1.11.1; Suet. *Aug*. 15; Cass. Dio 48.14.3-4; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.74.4; App. *B Civ*. 5.48-49. Weinstock 1971: 398-399; cf. Wardle 2014: 137-138. See also Conclusion.
[362] E.g. *RRC* nos. 525/3-4, 526/2, 526/4, 534/1-2, cf. 525/1-2, 526/1, 526/3, 534/3.

his legacy. This is especially the case because he was competing against other accomplished partisans of Caesar in Antonius and Lepidus.

In the wake of Caesar's dictatorship, a number of individuals began to assert their own claims to having a superhuman nature or enjoying divine favour. It appears to have been part of Caesar's impact, and the culmination of a longer trend, that power needed to be justified and supported in this manner almost by necessity. This is true even of Brutus and the Republicans. During their civil war with the Caesarians, they associated themselves with Victoria, Libertas and Apollo in his capacity as a god of liberty.[363] Brutus had connected himself with Apollo as early as July 44 BC, when he lavished great expense on the *ludi Apollinares* to secure the favour of the People.[364] Somewhat hypocritically, Brutus also engaged in explicit self-promotion, depicting his own head on his coinage and that of his supposed ancestor, L. Brutus.[365] In this way, he portrayed himself as the protector and embodiment of freedom and, furthermore, asserted that this was characteristic of his bloodline. He had made much the same claim long before the Ides of March, in 54 BC when he was a moneyer.[366] His coins then featured Libertas, L. Brutus and another famous ancestor, C. Servilius Ahala. Brutus' pride in his ancestry can be compared to that of Caesar, Octavian and others. It is worthy of note that Athens gave Brutus and Cassius statues next to those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, which not only copied the honour once conferred on Demetrius and Antigonus but also recalled the statue of Caesar erected on the Capitol.[367] This action very much suited the Republicans since it reinforced their own declarations to be liberators and directly contested Caesar's representation as having been one.

Sex. Pompeius had clear divine pretensions. He cast himself as the son of Neptunus, whether by a sort of adoption or because of his natural father's conquest of the pirates.[368] Pompeius Magnus was depicted as Neptunus on some coin-types, while Neptunus appeared in his own right on others or on the reverse to Magnus' portrait.[369] Sextus is said to have worn a blue cloak as a reference to his divine paternity.[370] Earlier, Sextus had minted coins showing his father as Janus.[371] This god had long appeared on Roman coinage, often with a prow on the reverse, and indeed the Pompeians did employ such a coin-type. Thus they probably initially chose this god, as they did Roma, to associate themselves with tradition and the Republic. Identifying their dead leader with

---

[363] *RRC* nos. 498/1, 499/1, 500/2-5, 501/1, 502/1-3, 503/1, 504/1, 505/1-5, 506/2-3, 507/2. Crawford, *RRC* 2.741. The watchword of Brutus' forces at Philippi was 'Apollo' (Plut. *Brut*. 24.5; cf. Cass. Dio 47.43.1).
[364] Cic. *Phil*. 1.36, 2.31, 10.7-8; Plut. *Brut*. 21.2-3; App. *B Civ*. 3.23; cf. Cass. Dio 47.20.2. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 369.
[365] *RRC* nos. 506/1, 507/1, 508/3.
[366] *RRC* nos. 433/1-2.
[367] Cass. Dio 47.20.4. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 145-146.
[368] Plin. *HN* 9.55; App. *B Civ*. 5.100; Cass. Dio 48.19.2, 48.48.5, cf. 48.31.5; *De vir. ill*. 84.2; cf. Hor. *Epod*. 9.7-8. Taylor 1931: 120-121.
[369] *RRC* nos. 483/1-2, 511/2-4.
[370] App. *B Civ*. 5.100; Cass. Dio 48.48.5.
[371] *RRC* nos. 478/1, 479/1, cf. 471/1.

the god would have furthered this aim. On the other hand, it may also have been a means of challenging Caesar's claims to divinity. Janus was an ancient and important deity and so the identification could be asserting that Pompeius Magnus deserved a higher status to the dictator. This is especially plausible given that the coin-type dates to 45 BC, in the midst of Caesar's exceptional honours. In addition, Sextus issued coins featuring Pietas and adopted the *agnomen* Pius.[372] He did this to stress his dutifulness in seeking vengeance for his father and brother.

Someone like Sextus, whose claim to legal authority was tenuous, might be expected to rely heavily on connections to the divine to bolster his standing. The *triumviri*, however, were no less prominent in this regard, particularly Octavian and Antonius. Octavian closely affiliated himself with Apollo.[373] There were even stories that he was Apollo's son very similar to those told about Alexander, Seleucus and Scipio Africanus.[374] Octavian's relationship with the god had probably begun by 42 BC and certainly by 40 BC, when he allegedly dressed as Apollo at a dinner banquet.[375] While Apollo became Octavian's patron deity, Divus Iulius continued to be of major importance for presenting himself as Caesar's son and successor. Octavian extensively featured Divus Iulius on his coinage and undertook the building of his temple.[376] Octavian's use of *Divi filius* in his titulature acted as a constant reminder not only of Caesar's divinity but of his own by implication. How this was to be consistent with Apollo's paternity is uncertain. Apollo perhaps replaced his natural father, Octavius, as the myth of his conception indicates, while Caesar remained his adoptive father, as he was in fact. Whatever the case, Octavian was undoubtedly promoting himself as being divine and not merely as enjoying divine favour. Virgil did not hesitate to describe Octavian as a god or depict him as worthy of worship.[377] While calling someone a god in poetry or rhetoric meant little in itself, Virgil's lines carry more weight because of Octavian's behaviour and the apotheosis of Caesar, which Virgil also celebrates. It is also noteworthy that Virgil writes of actual cult being paid to Octavian each month.[378]

Octavian gained a number of honours in Rome and Italy in 36 BC that recognised him as having a superhuman status.[379] These came after the defeat of Sex. Pompeius and the ousting of Lepidus from the Triumvirate. They included inviolability, a golden statue, the right to wear the laurel crown, annual thanksgivings for his victory, a house at public expense, and an *ovatio*.[380]

---

[372] *RRC* nos. 477/1-3, 511/1-4. See also next chapter.
[373] Taylor 1931: 118-120; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.80-82.
[374] Asclepiades of Mendes ap. Suet. *Aug*. 94.4; Cass. Dio 45.1.2. Wardle 2014: 512-515. ALEXANDER: Just. *Epit*. 11.11.3-9, 12.16.2; Plut. *Alex*. 2.2-4, 3.1-2. SELEUCUS: Just. *Epit*. 15.4.3-9; cf. *LSAM* 24 B = *IErythrai* 205. SCIPIO AFRICANUS: Livy 26.19.7; Sil. *Pun*. 13.615, 637-644; Aul. Gell. *NA* 6.1.1-5.
[375] Suet. *Aug*. 70.1-2. Cf. Plut. *Brut*. 24.4. Wardle 2014: 443-446.
[376] E.g. *RRC* nos. 534/1-2, 535/1.
[377] Verg. *Ecl*. 1.6-8, 40-43, *G*. 1.24-42, 3.13-25. Cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.77-79.
[378] Verg. *Ecl*. 1.6-8, 40-43.
[379] App. *B Civ*. 5.130, 132; Cass. Dio 49.15.1, 5-6.
[380] Cf. *Inscr*. *Ital*. 13.1.86-87.

Such honours were not technically divine but unquestionably had divine connotations, especially because they are strikingly reminiscent of the honours conferred on Caesar. Inviolability conferred a certain sanctity and implied that Octavian was essential for Rome's safety. It was for much the same reasons that Caesar had received it in 44 BC. The use of precious metal for Octavian's statue was a privilege often employed for deities. Moreover, the statue's inscription explicitly honoured him as a bringer of peace. Various statues of Caesar erected during his dictatorship presented him as a saviour and liberator who had established peace and safety at Rome. That on the Rostra may have been made from gold.[381] Certainly, he had a golden throne and golden crown, and copies of the honorary decrees that deified him were wrought in silver and gold and placed in the Temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus.[382]

The annual thanksgiving signified the importance of Octavian's victory, which appeared to have ended civil strife at the time. This honour took on an extra religious dimension with the express privilege of Octavian and his family holding a banquet in the Temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus. Caesar too had annual thanksgivings for his victories. Octavian's laurel crown, another honour belonging to Caesar, acted as a permanent reminder of his success and conveniently gave him another link to Apollo, his patron god. The state-funded residence was a reward for his services and benefactions, as it had been for Caesar. It also allowed Octavian to live next to the grand new temple of Apollo he was building on the Palatine, thereby further associating himself with the god. The *ovatio* was undoubtedly chosen as being more appropriate for the defeat of a Roman enemy and for the connotations of peace and safety it had taken on since that held by Caesar. The theme of peace was emphasised through the story of an omen that had supposedly occurred. On the day of the victory, a soldier in Rome, under divine influence, ran into Iuppiter's temple on the Capitol and laid his sword at the foot of the god's statue. This temple is where Octavian's *ovatio* would end and where he would banquet with his family on the anniversary of his success. Clearly, Iuppiter had been given an important role to play in Octavian's honours.

Appian mentions a further honour given to Octavian that reinforced his divine connections but to what degree is uncertain. He vaguely states that the cities set Octavian alongside their gods.[383] One plausible suggestion is that Italian cities placed statues of Octavian in their temples, probably as an honorific dedication rather than a cult object for worship.[384] This would parallel the statue of Caesar erected in the Temple of Quirinus and the golden statue of Cleopatra that Caesar himself put in the Temple of Venus Genetrix.[385] The matter is complicated by the fact that such a measure would, once again, closely emulate the one decreed for Caesar in 44 BC, where his statues

[381] Nic. Dam. 69.
[382] Cass. Dio 44.7.1.
[383] App. *B Civ*. 5.132.
[384] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.78-79; cf. Taylor 1931: 133.
[385] STATUE OF CAESAR: see above. STATUE OF CLEOPATRA: App. *B Civ*. 2.102; Cass. Dio 51.22.3.

were to be set up in the temples of Rome and Italy. It is uncertain whether Caesar's statues were for cult or not. For Romans, those statues would have been the images of a god in either case because of his official deification. Even if the measure was possibly not implemented due to Caesar's assassination, there still existed the statue of Caesar kept in the Temple of Venus Genetrix. Octavian's act of fixing a star above its head as part of his campaign promoting Caesar's apotheosis would have ensured that it was well-known. As a result of this precedent, the placement of Octavian's statues in temples must have resulted in some ambiguity as to his status. Many people would have been reminded of his divine father and interpreted the statue as having the same significance, despite it technically standing as an offering. Of course, all this assumes that the cities' action did not amount to cult towards Octavian. That view could be relying on hindsight and the caution Octavian showed in avoiding an overt official cult of himself in Rome until after his death. It is possible that the cities did offer him worship on this occasion. In that case, there would have been no doubt that Octavian was being accorded the same status as a god, at least in some places within Italy. If he was not offered worship, he was still being honoured on a level above that traditionally reserved for mortal men under the Republic.

The general significance of the honours accepted by Octavian in 36 BC was that he was the superhuman saviour and benefactor of Rome. This is entirely in keeping with his self-representation. Indeed, he explicitly proclaimed that civil dissensions had been ended and peace established as a result of his actions.[386] He not only did this in speeches to the Senate and People but in published pamphlets as well. Therefore, the honours neatly fit his own actions and agenda. This fact is confirmed by Octavian extending the privileges of statues and inviolability to Livia and Octavia the following year.[387] It is reasonable to suspect that Octavian had directed in 36 BC that certain honours should be offered to him. He could have done this by explicit instructions to his supporters or by more subtle means, such as hints and prompts as to what suggestions he would find agreeable. The number and significance of the honours he accepted shows how closely they accorded with his wishes. The conclusion that Octavian essentially fashioned the distinctions he received is supported by the consistent pattern of behaviour that was already emerging. He had been promoting his own divine connections for years and now had these reinforced. He had portrayed himself as Caesar's heir and successor, as he had to if he were to pursue power, and now had this aim furthered by achieving several of his adoptive father's privileges. This lends credence to the alternative interpretation of his oath in 44 BC to attain his father's honours, despite the audacity it would require. His entry into Rome, when he was escorted by the People to the temples

[386] App. *B Civ*. 5.130; cf. Cass. Dio 49.15.3.
[387] Cass. Dio 49.38.1.

and then his home, resembled the manner he entered the city in 40 BC after the Perusine War.[388] Both occasions acted as a demonstration of popularity and public gratitude, and in 40, as in 36, Octavian was permitted a laurel crown to honour his success. The golden statue was to represent him in the clothes he wore when he arrived in the city.[389] This suggests that Octavian may have deliberately dressed himself in a certain way and that he had a motive for conceiving the statue to commemorate his gesture. The mention of temples recalls the great emphasis he would later place on restoring traditional religion. Indeed, the act of being accompanied by the People as he entered or left Rome would be prominent under his principate too.[390] In 36 BC, moreover, he declared that he would restore the constitution when Antonius returned from the East, foreshadowing the events of 27 BC.[391] Octavian's independent actions over time strongly correlate with the honours he received in 36 and later. All this points to him having a dominant role in the way his authority was framed.

It was perhaps inevitable that M. Antonius would make claims to divinity once he obtained the East as his domain. Certainly, he was likely to be offered divine honours, whether he wanted them or not. In actual fact, however, there are signs of his aspirations before this and possibly even before Caesar's death. Antonius was a blood relative of Caesar through his mother, Iulia.[392] Her brother, L. Caesar (*cos*. 64), was an important associate of his more famous cousin. Antonius had been left in an awkward position by Caesar's posthumous adoption of Octavian. The youth was determined to make as much capital out of his new name as he could. This included claiming descent from Venus and being the successor to Rome's newest god. If not for Octavian, Antonius would probably have used the same tactics. His Julian blood made Venus his ancestress also, and his long standing as one of Caesar's most trusted lieutenants gave him grounds to be accepted as his political heir, especially because he was his consular colleague. Octavian had neither the years nor the accomplishments. Indeed, Antonius apparently asserted that it was he whom Caesar had planned to adopt.[393] The naming of his second son by Fulvia may be evidence of his ambitions, since 'Iullus' had been used as a *cognomen* by the early Iulii.[394] The possibility of succeeding Caesar could have been a motive for his role in making him a living god in 45-44 BC, if he anticipated that it would eventually enhance his own status in the same way it ended up doing for Octavian. His support for Caesar's agenda would at least help to secure the dictator's favour. Octavian's presence on the political scene did not cause Antonius to abandon attempts to be seen as

---

[388] 40 BC: Cass. Dio 48.16.1. 36 BC: App. *B Civ*. 5.130; cf. Cass. Dio 49.15.3.
[389] App. *B Civ*. 5.130.
[390] See below and next chapter.
[391] App. *B Civ*. 5.132.
[392] E.g. Cic. *Fam*. 9.14.3, *Phil*. 2.14, 3.17; Plut. *Ant*. 2.1, 20.3; App. *B Civ*. 2.143; Lactant. *Div*. *inst*. 1.15.30.
[393] Cic. *Phil*. 2.71; Nic. Dam. 74; cf. App. *B Civ*. 3.16, 19. Weinstock 1971: 385.
[394] *MRR*, Index (2.574-575).

Caesar's true heir. In addition to his claims regarding adoption, he portrayed himself in mourning on coins, perhaps partly to recall his funeral oration, which was typically performed by a son.[395] He also set up a statue of Caesar describing him as a *parens*, with the word taking a pointed double meaning.[396] Nevertheless, Octavian had the edge because of Caesar's will and so Antonius used other means of boosting his eminence. By 42 BC, he was promoting himself as a descendant of Hercules through a supposed son called Anton.[397] This does not appear to have been a sudden creation of his, invented for the sake of expediency. Plutarch states that the myth of the Antonii's Herculean ancestry was 'ancient'.[398] It is certainly possible that it had existed long before the birth of the *triumvir*. A number of families, like the Iulii, had cultivated such mythical origins since the second century BC or earlier.[399] Plutarch comments, moreover, that Antonius thought he gave the story currency by his physical features and the way he dressed.[400] If true, this strongly suggests he had claimed descent from Hercules before Caesar's death. It is certain that Antonius had some sort of association with lions as early as 49 BC.[401] That could confirm an attachment to Hercules pre-dating Caesar's assassination, although this straightforward explanation for the lions' significance has been doubted.[402] Instead, it has been suggested that lions refer to the zodiac sign of Leo or to Alexander the Great. Antonius' birth date of 14 January makes Leo improbable. The link to Alexander would have been welcome to Antonius after Philippi, when he had control of the East, but there would hardly have been grounds for it in 49 BC. Antonius had neither the military achievements nor the political position to justify it. The same is true of lions' association with Dionysus, although some of the details given by Plutarch with his mention of the big cats are suggestive.[403] It is thus most likely that the lions were a symbol of his Herculean bloodline. Whatever the facts of the matter, Antonius' use of legendary family origins was not radical or unprecedented at Rome, even before Caesar's dictatorship. In the unlikely event he did make gestures in imitation of Alexander or Dionysus at so early a stage, this was not unparalleled either, even if it was in questionable taste.

As in Rome, Antonius' actions in the Hellenistic East were consistent with practice there. However, they were more akin to those of a monarch than a typical Roman commander. This was commensurate with the extent of his power but could also be a result of other factors, including the

---

[395] *RRC* no. 480/22.
[396] See above.
[397] *RRC* no. 494/2, cf. 494/37-38. Plut. *Ant*. 4.1-2, 36.4, 60.3. Appian (*B Civ*. 3.16, 19) mentions Antonius' claims in 44 BC but they might be an anachronistic insertion by the historian into speeches he composed. A possible reference by Cicero (*Ad Caes*. *Iun*. 1, fr. 7 [Non. 437 L]) relies on an emendation to the text.
[398] Plut. *Ant*. 4.1.
[399] Wiseman 1974; Hamlyn 2011: 53-54, 58, 62, 105.
[400] Plut. *Ant*. 4.2.
[401] *RRC* nos. 489/5-6, 533/1. Cic. *Att*. 10.13.1; Plin. *HN* 8.55; Plut. *Ant*. 9.5.
[402] Crawford, *RRC* 2.740 n. 1.
[403] Plut. *Ant*. 9.5; cf. Plin. *HN* 8.55. See, for example, the comparison of Antonius' travels with religious processions.

influence of Caesar. In 41 BC, the people of Ephesus hailed Antonius as Dionysus and gave him divine honours.[404] While in Athens with his new wife, Octavia, from 39 BC, he conducted Bacchic revelries and ordered that he should be proclaimed as Dionysus throughout the East.[405] It was around this time that the Athenians supposedly betrothed Athena to him.[406] The city may have identified Octavia with their patron goddess and honoured her on this basis.[407] By 31 BC, Antonius and Cleopatra had statues of themselves on the Acropolis in the guise of gods, presumably Dionysus and Aphrodite or Selene, with whom they were respectively identified.[408] They had portrayed themselves as these deities and their Egyptian counterparts, Osiris and Isis, in Alexandria, where Antonius also received a temple.[409] Among the omens said to have preceded Antonius' downfall are ones referring to his descent from Hercules and his characterisation as Dionysus.[410] The use of sources hostile to Antonius may diminish the reliability of surviving accounts but epigraphic and numismatic evidence at least confirms his identification with Dionysus and that he received divine honours in Athens.[411] According to a number of writers, Antonius personally and deliberately promoted his relationship with Dionysus.[412] If one accepts their evidence, this would rule out it being driven from below by the cities of Asia. It is not impossible that the link was first made spontaneously by Ephesus. The city was seeking pardon for siding with the Republicans in the civil war and it was commonplace in the East for powerful individuals to be identified with Dionysus. Moreover, it suited Antonius' carousing. Yet it is much more likely that Antonius was behind his characterisation as Dionysus from the beginning. Assuming the role of this god brought significant advantages for someone claiming authority in the Hellenistic East. It would allow him to fit into the established system of divine honours and use them to enhance his prestige. He could also take on the positive associations of Dionysus, and in turn Alexander, such as successful conquest, liberty, fertility and rebirth. These considerations were strong motives for Caesar developing his own connections to Dionysus and Alexander ahead of his planned campaigns. Therefore, there is the strong possibility that Antonius was, to a great extent, implementing plans conceived by Caesar. A number of points support this conclusion. With the East as his domain, Antonius undertook attacks on the Parthians as Caesar had planned to do. He even explicitly stated

---

[404] Plut. *Ant*. 24.3, cf. 26.3.
[405] Socrates of Rhodes ap. Ath. 4.148 B-C; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.82.4; Plut. *Ant*. 60.3.
[406] Sen. *Suas*. 1.6; Cass. Dio 48.39.2.
[407] Raubitschek 1946: 147-150. The inscription discussed there shows that she received divine honours with her husband.
[408] Cass. Dio 50.15.2. Cleopatra's statue may have been a later addition in the build-up to Actium (cf. Plut. *Ant*. 57.1-2).
[409] Vell. Pat. 2.82.4; Cass. Dio 50.5.3, cf. 50.25.3-4. ANTONIUS' TEMPLE: Cass. Dio 51.15.5; *Suda* s.v. Ἡμίεργον.
[410] Plut. *Ant*. 60.2, 75.3-4
[411] Raubitschek 1946: 148-149.
[412] Socrates of Rhodes ap. Ath. 4.148 B-C; Vell. Pat. 2.82.4; Sen. *Suas*. 1.6; Cass. Dio 48.39.2. Plutarch implies the same (*Ant*. 24.1-3, 60.3, cf. 23.2).

that his campaign in 36 BC was based on Caesar's intended strategy.[413] Antonius continued to cultivate the image of being Caesar's successor in other ways too. He insisted that Ptolemy Caesarion was the dictator's son and declared that Cleopatra had been his wife. She became his own consort and mother to three of his children. It is probably significant that Antonius' honours, like Caesar's, strongly recall those of Demetrius Poliorcetes. Antonius apparently took over using Demetrius as a model from Caesar. Thus, even outside Rome, Antonius heavily employed the tactic of assuming Caesar's mantle.

Antonius' religious policy was reinforced by his relationship with Cleopatra. This does not mean that he was dominated by the Egyptian queen, as he is portrayed in the sources.[414] He almost certainly was not. His time in Athens with Octavia in the early 30s BC demonstrates that he was willing to pursue efforts to be recognised as divine independently of Cleopatra and perhaps in partnership with his Roman wife.[415] Nevertheless, Cleopatra's role in affairs was important. She received divine honours, as was normal for Hellenistic monarchs, and also came to be represented as the New Isis.[416] The Greek counterparts adopted for Cleopatra were Aphrodite and Selene.[417] There are perhaps early traces of Cleopatra being identified with the goddesses even at Rome, with the golden statue Caesar erected of her in his Temple of Venus Genetrix and the plan in 43 BC under the Triumvirate to build a temple of Isis and Sarapis.[418] Osiris was the brother and husband of Isis, as well as being Dionysus' Egyptian equivalent. Moreover, Dionysus was a deity closely associated with the Ptolemies and was claimed as an ancestor.[419] Indeed, Cleopatra's father, Ptolemy Auletes, had called himself a new Dionysus, just like Antonius. All this made Dionysus a very fitting god for a man who took Cleopatra as his ally and consort. Antonius' children with Cleopatra also helped his divine aspirations. They provided him with a blood tie to a line of deified rulers going back to Alexander's general, Ptolemy. The name of his son, Alexander Helios, emphasised the link. He and his twin sister, Cleopatra Selene, by being called 'Sun' and 'Moon', served as heralds of an anticipated new age under Antonius' leadership.[420]

The remaining *triumvir*, M. Aemilius Lepidus, is noteworthy for not showing any divine pretensions of the kind displayed by his colleagues and Sex. Pompeius. His claims to religious superiority were far more traditional. In the same series of coins where Antonius and Octavian celebrated their mythical ancestry, Lepidus appeared with his famous relative, Aemilia, the

---

[413] Southern 1998: 120.
[414] E.g. Vell. Pat. 2.82.3-4; Plut. *Ant*. 25.1; Flor. 2.14.4, 2.21.1-3; Cass. Dio 49.34.1.
[415] Taylor 1931: 122.
[416] Plut. *Ant*. 54.6; Cass. Dio 50.5.3, cf. 50.25.3.
[417] APHRODITE: e.g. Plut. *Ant*. 26.2-3. SELENE: e.g. Cass. Dio 50.5.3, 50.25.3.
[418] STATUE: see above. TEMPLE OF ISIS AND SERAPIS: Cass. Dio 47.15.4.
[419] E.g. Theoph. *Ad Autol*. 2.7. Friesen 2015: 73.
[420] Cf. Taylor 1931: 123-124; Pelling 1988: 219.

Vestal.[421] She was a renowned example of piety and purity. Her image also recalled his office of *pontifex maximus*, whereby he had oversight of the Vestals. His priesthood is alluded to on other coins as well.[422] Lepidus had featured Aemilia on coins when he was a moneyer in 61 BC, along with his distinguished great-grandfather, who had been *pontifex maximus* from 180 to 152 BC.[423] He therefore advertised his family connections to Roman priests and priestesses and not an explicit personal connection to any particular god. There is no surviving evidence of Lepidus using any other means to profess a degree of divinity. Although Lepidus' apparent moderation in this regard was not the cause of his downfall, it was perhaps symptomatic of poor judgement and even naïveté as to what was required to be competitive in the contemporary political landscape.

From Actium to the Death of Augustus, 31 BC-AD 14

With Octavian's victories over Antonius and Cleopatra at Actium and Alexandria, he secured dominance over Rome and its empire. A range of significant honours were decreed to him, some in 31 BC after his initial success and others after the civil war had been brought to an end the following year.[424] These honours did not amount to deification but bordered on the divine, since they presented Octavian as having a status and nature superior to those of other mortals. Caesar clearly provided inspiration for many of the honours. Octavian was to have a quadrennial festival celebrated in his honour, much the same as Caesar was.[425] The first one was held in 28 BC.[426] This festival resembled those created as divine honours in the East. Another such measure was that a tribe should be called Julian after him, as had been voted for Caesar.[427] Just like Caesar too, Octavian was to be included in the Vestals' prayers, as well as those of the priests and Senate.[428] These vows were the first of many for Octavian's welfare.[429] Their importance lay in presenting Octavian as the provider and guarantor of Rome's safety and success, almost like the Vestals or the

[421] *RRC* no. 494/1. Weigel (1992: 76-77) denies the identification of the female figure as this Vestal and instead thinks it is the Aemilia who was a daughter of Aeneas and mother of Romulus by Mars (Plut. *Rom*. 2.3). The *simpulum* in her right hand, however, clearly indicates a connection to the pontifical college. Moreover, other myths related to Rome's foundation had become dominant. Weigel's alternative suggestion of Vesta is possible. Vesta was depicted holding a sceptre in her left hand (e.g. *RIC* 1^2 Gaius, nos. 38, 47, 54), as is the case for the image on the coin. Perhaps it is relevant that Macrobius describes Bona Dea as holding a sceptre in her left hand (Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.23). Surviving portrayals of the goddess do not actually fit Macrobius' description (see the note *ad loc*. in the Loeb edition; cf. Brouwer 1989: 235-236) but the Vestals were integral to her cult. The sceptre would thus seem to support the interpretation of the image representing either a Vestal or Vesta (cf. Weigel 1973: 342-343). The Vestal Aemilia is more likely because of the appearance of ancestors for the other two *triumviri* on coins from the same moneyer (*RRC* nos. 494/2-3) and because Lepidus had already depicted her on coins in 61 BC.

[422] *RRC* nos. 489/1-3, 492/2, 495/1-2.

[423] *RRC* nos. 419/1-3. The family relationship is stated by Cicero (*Phil*. 13.15), although the distance in time between the two Lepidi would be more consistent with the *triumvir* being a great-great-grandson.

[424] Cass. Dio 51.19-21.

[425] *RG* 9.1; Cass. Dio 51.19.2. Cooley 2009: 145-146.

[426] Cass. Dio 53.1.4-5.

[427] Cass. Dio 51.20.2. Weinstock 1971: 158; cf. Reinhold 1988: 152.

[428] Cass. Dio 51.19.7.

[429] See next chapter. Cf. Cooley 2009: 145-146.

sacred objects in their care, which naturally raised him closer to the divine.[430] The institution at this time of thanksgivings on his birthday and on the anniversaries of the announcements of his victories served the same end of portraying Rome as indebted to Octavian for its welfare.[431] This aim was also furthered by the decree that the Vestals, Senate and People should meet Octavian when he entered the city on his return.[432] The religious character of the occasion was emphasised by all the citizens offering sacrifice, including his consular colleague, and the decree that the day would be regarded as sacred in perpetuity.[433] Dio comments that the consul's public sacrifice was on behalf of the Senate and People and had never been done before. Clearly, Octavian's renewed presence in Rome was treated as momentous.[434] Such an *adventus* was becoming an established practice at Rome, going back to Octavian's arrival in 36 BC and Caesar's special *ovatio* in 44 BC.[435] There were in turn Hellenistic precedents, like the entrance of Demetrius Poliorcetes into Athens.[436] The purpose of the *adventus* was that it was a display of the state's gratitude for the ruler's beneficent power as something that was conspicuous and directly experienced. This had acted as an important element in the cult of Hellenistic kings. Octavian was given jurisdiction over legal appeals and the *ius auxilii*, or the right of helping those who asked for his aid, in Rome.[437] These measures presented Octavian as a source of safety and benefactions.[438] This once again contributed to his potential worship, since Hellenistic rulers and other recipients of lifetime cult had often been praised as manifest beings capable of directly benefiting their subjects. Demetrius Poliorcetes is a prime example.[439]

Another measure decreed for Octavian was that he should be included in the hymn of the Salii, an ancient patrician priesthood created by Numa, his ancestor.[440] They were in charge of the sacred *ancilia*, one of which had fallen from heaven, and were figured among Rome's *pignora imperii* ('pledges of empire'). Once more, therefore, it was heavily implied that Octavian too was essential to Rome's welfare. In addition, since it was gods who were called upon in the hymn, Octavian could easily be seen as being put on a similar level. This is especially true if one considers the precedent of Demetrius in Athens, which appears to have been very influential in the

[430] See next chapter.
[431] Cass. Dio 51.19.2.
[432] Cass. Dio 51.19.2.
[433] Cass. Dio 51.20.3, 51.21.1-2.
[434] Cf. Reinhold 1988: 155.
[435] See above.
[436] Scott 1928: 144; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.27-28; cf. Luke 2014: 148-149.
[437] Cass. Dio 51.19.6-7. See next chapter.
[438] See next chapter.
[439] Cf. Duris of Samos ap. Ath. 6.253 D-E.
[440] *RG* 10.1; cf. Cass. Dio 51.20.1. Cooley 2009: 147.

honours of Caesar, Augustus and Antonius.[441] Demetrius had hymns sung in his honour and his image was woven into the sacred robe to join those of the gods.[442]

Among the honours voted by the Senate after the conquest of Egypt in 30 BC was the decree that everybody should pour a libation to Octavian at every banquet, whether public or private.[443] This had a number of Hellenistic and Roman parallels.[444] There has been considerable disagreement as to whether this was to be directly to Octavian or to his Genius.[445] Arguments for the Genius do have some points in their favour. On the other hand, there is a distinct lack of any mention of the Genius with respect to the libation in the literary sources.[446] The offering is always described as to Octavian-Augustus himself. It would seem best to take this explicit testimony at face value. In the event that the object of the measure was indeed his Genius, people must have generally overlooked it in practice. The libation was thus effectively a divine honour, although significant ambiguity may have surrounded it and perhaps deliberately so. Allowing a certain freedom of interpretation as to whether Octavian was being honoured as a god, as a father-figure or was merely being given a sort of toast would encourage popular acceptance of the measure.[447]

In 27 BC, Octavian gained further honours. Once again, Caesar's influence can be easily discerned. On 15 or 16 January, the Senate conferred on him the honorary name Augustus.[448] His new name had strong religious connotations and conferred a sense of sanctity and indeed divinity upon him.[449] It also provided some of the positive associations he had attempted to gain by linking himself to Romulus without any of the negative ones, such as accusations of tyranny and his possible assassination by the Senate, made stronger by his adoptive father. Caesar had heavily identified himself with Rome's founder. The Senate also decreed that the month Sextilis would be renamed Augustus after him.[450] This measure had been used as a divine honour in the East and was among those conferred on Caesar leading up to his deification. At the same time, he was granted the right to have his doorposts decorated with laurel.[451] This plant signified victory, as can be seen from its role in the triumph, and had a sacred character at Rome. Moreover, it was the plant associated with his patron god, Apollo, whose grand new temple he had built alongside his Palatine home. This served to strengthen the sense of holiness attached to him and also his family who

---

[441] For Augustus, cf. Pollini 1990: 347-348.
[442] E.g. Democharesap. Ath. 6.253 B-C; Plut. *Demetr*. 10.4.
[443] Cass. Dio 51.19.7; cf. *RG* 9.2.
[444] Taylor 1931: 151-153; Fishwick 1987-2005: 2.1.375-376; Cooley 2009: 146-147.
[445] Cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 2.1.375 n. 2.
[446] Hor. *Carm*. 4.5.31-36; Ov. *Fast*. 2.631-638; cf. Petron. *Sat*. 60.
[447] Cf. Stevenson 1996: 16-18.
[448] E.g. *RG* 34.2; Livy, *Per*. 134; Ov. *Fast.* 1.608-616; Vell. Pat. 2.91.1; Suet. *Aug*. 7.2; Cass. Dio 53.16.6-8.
[449] E.g. Ov. *Fast.* 1.608-616; Suet. *Aug*. 7.2; Cass. Dio 53.16.8. Scott 1925: 84-88; Taylor 1931: 158-160; Cooley 2009: 261-262; Wardle 2014: 105-108.
[450] E.g. Livy, *Per*. 134; Suet. *Aug*. 31.2; Cass. Dio 55.6.6; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.35. Cf. Wardle 2014: 250-251.
[451] *RG* 34.2; Cass. Dio 53.16.4. Cooley 2009: 262-264. See also next chapter.

resided there with their household gods. Octavian had already received the laurel crown in 36 BC, an honour that had belonged to Caesar, and so this measure took it a step further.

Augustus received yet another of Caesar's honours, the *corona civica* or oak-crown, which was permanently displayed above the door of his home.[452] The crown was linked to Iuppiter and denoted Augustus' role as a saviour and liberator, which was a key justification for cult in the East and, since Caesar, also in the West.[453] The *corona obsidionalis* he was given in 30 BC had the same significance.[454] Therefore, while not a divine honour in itself, the oak-crown had divine implications for Augustus, especially in the context of his other honours. The *clipeus virtutis* was awarded to Augustus around this time and was kept in the Curia Iulia with the statue of Victoria.[455] This shield had divine implications for Augustus too. It was made from gold, a precious metal often employed for deities, and the virtues it claimed for Augustus had been given as grounds for worship among the Greeks and in the Hellenistic kingdoms. The connection with Victoria reinforced its divine connotations. This collection of honours was extremely important for Augustus and his prestige. The measures portrayed him as superhuman and were extensively advertised and celebrated throughout numerous media, such as poetry, coins and monuments. The laurels, oak-crown and golden shield became key elements of Augustan imagery.[456] Their effectiveness can be gauged by their appearance in people's homes and shrines.

Augustus was closely linked to a number of important deities. The effect of this was to portray him as having a superhuman nature and even as being a colleague of the gods. This can be seen as the continuation of an existing trend, including the likes of Marius and Sulla but particularly Caesar. The number of deities connected to Augustus, however, far outstripped any previous Roman. In addition to the gods discussed below, such as Iuppiter, Mars and the Magna Mater, Augustus associated himself with others like Apollo, Diana, Vesta and the Lares.[457] Liber and Alexander could be added to the list, despite their associations with M. Antonius. Venus and Divus Iulius naturally remained significant as well. The abundance and degree of Augustus' divine connections were surely a deliberate attempt on his part to secure his dominance of Rome. Such is clear from his development of the Palatine into an imperial religious precinct that included his own home and incorporated Apollo, Vesta, Victoria, Romulus and the Magna Mater, as well as himself.[458] In fact, he clearly intended his family to share his superior status. Not only did they

---

[452] *RG* 34.2; Ov. *Met*. 1.562-563, *Fast*. 1.614, 4.953, *Tr*. 3.1.35-48; Val. Max. 2.8.7; Cass. Dio 53.16.4.
[453] See next chapter.
[454] Plin. *HN* 22.13. Cf. Cooley 2009: 265.
[455] *RG* 34.2. Cooley 2009: 266-271.
[456] Cooley 2009: 262-269.
[457] For Vesta and the Lares, see next chapter.
[458] Cf. Ov. *Fast*. 4.954, *Met*. 15.864-865. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.90 n. 50; Bell 2007: 107-114, 123-132. One could add his family Penates and Lares, which had a special significance because of the Trojan origins of the Iulii (see next chapter). Various pieces of Augustan art combine some of the mentioned deities, which reflects the importance of the

share his home and his household gods but they were linked to deities themselves.[459] In any case, the great importance of religion to Augustus' position is readily apparent from the efforts to associate him with the divine. One can also note significant foreign influences, most distinctly in respect of Augustus' relationship with the Magna Mater. As in general, these were actively adapted to suit Roman conditions and did merely come from outside 'contamination' or contact.

Augustus was closely linked to Iuppiter, both through his own agency and that of others. The effect was to cast him as the god's earthly equivalent or representative. This obviously implied that he possessed some degree of divinity, while also justifying his political position as Rome's ruler. Iuppiter was especially significant in this regard because he was the ultimate source of magisterial authority and *imperium*. The fact that Augustus' Trojan ancestry made him Iuppiter's descendant strengthened their association. Augustus took credit for constructing the temples of Iuppiter Feretrius, Iuppiter Libertas and Iuppiter Tonans, although only the last had truly been founded by him.[460] He is said to have visited that new temple regularly.[461] Moreover, the walls were built from solid marble.[462] He also restored Iuppiter's Capitoline temple, which he endowed with lavish offerings of gold and precious stones.[463] Augustus would frequently have engaged in various ceremonies and state functions that related to Iuppiter, ranging from the taking of auspices to major occasions like his triple triumph. Indeed, his honorary name recalled the auspices, which were effectively signs sent by the god to indicate whether he favoured a course of action.[464] Accordingly, on the Gemma Augustea, where Augustus is portrayed as Iuppiter, he holds a *lituus*.[465] His name also carried such a sense of sanctity that Ovid could rank it with that of Iuppiter.[466] The god features heavily in tales of the signs that had foretold Augustus' greatness.[467] He is supposed to have communicated with Augustus in a dream.[468] In the *Aeneid*, Virgil has Iuppiter assure Venus by prophesying Rome's glorious future, culminating in Augustus' principate.[469] The god was the recipient of vows for Augustus' safety, giving him a protective role over the *princeps*.[470] Augustus'

Palatine precinct. Examples include the Sorrento Base (Kleiner 1992: 88; Bell 2007: 217-241), Belvedere Altar (Kleiner 1992: 102-103; Buxton 2003: 340-367) and the *Vicus Sandaliarius* Altar (Bell 2007: 200-216).

[459] See next chapter.

[460] IUPPITER FERETRIUS: Nep. *Att*. 20.3; Livy 4.20.7; *RG* 19.2. IUPPITER LIBERTAS: *RG* 19.2. IUPPITER TONANS: *RG* 19.2; Suet. *Aug*. 29.1, 3, 91.2; Cass. Dio 54.4.2; cf. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 27, 59, 63-67. Richardson 1992: 219, 221, 226.

[461] Suet. *Aug*. 91.2.

[462] Plin. *HN* 36.50.

[463] RESTORATION: *RG* 20.1. OFFERINGS: *RG* 21.2; Suet. *Aug*. 30.2; Cass. Dio 51.22.3.

[464] Ov. *Fast*. 1.611-612; Suet. *Aug*. 7.2; cf. Festus 2 L. Wardle 2014: 107-108.

[465] Fears 1981a: 58.

[466] Ov. *Fast*. 1.608.

[467] Plut. *Cic*. 44.2-4; Suet. *Aug*. 94.6, 7-9, cf. 94.2, 95, 96.1, 97.1-2; Cass. Dio 45.2.1-4, cf. 56.29.4; cf. Plin. *HN* 15.136-137.

[468] Suet. *Aug*. 91.2; Cass. Dio 54.4.2-4.

[469] Verg. *Aen*. 1.254-296.

[470] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 217-218; Fears 1981a: 63-64; Fishwick 1992: 240. Note also votive offerings from members of the public (Suet. *Aug*. 59; Fishwick 1992: 242).

oak-wreath and the later grant of the title *pater patriae* gave him strong ties to Iuppiter.[471] Oaths by Augustus perhaps reveal another link, since Iuppiter was traditionally one of the main deities invoked.[472]

There were coins that associated or assimilated Augustus and Iuppiter, as occurred many times in art and the leading poets too.[473] Even in those instances that cannot be attributed to Augustus' initiative, it is safe to assume they met with his approval and were perhaps discreetly encouraged, according as they did with his own actions.[474] Capricorn, a prominent Augustan symbol, was linked to Iuppiter through myth, and so it might have served as a subtle but conscious reference to the god. This would explain the occasions when Capricorn and Iuppiter are found alongside each other.[475] Outside Rome, Augustus was frequently represented as Zeus-Iuppiter, including as part of his worship.[476] Given all this, it is hardly surprising that Livia is identified with Hera-Iuno.[477] His adopted sons, Gaius and Lucius, were identified with the Dioscuri, including in Rome itself.[478] Therefore, despite Augustus promoting other gods, not to mention his religious precinct on the Palatine, Iuppiter was still a key deity for him and his image. Here again one can see Augustus' similarities with Caesar, who had also established links with Rome's patron god.

Augustus honoured Mars as a major deity during his principate. He depicted the god as aiding him in some of his most notable achievements. These deeds and the fact they were worthy of divine assistance could be argued to merit recognition of his own superhuman status. Ovid virtually states as much when he writes that Mars considered his temple all the greater for having Augustus' name on it.[479] Mars' support for Augustus' divinity, however, was not limited to this. Through inclusion with Augustus' divine relatives, Mars reinforced another key justification for Augustus' godhead, which was familial ties to other deities. The god was in some respects a natural target for the *princeps*' attention. First, he was the father of Romulus, Rome's founder and an important figure for Augustus personally. He could, as a result, be considered a sort of ancestral or founding god.[480] Second, Mars was often paired with Venus, who through Aeneas was another

---

[471] See next chapter.
[472] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 212-213.
[473] COINS: *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 269-270, 277. Fears 1981a: 56-57. ART: e.g. the Gemma Augustea and another gem in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna (Fears 1981a: 57-58). POETRY: e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.49-57, 3.5.1-4; L. Varius Rufus ap. Hor. *Epist.* 1.16.27-29; Ov. *Fast.* 1.607-608, 650, 2.131-132, *Met.* 15.858-860, *Tr.* 2.331-338, 4.4.11-20, 5.2.45-54; Manil. *Astr.* 1.799-800, 914-918. Ward 1933: 203-213; Weinstock 1971: 304-305; Fears 1981a: 66-68.
[474] Cf. Fishwick 1992: 241.
[475] Such is the case with the Gemma Augustea and the other gem in Vienna (Fears 1981a: 57-58). Strictly speaking, an eagle and lightning bolt appear in the latter rather than Iuppiter himself.
[476] E.g. *IGRom.* 1.1117, 1163, 1206, 1322, 4.62, 95; Josephus, *BJ* 1.21.7 (414); Suet. *Aug.* 60 (with *RIC* 1^2 Aug. no. 472). Ward 1933: 213-221; Weinstock 1971: 304.
[477] E.g. *IGRom.* 4.249. Ward 1933: 221-223.
[478] See next chapter.
[479] Ov. *Fast.* 5.567-568.
[480] Cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.35-40.

ancestral deity for Rome and of course Augustus.[481] Indeed, Mars and Venus were frequently portrayed together during his principate. This was particularly fitting since she had come to represent success and divine favour for the great generals of the late Republic. Thus, for example, Sulla left trophies inscribed with the names of Mars, Venus and Victoria on the battlefield of Chaeronea in 86 BC.[482] Consequently, Venus reinforced Mars' obvious significance and attraction for Augustus that, as a god of war, he could help achieve success in battle. This aspect was paramount with respect to the Parthians and the civil war against Caesar's assassins.[483]

Augustus built as part of the Forum Augustum the Temple of Mars Ultor, which was dedicated in 2 BC, although still not fully completed.[484] The temple was exceptionally large and impressive.[485] Augustus endowed it with a number of special privileges, such as that it should hold standards retrieved from the enemy.[486] Mars and Venus appeared both inside the new temple and on the pediment.[487] Statues of Romulus and Julian ancestors like Aeneas and Anchises stood close by.[488] Other Augustan monuments included Mars with either Romulus or Venus, like the Pantheon and the Sorrento Base.[489] Moreover, Divus Iulius joined Mars and Venus in the Pantheon and in the Temple of Mars Ultor.[490] Mars was essentially being grouped with these gods as a member of the *princeps*' family. He was, furthermore, a protector and patron of this family. Coins imply that Mars might have had some connection to vows for Augustus' safety.[491] One of the privileges Augustus gave to the Temple of Mars Ultor was that those leaving for commands abroad should set out from there.[492] Gaius Caesar might have been the first to do so soon after the temple's dedication. This would have been particularly fitting given that his command was in the East, where Mars had supposedly already helped to secure vengeance against the Parthians.[493] Augustus also instituted a new festival involving the cavalry commanders, or *seviri turmae*, near the steps to

---

[481] Weinstock 1971: 128-129.
[482] Plut. *Sull*. 19.5.
[483] Ov. *Fast*. 5.569-596; Suet. *Aug*. 29.2.
[484] *RG* 21.1; Vell. Pat. 2.100.2; Suet. *Aug*. 29.1-2; Cass. Dio 55.10.2-8; cf. Ov. *Fast*. 5.549-598. The dedication was perhaps on 1 August (Cass. Dio 60.5.3; Swan 2004: 95-96; cf. Cooley 2009: 197-198), in which case Augustus' personal connection to Mars Ultor was even closer.
[485] Ov. *Fast*. 5.551-568; cf. *RG* 21.2; Plin. *HN* 36.102.
[486] Suet. *Aug*. 29.2; Cass. Dio 55.10.2-5. Swan 2004: 96-99.
[487] Ov. *Tr*. 2.295-296. The pediment is represented in reliefs from the Villa Medici (Kleiner 1992: 100, 144-145; Richardson 1992: 161-162). The Algiers Relief, originally from Carthage, has been thought to show statues from inside the temple (Kleiner 1992: 100-102).
[488] Ov. *Fast*. 5.563-566. Cooley 2009: 198-199.
[489] PANTHEON: Cass. Dio 53.27.2. SORRENTO BASE: Kleiner 1992: 88. TEMPLE OF QUIRINUS: a relief in the Museo Nazionale Romano (Scott 1925: 92-93; Wiseman 1995: 146-148).
[490] PANTHEON: Cass. Dio 53.27.3. TEMPLE OF MARS ULTOR: the Algiers Relief (Kleiner 1992: 100-102). Cf. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. no. 274. The Feriale Cumanum records a sacrifice to Mars Ultor and Venus, perhaps on Caesar's birthday (*Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.279-280).
[491] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 146-153, 351-353, 356.
[492] Suet. *Aug*. 29.2; Cass. Dio 55.10.2. Swan 2004: 96.
[493] Ov. *Fast*. 5.579-596. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 132.

the temple.[494] Considering that Gaius and Lucius Caesar were two of these commanders, it would appear that Augustus intended Mars to be a deity who would oversee a Julian dynasty.[495] He had already done something of a service in this regard by helping bring Caesar's assassins to justice. Such divine favour was itself a strong indicator of the importance of the Julian line.

Although Octavian is said to have vowed the Temple to Mars Ultor at Philippi in 42 BC to help avenge his adoptive father, the evidence shows that the god's primary significance was related to Parthia.[496] The standards recovered from Phraates IV in 20 BC were housed in Mars' new temple, the god appeared on coins in reference to the hand-over soon after it occurred, and Ovid explicitly mentions the god's assistance in the matter.[497] Mars may be shown as receiving the standards on the cuirass of the Prima Porta Augustus.[498] Nevertheless, Caesar played a critical role in Augustus' relationship with Mars.[499] Augustus was in fact to a large degree adopting the plans of Caesar, for whom Mars had held the same attractions. He sacrificed to Mars and Venus at Pharsalus in 48 BC and Asia called him a god descended from Ares and Aphrodite.[500] He apparently named a legion after Mars.[501] The dictator planned to build a temple to Mars that would be the largest in the world.[502] Before his death, he intended to lead a campaign against the Parthians whereby he would avenge Crassus' death at Carrhae in 53 BC.[503] Caesar intended to use the Legio Martia in this war.[504] Given Mars' importance regarding the Parthians under Augustus, the natural conclusion is that Caesar had originally made vows to the god in view of the forthcoming war. In the same way that Augustus took over his ties to Venus and Romulus, he thus also took over Caesar's ties to Mars. There was perhaps some acknowledgement of this when he made the Temple of Mars Ultor in the Forum Augustum the counterpart of the Temple of Venus Genetrix in the Forum Iulium.[505] The same may be true for Caesar's statues that accompanied those of Mars, as well as Augustan coins that linked the two.

Romulus-Quirinus was a key figure for Augustus. This relationship began as early as 43 BC and closely emulated his adoptive father, who had strongly identified himself with Rome's founder.

---

[494] Cass. Dio 55.10.4. Swan 2004: 98.
[495] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 132.
[496] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 131-132. OCTAVIAN'S VOW: Ov. *Fast*. 5.569-578; Suet. *Aug*. 29.2.
[497] STANDARDS IN TEMPLE: *RG* 29.2. The standards may even have been temporarily stored in a temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitol (Cass. Dio 54.8.3; cf. Richardson 1992: 245-246; Cooley 2009: 244-245). COINS: *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 28, 39, 41, 58, 60, 68-74, 80-84, 103-106. OVID: Ov. *Fast*. 5.579-596.
[498] Galinsky 1996: 107, 157.
[499] Weinstock 1971: 128-132.
[500] SACRIFICE: App. *B Civ*. 2.68. ARES AND APHRODITE: *Syll*.^{3} 760.
[501] Val. Max. 3.2.19; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 3.6-7, 14.31-32, etc.; C. Asinius Pollio ap. Cic. *Fam*. 10.33.4; App. *B Civ*. 4.115; etc. Weinstock 1971: 130.
[502] Suet. *Iul*. 44.1.
[503] Cic. *Att*. 13.27.1, 13.31.3; Nic. Dam. 95; Plut. *Caes*. 58.3; Suet. *Iul*. 44.3; App. *B Civ*. 2.110; Just. *Epit*. 42.4.6; Cass. Dio 43.51.1; etc.
[504] Keppie 1984: 112.
[505] Cf. Kleiner 1992: 100; Richardson 1992: 160.

With regards to Augustus' divinity, Romulus offered a number of positive similarities that indicated that the *princeps* too was deserving of deification. Both were the son of a god, both were credited with great achievements and virtues, and both were presented as father-figures. Both were also considered founders of the city, literally in Romulus' case and metaphorically in Augustus' because he had restored peace and prosperity. Each of these points acted as justification for worship. It remained only for Augustus to attain apotheosis on his death to complete the parallels. Octavian's new name of 'Augustus' gave him a permanent link to Rome's founder and was adopted as an alternative to using 'Romulus' itself, which Octavian had initially desired.[506] The name was also related to the practice of augury.[507] Likewise, the frequent appearance of the *lituus* in connection with Augustus would also recall Romulus. Augustus' promotion of his Palatine home and the surrounding area as Rome's religious centre gave him strong links to Romulus. The hill was the site of the famous augury by which the city was established.[508] Octavian had supposedly received the same augury when he attained his first consulship in 43 BC.[509] It was also the location of important Romulan landmarks like his hut (the *casa Romuli*) and the *lupercal*, the latter of which Augustus 'built', to use his own misleading language.[510] The *lupercal* was the cave where Romulus and Remus were meant to have been suckled by the she-wolf.[511] According to Suetonius, Augustus revived the Lupercalia.[512] This is an exaggeration at the very least, given that the festival seems to have been regularly performed as recently as a month before Caesar's assassination.[513] Augustus perhaps raised the festival's profile along with restoring the *lupercal* and appointing a *flamen Dialis*, who took part in the rites.[514] In any case, it demonstrates that Augustus was willing to be linked to Romulus through the *lupercal* and the Lupercalia and that he was not deterred by fears people would be reminded of Antonius' attempted crowning of Caesar in 44 BC.[515]

Augustus restored the Temple of Quirinus as well.[516] A purported ancestor, Proculus Iulius, was said to have witnessed Romulus' apotheosis on the site and was thus crucial to the temple's establishment.[517] The pediment of the restored temple depicted Romulus and Remus taking the

---

[506] See above.
[507] Ov. *Fast*. 1.611-612; Suet. *Aug*. 7.2; cf. Festus 2 L. Wardle 2014: 107-108. See also above.
[508] E.g. Livy 1.7.1-2; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.86.2-4.
[509] Suet. *Aug*. 95; App. *B Civ*. 3.94; Cass. Dio 46.46.2-3; Obseq. 69. Wardle 2014: 534.
[510] *RG* 19.1. Cooley 2009: 186-187.
[511] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.79.8; Ov. *Fast*. 2.381-422; Serv. *Aen*. 8.343.
[512] Suet. *Aug*. 31.4.
[513] Cf. Cooley 2009: 187. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, for one, does not indicate any discontinuity in the festival's history (*Ant. Rom*. 1.32.5). If there was any disruption, it must have been due to political instability, which would also have affected other events in the religious calendar.
[514] Ov. *Fast*. 2.281-282.
[515] Cf. Cooley 2009: 187.
[516] *RG* 19.2; Cass. Dio 54.19.4. Cooley 2009: 190.
[517] Cic. *Rep*. 2.20, *Leg*. 1.3. Richardson 1992: 326.

auspices at Rome's foundation.[518] This not only served as a reminder of the significance of Augustus' name but also the omens of his first consulship, which recreated those of Remus and Romulus in turn.[519] The pediment may also have been intended to reflect positively on Augustus' and Agrippa's partnership, with the two being roughly the same age.[520] The temple was dedicated in 16 BC, the year following the *ludi Saeculares*, in which Augustus and Agrippa played leading roles.[521] The timing underlined Augustus' role as a second founder of Rome and the bringer of a new age. Virgil had included the same messages in the *Aeneid*, particularly when Iuppiter prophesies the peace of Augustus' principate, during which Quirinus will preside with his brother, Remus.[522]

There were other means by which Augustus was closely associated with Romulus. Augustus extended the *pomerium*, the sacred boundary created by Rome's founder.[523] His role as a father-figure to the state, eventually acknowledged officially with the title *pater patriae*, connected him to Romulus, who was also described in such terms.[524] Augustus' supposed apotheosis after his death mirrored that of Romulus.[525] The *princeps* had left detailed instructions for his funeral and there is no reason to doubt that this was similarly arranged. Augustus' identification with Romulus was hardly less extensive than Caesar's had been.

The Magna Mater or Cybele was another deity with which Augustus associated himself. Despite some aspects of her cult that Romans found distasteful, most notably the *galli*, she brought a number of positive implications for Augustus' image and authority. These were emphasised under his principate while the less savoury elements of her worship were minimised.[526] In fact, the Magna Mater was portrayed in such a way that she could be compared to Vesta, another goddess of great significance for Augustus, with both being tutelary deities linked to Troy.[527] The motives for Augustus linking himself to the goddess were manifold. The first is her relationship with Iuppiter, a god with whom he was intimately connected. She had indirectly acted as Zeus-Iuppiter's protector when her worshippers, the Corybantes or Curetes, had helped to save him from being killed as an infant.[528] For Augustus then, ties with the Magna Mater would further his close connection with

---

[518] Scott 1925: 92-93; Wiseman 1995: 146-148. The appearance of the pediment is preserved in reliefs now in the Museo Nazionale Romano.
[519] Cf. Scott 1925: 93.
[520] Wiseman 1995: 145-149.
[521] YEAR OF DEDICATION: Cass. Dio 54.19.4. Wiseman 1995: 146.
[522] Verg. *Aen*. 1.291-296. Scott 1925: 93-94; Wiseman 1995: 145.
[523] Tac. *Ann*. 12.23; Cass. Dio 55.6.6; SHA, *Aurel*. 21.11. Swan 2004: 66.
[524] See next chapter.
[525] See below.
[526] Bell 2007: 92-95, 244-245.
[527] Bell 2007: 233-234, 241.
[528] E.g. Eur. *Bacch*. 120-129; Callim. *Hymn* 1.45-53; Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 2.1233-1234; Diod. Sic. 5.70.2-4; Lucr. 2.633-639; Strabo 10.3.11; Ov. *Fast*. 4.207-214; Paus. 5.7.6; Apollod. *Bibl*. 1.1.6-7; Hyg. *Fab*. 139. Bell 2007: 88-89.

Iuppiter.[529] She was even identified with Rhea and thus made Iuppiter's mother, as in writers like Virgil and Ovid.[530] As a result, she was another divine ancestress of the Iulii and Augustus.[531] Public ties to the goddess would therefore highlight Augustus' descent from her and her Olympian offspring and bolster his own claims to divinity.

Another motive for Augustus cultivating the goddess was her links to Troy. His and Rome's mythical Trojan heritage were central to justifications for his dominance. His principate was depicted as fated and in accordance with divine will, a kind of inheritance that brought renewed success and prosperity for the Roman people. The goddess could reinforce this message. It was especially useful for the *princeps* that Aeneas had been born or conceived on Mt Ida, her home.[532] In the *Aeneid*, his great national epic, Virgil gave the goddess a crucial role.[533] For example, a grove of pine trees on Mt Ida belonging to the Magna Mater was the source of wood for Aeneas' fleet.[534] The goddess further aided Aeneas when one of these ships, now turned into a sea nymph, advised him on the state of affairs in his war with Turnus and urged him to battle.[535] Aeneas then called upon the Magna Mater to lead him in the fighting.[536] Ovid too stresses her Trojan origins and connects her with Aeneas, saying she almost followed him and the *sacra* then but she was not yet needed.[537] She was thus promoted as a key ally in Aeneas' mission to found the Roman race in Italy.

The goddess had indeed been seen for some time as protecting Rome and guaranteeing it victory. Close links with the *princeps* would in turn reinforce the attribution of these qualities to him. The cult of the Magna Mater had been established in Rome in 204 BC after a consultation of the Sibylline Books advised that this would secure victory over Hannibal and the Carthaginians.[538] She intervened on the side of Rome on various later occasions, including in 102 BC when the Cimbri and Teutoni threatened Italy.[539] Marius had made vows to the goddess and travelled to

---

[529] Despite how fitting it would be for Augustus, the goat who suckled Zeus-Iuppiter did not become the constellation Capricorn (*contra* Bell 2007: 186). She became the star Capella in the constellation Auriga (e.g. Aratus, *Phaen*. 156-166; Ov. *Fast*. 5.111-128; Manil. *Astr*. 1.366-370, 5.130-134; Hyg. *Poet. astr*. 2.13; [Eratosth.] *Cat*. 13).

[530] Verg. *Aen*. 9.82-94; Ov. *Fast*. 4.191-192, cf. 193-214. The identification of Cybele and Rhea is also found in Greek authors (e.g. Hipponax fr. 156; Eur. *Bacch*. 58-59, 78-79; Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 1.1092-1102, 1123-1152; Strabo 10.3.12, 15, 19, 20; Nonnus, *Dion*. 10.140; cf. Roller 1999: 170-174) and is not confined to Latin literature (*contra* Bell 2007: 188 n. 60).

[531] The Magna Mater might have influenced the renaming of Romulus' mother from Ilia to Rhea Silvia (Bell 2007: 112-113).

[532] Hom. *Il*. 2.820-821; Hes. *Theog*. 1008-1010.

[533] Getty 1950: 8-10; Bell 2007: 75-79, 120-123.

[534] Verg. *Aen*. 3.5-6, 9.85-89, 116; cf. Ov. *Fast*. 4.273-274.

[535] Verg. *Aen*. 10.219-250.

[536] Verg. *Aen*. 10.251-255.

[537] Ov. *Fast*. 4.179-372. AENEAS: Ov. *Fast*. 4.251-254, cf. 273-274.

[538] Cic. *Har. resp*. 27; Livy 29.10.4-8, 29.11.5-8, 29.14.5-14; Sil. *Pun*. 17.1-47; App. *Hann*. 56; Herodian 1.11.3-5; Arn. *Adv. nat*. 7.49-50; Julian. *Or*. 5.159 C-161 A; Amm. Marc. 22.9.5; *De vir. ill*. 46; cf. Varro, *Ling*. 6.15; Ov. *Fast*. 4.247-348; etc. Bell 2007: 116.

[539] WAR AGAINST THE CIMBRI AND TEUTONI: Plut. *Mar*. 17.5-6; cf. Diod. Sic. 36.13. WAR AGAINST THE GALATIAN GAULS IN 189 BC: Polyb. 21.37.5-7; Livy 38.18.9-10. Bell 2007: 117.

Pessinus to fulfil them after his success.[540] Other generals supposedly did the same.[541] Therefore, the Magna Mater had helped Rome to be triumphant multiple times, especially when faced with great peril. Her role as a bringer of victory was perhaps the reason that the Magna Mater's sacred stone was kept in the nearby Temple of Victoria on the Palatine until her temple was completed.[542]

One more reason for Augustus seeking ties to the Magna Mater was her powers of divination. Augustus promoted himself as having superior abilities in this field in order to strengthen his religious and political authority.[543] Besides casting him as a peerless leader and decision-maker, it implied a close connection to the gods and that he was to some degree divine himself. The Magna Mater could support this image. The goddess had, through her priests, prophesied victory for Rome on at least two occasions. Virgil emphasises her prophetic powers in the *Aeneid* by having Creusa and Cymodocea advise Aeneas of future events, clearly under the goddess' influence.[544] Moreover, Cybele's cult had come to Rome because of the Sibylline Books and the Delphic oracle.[545] This not only gave her a further link to divination but also one to Apollo, Augustus' patron god.

Finally, the goddess' Claudian connections could be beneficial for the *princeps*.[546] His step-sons, Tiberius and Drusus, were patrician members of this prestigious *gens*. Perhaps more importantly, Livia was a Claudian herself by natural descent, since her father had been a Claudius Pulcher before his adoption by M. Livius Drusus. The Magna Mater offered the opportunity to promote his wife and step-sons as part of the imperial *domus*. This largely rested on the legend of Claudia Quinta, who had miraculously moved the ship bringing the Magna Mater to Rome when it was stuck in the Tiber and so proved her purity with the goddess' aid.[547] Claudia had the honour of a statue in front of the Magna Mater's temple.[548] Depicting Livia as Claudia's modern-day counterpart or heir would naturally claim for her such virtue and divine favour. There were other Claudian links to the goddess too.[549]

Augustus took a number of actions that associated himself with the Magna Mater. The goddess' temple was close to the residence he had established on the Palatine and thus formed part

---

[540] Plut. *Mar*. 31.1.
[541] Cic. *Har. resp*. 28; Val. Max. 1.1.1c.
[542] Livy 29.14.14.
[543] See next chapter and Conclusion.
[544] Verg. *Aen*. 2.775-789, 10.219-245.
[545] Livy 29.10.4-6, 29.11.5-6; Ov. *Fast*. 4.255-264; etc.
[546] Cf. Bell 2007: 57.
[547] Prop. 4.11.51-52; Ov. *Fast*. 4.291-344; Plin. *HN* 7.120; Suet. *Tib*. 2.3; App. *Hann*. 56; Lactant. *Div. inst*. 2.7.12; cf. Cic. *Har. resp*. 27; Livy 29.14.12.
[548] Val. Max. 1.8.11; Tac. *Ann*. 4.64.
[549] Cicero refers to Clodius' father and uncle holding the Megalesia, occasions when it appears, at least in 99 BC, to have been especially magnificent (Cic. *Har. resp*. 26, cf. *Verr*. 2.4.6, 133, *Off*. 2.57; cf. Val. Max. 2.4.6; Plin. *HN* 35.23; *MRR* 2.1, 21). One of the censors in 204 BC responsible for letting the contract for construction of the temple of the Magna Mater was C. Claudius Nero (Livy 29.37.2, 36.36.4).

of his Palatine religious precinct.[550] After the temple was destroyed by fire in AD 3, Augustus rebuilt it, as he noted in his *Res Gestae*, and allowed his name to be attached to the building as though he had founded it.[551] This stands in contrast to other buildings he restored, where he let others' names remain.[552] The materials used demonstrate that considerable thought and expense went into the temple's reconstruction.[553] Augustus may have instigated changes to the ritual *lavatio* that was part of the Magna Mater's cult in order to make it more prominent and magnificent.[554] The decoration of the Augustan temple appears to have referred to the *Aeneid* with the inclusion of a pine branch on the pediment.[555] It has also been persuasively argued that the figure holding the pine branch is a personification of Mt Ida, with the figure on the other side being the Palatine.[556] If this is the case, the intention was to emphasise further the goddess' Trojan origins and her Roman home on the same hill where her descendant Augustus now lived too. A throne and crown belonging to the goddess featured on the pediment. These may have helped to recall Caesar, her other great descendant who had received a similar honour of having a throne and crown.[557] It was this honour that Octavian had repeatedly attempted to implement after his assassination. Augustus took a palm tree that had sprung up in front of his home and transferred it inside where he cultivated it alongside his Penates.[558] Although the palm was a symbol of victory and was sacred to Apollo, there is reason to think that Augustus' action also consciously aimed at giving the Magna Mater a presence in his house. In 38 BC, palm trees sprung up around her temple and in the Forum after portents indicating her displeasure had been expiated with the aid of the Sibylline Books.[559] Augustus' placement of the obelisk and a statue of Victoria near the lion statue in the Circus may have been designed to reproduce the close association of the Magna Mater, Apollo, Victoria and himself on the Palatine.[560]

The Magna Mater is positively portrayed in Augustan literature, art and monuments.[561] The *Vicus Sandaliarius* Altar is a noteworthy example. One side of the altar, used for the Augustan compital cult, appears to depict the taking of auspices before Gaius Caesar departed for his Eastern command in 1 BC.[562] A priestess of the Magna Mater appears alongside Augustus and Gaius as they witness a *tripudium*, the favourable omen for military campaigns involving chickens.

---

[550] Bell 2007: 107-114, 123-132; Cooley 2009: 191.
[551] Ov. *Fast*. 4.348; *RG* 19.2; cf. Val. Max. 1.8.11; Tac. *Ann*. 4.64. Richardson 1992: 242; Bell 2007: 8-9; Cooley 2009: 191.
[552] Cf. *RG* 19.1, 20.1. Cooley 2009: 192, cf. 187.
[553] Bell 2007: 25-26, 44-45.
[554] Bell 2007: 48-55.
[555] Bell 2007: 75-79.
[556] Bell 2007: 84-89, 101-105.
[557] Bell 2007: 69-70.
[558] Suet. *Aug*. 92.1.
[559] Cass. Dio 48.43.4-6. Bell 2007: 174-175.
[560] Bell 2007: 165, 172-175.
[561] Bell 2007: *passim*. See some of the references above.
[562] Bell 2007: 211-213.

Augustus, as the centre figure holding a *lituus*, is shown as the taker of the auspices and so the one ultimately responsible for securing divine favour and victory. Yet the reference to the cult of the Magna Mater again demonstrates that she too was seen as a bringer of victory and a goddess of prophecy in aid of Roman, and now Augustan, power. This is emphasised by the presence of Victoria, the *clipeus virtutis* and a trophy on another side of the altar, together with Augustus' laurel trees and *corona civica* on a third. She is also, like Augustus himself, a source of protection, as she had been in the *Aeneid*. Presumably, the goddess would watch over Gaius, her descendant, like she did Aeneas. It was especially fitting because Gaius' destination was the East, whence she and the Iulii's ancestors had come.[563] This protective aspect is particularly strong here because the altar was part of the cult of Augustus' Genius and the Lares Augusti, tutelary deities. In addition, the link to the Magna Mater reinforced the notion of Augustus' divinity that was implicit in the reformed compital cults. She served to recall the origins of the Iulii and the ancestral gods with whom Augustus and his *domus* still enjoyed a special relationship. There is no evidence that Caesar advertised any ties to the Magna Mater. Nevertheless, he did provide the grounds for Augustus' relationship with the goddess through his emphasis on his mythical heritage, his promotion of Victoria, and his links to the East, both with respect to his military plans and his actions regarding Dionysus.[564]

Augustus' relationship with a number of divine qualities or virtues formed a conspicuous aspect of his principate. The epithet Augusta attached to several of the virtues made the connection especially intimate and personal.[565] While there were Hellenistic precedents for this, the immediate inspiration was surely the Fortuna Caesaris and Clementia Caesaris.[566] Not only was Augustus portrayed as possessing or conferring the particular values but their respective goddesses were presented as having the *princeps* as their special interest. All this helped to raise Augustus above ordinary mortals and into the divine. The *clipeus virtutis* bestowed on Augustus in 27 BC explicitly attributed to him four cardinal virtues: *virtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas*.[567] The shield was kept with a statue of Victoria in the Curia Iulia, and the pair became prominent Augustan symbols.[568] Indeed, Victoria was one of the personifications of greatest importance for Augustus. In this respect, he was emulating earlier Romans like Marius, Sulla, Pompeius and, above all, Caesar. Victoria represented the divine favour, earned through their *virtus*, that aided these generals in bringing success to the Roman state.[569] Augustus even strengthened his adoptive father's

[563] Bell 2007: 213-214.
[564] See above.
[565] Fears 1981b: 886-889.
[566] See above.
[567] See the next chapter.
[568] Cass. Dio 51.22.1-2. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.111-112.
[569] Cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.117.

connection with the goddess by renaming his *ludi Veneris Genetricis* the *ludi Victoriae Caesaris*.[570] Venus and Victoria had long been linked, which greatly suited Augustus, just like it had Caesar, because of the Iulii's mythical ancestry. Augustus' connections with Victoria were extensive. The goddess and her symbols appear frequently on Augustan coins and monuments, including as part of the altar for his cult at Lugdunum.[571] The laurel wreath he received and the laurel that decorated his doorposts had strong connotations of victory. The Temple of Victoria was situated on the Palatine and thus formed part of the religious precinct Augustus developed around his home.[572] Augustus' monopolisation of the credit for Roman victories and his claims to superior divinatory skills underscored his image as being divinely favoured and the guarantor of Roman success. Trophies like the Egyptian obelisks he brought to Rome and even the standards reclaimed from the Parthians acted as strong public reminders, as did supplications in the calendar. For example, supplications to Victoria Augusta commemorated Octavian's first success at Mutina.[573] Representations of Octavian-Augustus as dominating the world in the form of a globe naturally symbolised that he was victorious and unconquered, which was particularly reminiscent of Caesar. As in other areas, it is highly likely that Augustus personally drove his association with Victoria, as is supported by his foundations of Nicopolis near Actium and Nicopolis near Alexandria.[574] His role as founder of these cities also provided another link between victory and his divinity.[575] Dio explicitly states that it was Augustus who put the statue of Victoria in the Curia Iulia.[576] Of course, other actions of his, such as the aggrandisement of the Actian Games and his dedication of spoils, contributed to his ties to victory too.

Pax was another important personification for Augustus and one closely tied to Victoria, since peace came as a result of his military success.[577] Augustus was portrayed as restoring harmony and prosperity to Rome and as inaugurating a new golden age. The Secular Games are a noteworthy example of his efforts in this area. Likewise, the holding of the *augurium salutis* and the closing of the doors to the Temple of Ianus Quirinus were actions of his especially targeted at publicising and solemnising the peace that his leadership had brought to Rome and its citizens.[578] The Ara Pacis Augustae was created to serve as a magnificent permanent monument to this peace. It was voted by the Senate in 13 BC and dedicated in 9 BC.[579] The identification of various figures

---

[570] Ramsey and Licht 1997: 54-57.
[571] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.111-112.
[572] See above.
[573] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.279, cf. 441-442. Fears 1981c: 742.
[574] Suet. *Aug.* 18.2; Cass. Dio 51.1.3, 51.18.1. Cf. Reinhold 1988: 120-121.
[575] Cf. Reinhold 1988: 120.
[576] Cass. Dio 51.22.1.
[577] Fears 1981c: 807.
[578] *AUGURIUM SALUTIS*: Suet. *Aug.* 31.4; Cass. Dio 51.20.4. IANUS QUIRINUS: *RG* 13; Suet. *Aug.* 22; Cass. Dio 51.20.4; etc. Cooley 2009: 158-160.
[579] *RG* 12.2. Cooley 2009: 154.

that adorned the altar and its surrounds are disputed but the themes of harmony and fertility are readily apparent. Of particular significance is the panel featuring Numa Pompilius, once erroneously thought to be Aeneas.[580] Numa was the second king of Rome and renowned for the peacefulness of his reign as well as his religious reforms. He was, for example, credited with founding the Temple of Ianus Quirinus, whose doors Augustus shut. He was also an ancestor of Augustus through Caesar's grandmother, Marcia. This made an association with Numa all the more attractive for Augustus. Indeed, Numa can be seen as a complement to Romulus, who also appears on the monument, with each representing different favourable aspects of the *princeps*.[581] Thus, Virgil had placed Augustus in conjunction with Romulus and Numa in the *Aeneid*.[582] Augustus is also associated with Numa on his coinage.[583] Augustus' links to this regal ancestor were probably another inheritance from Caesar, who had also demonstrated parallels with Numa, such as his reform of the calendar, and had publicly drawn attention to this side of his ancestry.[584] Caesar would have benefited in the same way as Augustus did, since he was likewise portrayed as a bringer of peace.

Concordia was a personification of importance under Caesar, and this carried over to Augustus' principate too. Livia built a temple to Concordia, apparently as part of the Porticus Liviae.[585] Tiberius undertook the restoration of the old Temple of Concordia in 7 BC.[586] He dedicated this in AD 10 or 12 in his name and that of Drusus, suggesting that the temple's personal significance for Tiberius perhaps did not centre on Augustus.[587] Nevertheless, various items known to have been placed in the temple, especially ones related to Apollo, Latona, Diana and Vesta, and some given by Augustus and Livia, indicate that there would have been a very strong association with the *princeps* and the imperial family.[588] Although concord would be an expected feature of peace, it was especially significant in view of the decades of civil wars Rome had suffered. Internal harmony was often accentuated under Octavian-Augustus' leadership. Notable examples are public occasions involving the whole People, including the Senate and equestrians, such as his various *adventus*.[589] Even though there were obvious political benefits to assuring his popularity among the different classes, one should not dismiss there being genuine religious aspects. Harmony within the nobility and within the population was integral to Rome's welfare, as the reported background to

---

[580] Rehak 2001: 196-199.
[581] Rehak 2001: 200, 201.
[582] Verg. *Aen*. 6.777-812.
[583] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 390-396. Wallace-Hadrill 1986: 82.
[584] Suet. *Iul*. 6.1. Hamlyn 2011: 95-96. Numa was Ancus Marcius' grandfather (see next chapter).
[585] Ov. *Fast*. 6.637-638, cf. 1.649-650. Richardson 1992: 99-100.
[586] Cass. Dio 55.8.2. Richardson 1992: 99.
[587] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.114-115, cf. 160-161. Ov. *Fast*. 1.645-648; Suet. *Tib*. 20; Cass. Dio 56.25.1, cf. 55.8.2. Note also Tiberius' rebuilding of the Temple of Castor.
[588] E.g. Plin. *HN* 34.73, 77, 36.196, 37.4; Cass. Dio 55.9.6. Richardson 1992: 99.
[589] See above.

the foundation of Concordia's cult in 367 BC demonstrates.[590] It is also reflected in the planned temple for Concordia Nova under Caesar. Such a great benefaction as the restoration of internal peace and consensus would understandably be worthy of cult towards the gods and especially an eponymous goddess.

Other personifications were linked to Augustus. There was, for instance, a statue and perhaps a temple of Iustitia Augusta.[591] A cult of Fortuna Redux was instituted in 19 BC in connection with Augustus' successful return to Rome and the associated festival was called the Augustalia.[592] Not only did the favour of Fortuna imply a special status but having a festival named after him was reminiscent of divine honours. This is especially the case because of the example of his adoptive father, the god who had promoted his own Fortuna Caesaris. The result for Augustus was to reinforce his dominance of Rome's religious landscape. His actions and those of members of the imperial family, like Livia, indicate that, as in so many areas, he actively drove this as a way of securing his and his house's grip on the state.

There was not a public cult of Augustus in Rome while he was alive and he was only officially deified upon his death in AD 14 by senatorial decree, which was passed after the funeral.[593] There were, however, several signs that his deification had been decided upon beforehand. The details of the funeral all but declared that Augustus had undergone apotheosis and become a god. Above his coffin was a couch of gold and ivory, materials fit for a god, and a wax image of him in triumphal dress.[594] These honours closely resembled those granted to Caesar in the build-up to his deification. There was also a golden statue of Augustus and one in a triumphal chariot.[595] The funerary procession went through the Porta Triumphalis, perhaps headed by the statue of Victoria that Augustus had erected in the Curia Iulia.[596] The triumphal theme that can be detected recalled his *virtus*, his role as a bringer of victory and his benefactions to the state, all of which could be used as justification for deification. The statue of Victoria would be especially significant because of its association with the *clipeus virtutis*. Contrary to normal practice, Augustus' body preceded rather than followed the images of his ancestors, which on this occasion were joined by other famous Romans, beginning with Romulus.[597] This symbolised his greatness and that he had surpassed all these other figures, including the city's founder who had been worthy

[590] Ov. *Fast*. 1.639-644; Plut. *Cam*. 42; cf. Livy 6.42.9-14. Weinstock 1971: 260.
[591] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.112-113. Ov. *Pont*. 2.1.33-34, 3.6.23-26. Weinstock 1971: 247.
[592] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 53-56, 322. *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.194-195, 198-199, 279. *RG* 11; Cass. Dio 54.10.3. Cooley 2009: 151.
[593] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.192-193, 209, 214-215. Tac. *Ann*. 1.10; Cass. Dio 56.46; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.124.3. Swan 2004: 351.
[594] Cass. Dio 56.34.1.
[595] Cass. Dio 56.34.2.
[596] Cass. Dio 56.42.1; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; Suet. *Aug*. 100.2. Swan 2004: 340.
[597] Cass. Dio 56.34.2.

of joining the gods. Caesar did not appear among the images since he had become a deity.[598] His absence was a reminder of the fact that Augustus' adoptive father had achieved apotheosis before him. Tiberius' delivery of his funeral speech from the Julian rostra in front of the Temple of Divus Iulius had the same effect.[599] The return of Augustus' body to Rome via Bovillae had also underscored his Julian, and thus divine, heritage.[600] The release of an eagle from his funeral pyre symbolised his apotheosis in advance of any official acknowledgement, as well as his links with Iuppiter, including that by blood.[601] The involvement of Rome's population, including the Senate, equestrians and Praetorian Guard, was commensurate with his importance as the city's beneficent leader and supposed source of safety and success.[602] Thus it was decreed too that women were to mourn Augustus' death for a year.[603] Once again, such importance to a city supported the institution of a cult. Finally, Numerius Atticus, a senator of praetorian rank, claimed to have actually witnessed Augustus' soul ascending to heaven.[604] This directly paralleled the myth of Romulus' apotheosis, which had seen by a Julian ancestor. Livia rewarded the senator, showing that his testimony was welcomed by Augustus' widow, if indeed not secretly arranged by her.[605] However it came about, it was merely one more sign that Augustus would be established as a new state god.[606]

When the Senate made his deification official, Livia became Augustus' priestess with the new name Iulia Augusta she received as part of accepting her inheritance in his will.[607] Leading senators and members of the imperial family were selected as *sodales Augustales*, priests created for the worship of Augustus and the imperial house.[608] These were modelled on the *sodales Titii* said to have been instituted by Romulus, giving Augustus yet another link to Rome's founder. His cult name was Divus Augustus after the fashion of Caesar. He was naturally to have temples built for his worship, inside and outside Rome, and games were established on his birthday, to be held by the consuls.[609] These games are explicitly likened to the *ludi Martiales*, and Augustus' cult image, unsurprisingly made from gold, was housed in the Temple of Mars Ultor.[610] This demonstrates the importance of Mars Ultor to the imperial family. Plebeian tribunes wearing triumphal dress were to

---

[598] Cass. Dio 56.34.2, cf. 47.19.2. Strictly speaking, of course, Romulus should not have appeared either (cf. Swan 2004: 323).
[599] Suet. *Aug*. 100.3; Cass. Dio 56.34.4.
[600] Suet. *Aug*. 100.2. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 5-6.
[601] Cass. Dio 56.42.3. Swan 2004: 343-344. Some scholars claim that Dio is wrong about the eagle (e.g. Price 1987: 95) but Swan mentions some of the evidence in favour of its historicity.
[602] Cass. Dio 56.42.1-3; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 100.2-4.
[603] Cass. Dio 56.43.1.
[604] Suet. *Aug*. 100.4; Cass. Dio 56.46.2.
[605] Cass. Dio 56.46.2.
[606] Cf. Swan 2004: 353-354.
[607] Cass. Dio 56.46.1; cf. Ov. *Pont*. 4.9.107; Vell. Pat. 2.75.3. Swan 2004: 352.
[608] Tac. *Ann*. 1.54; Cass. Dio 56.46.1; cf. Suet. *Claud*. 6.2. Swan 2004: 351-352.
[609] TEMPLES: Cass. Dio 56.46.3; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 1.10. Swan 2004: 354-355. BIRTHDAY GAMES: Cass. Dio 56.46.4.
[610] Cass. Dio 56.46.4.

celebrate *ludi Augustales*.[611] Augustus' divine image would appear in the circus procession in the same manner as that of Caesar, perhaps drawn by elephants.[612] As with Caesar too, his image would no longer appear in funerary processions.[613] In addition, annual games were held on the Palatine, the site of the religious precinct Augustus had established around his home.[614]

There can hardly be any doubt that Augustus not only expected but actually arranged that he would be worshipped as a state divinity in Rome after his death. Augustus left instructions for his funeral, and senatorial suggestions were submitted for Tiberius and Livia to consider.[615] Tiberius and Livia were responsible for the construction of his temple in Rome, and it was Livia who gave the *ludi Palatini*.[616] Although intensifying Augustus' status and prestige was in their interests, it was evidently in accordance with his wishes too. He had long accepted worship outside Rome and the provincial cults were imposed from above. Now that he was dead, places that showed reluctance in building a temple to Divus Augustus were compelled to do so.[617] This demonstrates some continuity in religious policy. Augustus had ensured that his outstanding achievements and virtues would be appreciated after his death by ordering his *Res Gestae* to be inscribed on bronze pillars outside his mausoleum.[618] Copies were also set up throughout the empire. He thus clearly set out how he had fulfilled some of the criteria typically used for worship of mortals. Posthumous state cult within the capital followed the precedent set by his model Romulus, as well as his mythical ancestors Aeneas and Ascanius in other places. Caesar's deification could be presented as effectively posthumous, given the proximity of his assassination and the astral apotheosis subsequently signalled by the comet. Dio's record of Tiberius' eulogy for Augustus, with its mention of Romulus, Hercules and Alexander, may not be historically accurate but it is reflective of attitudes present during his principate.[619]

Augustus' intent of being worshipped after his death is also supported by the efforts he took to secure the Julian dominance of Rome. The construction of his mausoleum as a conspicuous monument in a public place could only serve to remind Rome of his reign and his family.[620] Its choice as the site of the *Res Gestae* demonstrates the *princeps*' awareness of this. Caesar might have had similar plans.[621] In his will, Augustus had Livia take his title for herself, so that she

---

[611] Tac. *Ann*. 1.15, 54; Cass. Dio 56.46.4-5. Swan 2004: 356-357.
[612] Cf. Suet. *Claud*. 11.2; Cass. Dio 62(61).16.4, cf. 59.13.8, 75(74).4.1. Swan 2004: 357.
[613] Cass. Dio 56.46.4.
[614] Cass. Dio 56.46.5.
[615] FUNERAL INSTRUCTIONS: Suet. *Aug*. 101.4; cf. Cass. Dio 56.33.1. TIBERIUS AND LIVIA CONSIDER SUGGESTIONS: Cass. Dio 56.47.1; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; Suet. *Aug*. 100.2-3. Swan 2004: 316.
[616] TIBERIUS, LIVIA AND THE TEMPLE: Cass. Dio 56.46.3; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.130.1; Plin. *HN* 12.94. Swan 2004: 354-355. LIVIA AND THE *LUDI PALATINI*: Cass. Dio 56.46.5.
[617] Cass. Dio 56.46.3, cf. 57.24.6; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 4.36. Swan 2004: 355.
[618] Suet. *Aug*. 101.4; cf. Cass. Dio 56.33.1. Swan 2004: 316. Cf. Bosworth 1999: 11-18.
[619] Cass. Dio 56.36.3-5. Cf. Swan 2004: 326, 329.
[620] Cf. Suet. *Aug*. 100.4.
[621] Cf. Cass. Dio 44.7.1.

became Augusta, with all its divine associations.[622] This further enhanced her status, not only aiding the succession of Tiberius but also helping to assure the ongoing prominence of the entire house.[623] This was consistent with his promotion of Marcellus and Gaius and Lucius Caesar before their deaths. The timing of the *ludi Palatini* to coincide with the anniversary of Augustus' marriage to Livia also attests to the continued importance of their relationship, especially in connection with the religious significance of their Palatine home.[624] Tiberius, Germanicus, Claudius and Drusus were some of the first *sodales Augustales*, which further tied the imperial family to Augustus' divinity.[625] Of course, the very act of deification for Augustus meant that his relatives were automatically given a special standing by association, as Caesar's deification had once done for him.

After Octavian defeated Antonius and prevailed in the civil wars, he came to be directly worshipped throughout Rome's empire. This worship occurred on a number of different levels, according to different social and political circumstances. In terms of scale, it ranged from cults covering whole regions, cities and towns down to private acts from individuals. The specific character of the worship varied by location, although broad generalisations can be made, especially for the East, where cult of living individuals had become customary, and for the West, where it was not traditional practice. At the highest level were the provincial or regional cults that were established outside Rome and Italy. These cults were not aimed at Roman citizens, at least not initially. In the East, they were a means for the provincial population to demonstrate their loyalty to Rome and its ruler, Octavian, and to maintain a mutually beneficial relationship. No compulsion was necessary on Octavian's part. People in this part of the world were accustomed to taking the initiative in offering worship to powerful individuals, and such was apparently the case again under Octavian. In 29 BC, he consented to Asia and Bithynia building temples to him.[626] Nevertheless, Octavian-Augustus and Roman officials undoubtedly still issued directives. This can be seen, for instance, in Octavian's stipulation that his provincial cults should be shared with Roma.[627] Likewise, Roman citizens were instructed to worship Roma and Divus Iulius.[628] Although this meant that they were not to be included in direct cult of Octavian, worshipping his father as a god inevitably meant that he too was divine to some extent. Octavian could only have been too well aware of this. In contrast to the East, regional cults in the West were instituted from above to impress the power of the emperor and Rome on the population, typically in areas not long under

[622] Tac. *Ann*. 1.8; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 101.2; Cass. Dio 56.32.1-2.
[623] Cf. Swan 2004: 311.
[624] DATE OF THE *LUDI PALATINI*: *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.238-239, 264, cf. 160-161. Swan 2004: 357.
[625] Tac. *Ann*. 1.54; Suet. *Claud*. 6.2. Lewis 1955: 133.
[626] Tac. *Ann*. 4.37; Cass. Dio 51.20.6-8.
[627] Suet. *Aug*. 52; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 4.37.
[628] Cass. Dio 51.20.7.

Roman control. Thus, altars to Roma and Augustus were established at Lugdunum, on the Elbe, at Oppidum Ubiorum and in north-west Spain.[629] Augustus' direct influence can be detected for the Lugdunum altar. He had been in Gaul immediately before its construction.[630] The same might have been true of Spain.[631] Moreover, the Lugdunum and Elbe altars were founded by Augustus' step-son and the husband of his niece respectively. The consistent use of altars for the provincial cults confirms it was a matter of policy and not independent initiatives.

Municipal cults were the next level of cult towards Augustus and these belonged to particular cities, towns and other settlements. Augustus allowed much greater freedom as to the form these cults took and many were to him only, not being shared with Roma. Countless municipal cults were created across the empire, including in Italy. The client kings Herod and Iuba II even established cults in some of their cities.[632] Many places were named Caesarea, Sebaste or the like after Augustus.[633] Those settlements he personally established probably worshipped him as a founder along traditional lines. Divine honours were also paid to members of the imperial family.[634] In the East, once again, there was no need for persuasion, let alone coercion. Mytilene, for instance, passed a decree conferring several divine honours on Augustus, including a priest and temple, and seem to have sent an embassy to inform him of their decision *c*. 26 BC.[635] The situation in Italy and the West was, in fact, not greatly different. Places there apparently created municipal cults autonomously and spontaneously too, and no doubt for fundamentally the same reasons, such as encouraging the *princeps*' favour. There was evidently some degree of willingness among many people in the West to offer worship to Augustus. Some contributory factors were foreign contact and migration, genuine gratitude for peace and stability, and the efforts of Caesar to establish his own cult.

Certainly, the example of the East played a role. Tarraco may well have instituted their municipal cult after a visit from Mytilenean ambassadors.[636] With the empire being controlled by one man, a sense of obligation or competition might have arisen for places in the West to demonstrate their thanks and loyalty through the same means as those that had formerly belonged to

---

[629] LUGDUNUM (the Altar of the Three Gauls, established by Drusus in 12 BC): *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 229-248; Livy, *Per*. 139; Strabo 4.3.2; Suet. *Claud*. 2.1; Cass. Dio 54.32.1. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.97-137. ELBE (established by L. Domitius Ahenobarbus in *c*. 2 BC): Cass. Dio 55.10a.2. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.145. OPPIDUM UBIORUM (established before AD 9): Tac. *Ann*. 1.39, 57. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.137-139. SPAIN (the Arae Sestianae, with only Augustus mentioned as the dedicatee): Plin. *HN* 4.111; Ptol. *Geog*. 2.6.3; cf. Pompon. Mela, *De chorogr*. 3.13. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.141-144. There may have been other provincial cults created as well (Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.144-146).

[630] Cf. *RG* 12.2; Cass. Dio 54.23.7, 54.25.1. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.142, cf. 97-99, 102-103.

[631] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.142.

[632] IUBA II: Mazard nos. 144-156, cf. 157-161; Strabo 17.3.12. HEROD: Josephus, *BJ* 1.21.2-4, 7-8 (403-407, 414-415), *AJ* 15.9.5, 6 (328-330, 339). Cf. Suet. *Aug*. 60. Taylor 1931: 171; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.147-148.

[633] Taylor 1931: 168-171.

[634] E.g. *IGRom*. 4.1094; *ILS* 119. Taylor 1931: 270-283.

[635] *IGRom*. 4.38-39. Taylor 1931: 168; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.171-172.

[636] Cf. *IGRom*. 4.38. CULT OF AUGUSTUS AT TARRACO: Quint. *Inst*. 6.3.77. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.172.

the Hellenistic kingdoms. Some sort of coaxing or pressure from above could well have still been present. Augustus was in Tarraco in 26-25 BC and his presence may have directly influenced the institution of his cult if it occurred on this occasion.[637] His representatives could make his wishes clear at any time. Herod claimed that his grant of honours to Augustus, Agrippa and others had been done under orders.[638] Augustus might generally not have needed to make any special effort to exert pressure for his worship in Italy and the West. His acceptance of divine honours elsewhere, not to mention the myriad of measures that brought him close to godhead in Rome, were perhaps enough prompting for cities and towns to establish their own municipal cults. It is telling that a key reason given for Cornelius Gallus' fall was his excessive prominence within Egypt, and provincial governors ceased receiving divine honours during Augustus' reign.[639] Cult became the preserve of Augustus and members of the imperial family.

Private acts of worship towards Augustus are also attested. These are generally dedications by individuals recorded in inscriptions.[640] An unusually lavish example is the Caesareum built by Vedius Pollio at Beneventum.[641] Some cases are only known through brief mentions in the literary sources. One example is the incident where the passengers and sailors of an Alexandrian ship paid divine honours to Augustus in AD 14.[642] There were undoubtedly many offerings and dedications that have left no trace at all. The evidence of the imperial cult in the army is highly significant. Although there were private dedications from individuals or small groups of soldiers, some religious observances were compulsory and official.[643] Sacrifices were performed on important occasions for the emperor and the imperial family, especially birthdays.[644] The standards were sacred objects that became closely associated with the emperor. He presented the standards to the legions and his image was kept with them in the shrines of the military camps.[645] Augustus was particularly linked to the legionary eagle through a number of reported omens.[646] He also named certain legions 'Augusta' or gave them the Capricorn, Augustus' special symbol, as their emblem.[647] He may have named another legion 'Apollinaris' after his patron god.[648] The sacred military oath was now sworn to the *princeps*.[649] This accorded with his monopolisation of the

---

[637] Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.172. He also visited Spain later, while absent from Rome in 16-13 BC (*RG* 12.2; Cass. Dio 54.23.7, 54.25.1).
[638] Josephus, *AJ* 15.9.5 (330). Taylor 1931: 171. He might have said this merely as an excuse.
[639] CORNELIUS GALLUS: Cass. Dio 53.23.5; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 66.1-2; etc. Wardle 2014: 427-428. GOVERNORS: Cass. Dio 56.25.6. Bowersock 1965: 119.
[640] Taylor 1931: 270-283; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.91-92.
[641] *ILS* 109. Taylor 1931: 279.
[642] Suet. *Aug*. 98.2.
[643] Cf. Birley 1978: 1509; Stoll 2007: 452.
[644] Helgeland 1978: 1481-1486; Stoll 2007: 453.
[645] Helgeland 1978: 1476-1478, 1491; Stoll 2007: 455, 457-458.
[646] Cf. Helgeland 1978: 1473-1474.
[647] Keppie 1984: 132, 139-140.
[648] Keppie 1984: 135.
[649] *RG* 3.3, cf. 25.2. Helgeland 1978: 1480; Cooley 2009: 118, 215-216.

auspices, as well as his claims to be the guarantor of Roman victory through divine favour. As a result of all this, Augustus effectively became the god-like commander of the army. There can hardly be any doubt that this was a deliberate strategy from Augustus. Much of it can be ascribed to his independent actions. For example, he directly promoted his connection to Victoria and he denied the rightful honour of the *spolia opima* to Crassus. Religious messages were also aimed at the soldiery through the coinage with which they were paid.[650] Even if one were to believe that some of it was driven from below, say that legionaries collectively chose of their own volition that their oaths should be to Augustus, he clearly did nothing to hinder it from happening.

To a large extent, Augustus' place as a divine leader of the Roman military came from Caesar. Besides instituting his cult, Caesar implemented a number of extraordinary honours that portrayed him as a bringer of victory, just as Augustus did. Augustus was also following Caesar in giving honorific names and special emblems to particular legions.[651] As Octavian, he had been heavily dependent on his inheritance from Caesar for the soldiers' loyalty and backing. He took pains to be seen as living up to this legacy and even adopted the *praenomen* Imperator that had been granted to Caesar. Such measures were especially important for Octavian-Augustus because his military achievements could in no way be compared to those of Caesar and he heavily relied on others like Agrippa.

It is deceptive to characterise Augustus as acting with restraint and moderation as *princeps*. He may have avoided a public cult in Rome while he was alive but he ensured that he would be worshipped as a god in the city once he had died. More to the point, he consistently promoted himself as divine through a wide range of other avenues in his lifetime and fostered his worship outside of Rome, including in Italy and the West. Consideration of his other measures, such as the reform of the compital cults, confirms the great lengths to which Augustus went in depicting himself as at least god-like or worthy of being considered a god. The suggestion of restraint is particularly misguided given that Augustus' divine claims also encompassed his family, a point that will be made more strongly in the next chapter. Augustus could hardly have done more to advance the interests of his autocracy and to make it permanent than he did. Gestures of moderation were necessary to avoid dangerous levels of resistance and were thus in his own interest. This could be presented as a point of difference between the *princeps* and Caesar, although Caesar was not devoid of concern for how he was perceived by others and he made conspicuous gestures of moderation too. In any case, there can be no denying the many similarities between the divine claims of Caesar and Augustus. They closely linked themselves to a range of deities, including personified virtues. They emphasised their divine bloodlines and their roles as saviours and new founders, which served

[650] Cf. Stoll 2007: 455.
[651] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 118-120, 130; Keppie 1984: 137-140.

as the key justifications for deification. The similarities are not mere coincidence. Augustus consciously imitated his adoptive father. Indeed, early in his career, he heavily relied on being seen to live up to the dictator's legacy. Contrary to what is often said, this did not end with his victory in the civil wars but continued into his principate. This is clear, for example, from Augustus' ongoing association with Romulus, the cult of Mars Ultor and the importance of Augustan virtues. Caesar's and Augustus' efforts in the religious sphere were considerable and thoroughgoing. Although the range of attitudes present at Rome meant that not everyone was receptive to the changes, there is no suggestion that the religious measures were anything less than highly significant. This is not merely in a political sense either. Finally, the fact that ruler cult was driven from above by the leaders helps to corroborate the view that Eastern influence did not simply manifest itself at Rome by weight of cultural contact with the Romans taking a passive role. Instead, foreign inspiration was actively and willingly adapted for Roman purposes.

Chapter 2: Augustus as a Father-Figure

During the course of his principate, Augustus acquired a number of honours that portrayed him as a sacred father-figure upon whom the safety and success of the state rested. A key event in this regard was his election to the chief pontificate in 12 BC, after which he became closely associated with household gods like Vesta and the Lares. Other members of his family, like Livia, Gaius and Lucius, were also linked to such deities and thereby elevated to special, virtually god-like positions. The single greatest honour that Augustus attained for his paternal image was naturally the title *pater patriae*. The importance of this title should not be underestimated. It supported and justified Augustus' hegemony by casting him as a parent as opposed to a lord or king. His rule was presented as benevolent guidance of the state, which effectively became his household. The members of the household, which is to say the entire population, consequently owed him their loyalty. Disobedience would have been impious or even sacrilegious. The title also reinforced his claims to divinity by strengthening his identification with Iuppiter and his representation as a saviour and new founder, which made him worthy of cult. There was an additional divine connotation because Caesar, the last father of the country, had become a god. Indeed, Augustus' efforts to become a sacred father-figure were heavily indebted to Caesar and were effectively a continuation of his plans and measures. The foundations of the Principate that were formed from the chief pontificate, the mythical ancestry of the Iulii and being the virtuous father of the country were all laid by Caesar. Moreover, Augustus can again be seen to have deliberately followed in his father's footsteps. There are multiple signs that his personal agency was critical in the formulation of his political and religious position. It was not a case of the Senate simply reproducing honours and measures that had previously been enacted under Caesar. This observation is confirmed by the various means by which Augustus extended what Caesar had begun to implement during his dictatorship. Furthermore, Augustus was quite consistent in his approach from the 30s BC, if not earlier. The inescapable conclusion is that he always had the strong intention for himself and his family to be dominant at Rome, during his lifetime and beyond. He did not secure his position only as much as was necessary to maintain stability at Rome. In addition, it can be noted that the measures that depicted Caesar and Augustus as sacred father-figures were distinctly Roman ways of reproducing the concept of the saviour and benefactor that had long been important in the East.

The Chief Pontificate and the Vestal Virgins

The young Octavius was made a pontiff in 47 BC, clearly at the behest of Caesar, then ruler of Rome and *pontifex maximus*.[1] Caesar often took steps to honour and promote his relatives, and it was in keeping with Republican practice to bestow priesthoods on promising young individuals.[2] The Senate decreed in 44 BC that the chief pontificate was to be inherited by Caesar's son.[3] This measure reflects Caesar's proprietary attitude towards the priesthood, in line with his strong emphasis on his mythical ancestry. It was not unusual for particular noble families to feel they had an inherent claim to the chief pontificate. In the immediate aftermath of Caesar's assassination, however, M. Antonius and M. Aemilius Lepidus arranged for the latter to be appointed *pontifex maximus*.[4] Lepidus was a senior member of the pontifical college and descendant of a famous chief pontiff, so it is little wonder he desired the priesthood, as Caesar and many others had throughout the Republic. From Octavian's point of view, he had been denied his legal right to emulate his adoptive father and take up a position of great prestige and dignity.[5] It would have been especially galling for him that it was not the result of the usual elective process but of the machinations of his two older and much more distinguished rivals. Octavian's bitterness is evident in his *Res Gestae*, despite the decades that had passed when he wrote it.[6] Such was his long-lived resentment that after he had become *princeps* of Rome he made a point of publicly humiliating Lepidus.[7]

When Octavian eliminated Lepidus as a political force in 36 BC, the People offered him the chief pontificate but he turned it down.[8] To what degree this refusal was actually arranged by Octavian and his circle one cannot say with any certainty. There is no doubt, however, that he could have taken the priesthood at this time but decided not to do so. This is despite the enormous significance it held for him, which is evident from the fact it was thought worthy of such a popular proposal in the first place. There are a number of possible motives for Octavian not replacing Lepidus as *pontifex maximus* at this first opportunity.[9] The first is regard for the priesthood and its traditions, as it had always been held for life and never stripped from an incumbent.[10] This apparently trumped any possible argument as to the unworthiness or illegitimacy of its holder. Besides, gaining an office he valued so highly in such a manner may well have tarnished it in

---

[1] PONTIFICATE: Nic. Dam. 9; Vell. Pat. 2.59.3; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 5.46, 53. *MRR* 2.292; Lewis 1955: 28; Szemler 1972: 136.
[2] CAESAR PROMOTING RELATIVES: Hamlyn 2011: 103. YOUNG PRIESTS: Szemler 1972: *passim*, esp. 191-192.
[3] Cass. Dio 44.5.3.
[4] E.g. *RG* 10.2; Livy, *Per*. 117; Vell. Pat. 2.63.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.132; Cass. Dio 44.53.6-7.
[5] In truth, one should be sceptical as to whether Octavian had any legitimate claim to inherit the chief pontificate. This matter depends on the question of whether Octavian was genuinely adopted or merely acquired Caesar's name.
[6] See below.
[7] Cass. Dio 54.15.4-8; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 54.
[8] *RG* 10.2; App. *B Civ*. 5.131; Cass. Dio 49.15.3, cf. 54.15.8; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 31.1.
[9] Cf. Simpson 2006.
[10] App. *B Civ*. 5.131; Cass. Dio 49.15.3, 54.15.8; cf. *RG* 10.2.

Octavian's eyes.[11] Second is that a gesture of moderation helped to distance himself from the earlier excesses of the triumvirate, such as the proscriptions, and place the blame on Lepidus and Antonius. Dio states that some people were given to saying as much at the time.[12] Clemency and restraint could be an effective strategy for bolstering one's position and avoiding criticism.[13] Respect for the rule of law and for the state's institutions also encouraged stability and order at Rome, which had been so sorely lacking in recent history.[14] Moreover, Lepidus was aged 52 or 53 and Octavian only turned 27 that same month.[15] He no doubt felt that time was on his side and that an opportunity to become *pontifex maximus* legitimately would arise sooner or later. Although Octavian's refusal was politically advantageous, his care to maintain the proprieties of the priesthood need not have been a mere affectation. Shrewdness and pragmatism could exist alongside esteem for such an important priestly office.

The People voted in 36 BC that Octavian should have a house at public expense.[16] Dio says this was recompense for Octavian having made his land on the Palatine public and consecrating it to Apollo. Yet a different explanation seems likely. Dio mentions the measure together with the vote that Octavian should be sacrosanct. Both followed his refusal to take Lepidus' place as *pontifex maximus*. It is therefore a plausible conclusion that both privileges were actually compensation for not taking on Rome's highest individual priesthood.[17] The position of chief pontiff held a certain sanctity, hence Octavian's new inviolability, and its incumbent was entitled to live in the *domus publica*, near the Regia and Atrium Vestae.[18] A public residence would thus serve as a replacement for the *domus publica*, the house that had belonged to his adoptive father for almost 20 years, and which presumably stood empty now that Lepidus was exiled to Circeii. If this explanation is right, it further demonstrates the great significance placed on Octavian's claim to the chief pontificate from an early date.[19] Moreover, this decree repeated an unfulfilled privilege given to Caesar, that he too should have a new public residence.[20] The honour thus referred to Caesar in two respects.

Lepidus finally died in 13 BC.[21] Augustus followed traditional Republican practice and held the election on 6 March the following year.[22] He thereby showed respect for proper process

---

[11] Cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.10.1.
[12] Cass. Dio 49.15.4.
[13] Cf. Taylor 1931: 133; Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.78. As dictator, Caesar had shown the possible consequences of not being sufficiently circumspect when it came to offices and honours, in spite of his *clementia*.
[14] Weigel 1992: 95.
[15] Lepidus is thought to have been born in 89 or 88 BC on the basis of his political career (Weigel 1992: 10).
[16] Cass. Dio 49.15.5.
[17] *Contra* Weinstock 1971: 278.
[18] Cf. Suet. *Iul*. 46. Weinstock 1971: 277.
[19] The laurel crown he received at this time would have contributed to his compensation for not being *pontifex maximus*, since the laurel had sacred connotations and was associated with the Regia and the Temple of Vesta (Ov. *Fast*. 3.137-144; Plin. *HN* 15.127; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.6). See also below.
[20] Cass. Dio 43.44.6.
[21] Cf. Cass. Dio 54.27.2. Dio mentions his death in 12 BC in connection with the election to replace him, which occurred at a set time rather than soon after the priesthood became vacant. Given the apparent preparations for the

and high regard for the priestly office. Subsequent emperors followed his example and it became customary for them to assume the chief pontificate in March rather than immediately on the death of their predecessor.[23] If Augustus truly adhered to normal Republican practice, he would have contested the election with two other candidates.[24] Judging from the elections of his successors, however, he was probably the sole nominee. In any case, the result would hardly have been in doubt. This is evident from the previous offers of the priesthood and the throngs of people who were in attendance for the event. Even though Augustus had attained exceptional honours and acquired virtually every important male priesthood, the chief pontificate was of special significance beyond any of them. His assumption of the role was not merely a matter of monopolising positions of authority. Besides listing the chief pontificate first among his priesthoods in his *Res Gestae*, Augustus gives it extra prominence by devoting a whole section to it.[25] He first emphasises that he refused to take the priesthood earlier when the People had offered it to him. The mention that his father, Caesar, had held it is perhaps an oblique reference to the senatorial decree of 44 that it should pass to his son.[26] Augustus also cannot resist a stab at Lepidus, belying his resentment. He takes pains to note that his predecessor, unnamed of course, seized the position at a time of civil unrest. Augustus' righteous conduct is thus contrasted with Lepidus' opportunism and alleged lack of integrity. Augustus then boasts that such a multitude poured into Rome from the whole of Italy for his election to the priesthood that it was the largest number of people ever to be present in the capital. Augustus may well have encouraged such a massive turn-out by distributing some sort of gift.[27] This would certainly help explain the popular enthusiasm to attend and travel significant distances. No doubt the festivities and celebrations made it worthwhile as well. Thus it was perhaps not solely a matter of overwhelming public affection that so many people were present in Rome. Nevertheless, Augustus wished to make it appear that the priesthood was partly the product

---

election, Lepidus' death was probably the previous year (cf. Bowersock 1990: 383). Indeed, it may well have occurred in the first half of 13 BC.

[22] See the references to the calendars below. Cf. Taylor 1942: 422; Hamlyn 2011: 46.

[23] Lewis 1955: 73; Bowersock 1990: 383.

[24] E.g. Livy 25.5.3, Suet. *Iul*. 13; cf. Cic. *Leg. agr*. 2.18-19. Hamlyn 2011: 21.

[25] *RG* 7.3, 10.2.

[26] Cass. Dio 44.5.3. Cf. Cooley 2009: 150.

[27] Cooley (2009: 172) identifies the *congiarium* recorded in the Fasti Cuprenses (*Inscr. Ital*. 13.1.245) with the 400 sesterces per person Augustus gave in 12 BC (*RG* 15.1; Cass. Dio 54.29.4). This is a reasonable view but it would then be a mistake to believe it should also be associated with Augustus' election to the chief pontificate (*contra* Cooley). The money was part of a bequest left by Agrippa, who died after the election, and is dated by Augustus to his twelfth year of tribunician power, which would mean no earlier than June/July 12 BC. Therefore, the *fasti* either record this *congiarium* or a separate one to celebrate the election. Buxton (2003: 277) appears to believe the latter. As fitting as this would be, a gift of money would probably have been mentioned in the *Res Gestae*. Moreover, it might have been avoided to prevent any negative connotations of bribery, even with a single candidate, particularly because bribery was supposedly the means by which his adoptive father, Iulius Caesar, was elected *pontifex maximus* (Plut. *Caes*. 7.2-3; Suet. *Iul*. 13). The huge number of people in Rome to see Augustus attain the priesthood seems to demand some sort of benefaction at the time, besides the general celebrations that would have been arranged. If it is not the *congiarium* mentioned in the Fasti Cuprenses, then it could be some other gift like food that was not thought worthy of record.

of overwhelming goodwill towards him. This was important for his public image and for fostering loyalty among the population.

In addition to the *Res Gestae*, Augustus' election as *pontifex maximus* in 12 BC was recorded on calendars and celebrated in Ovid's *Fasti*.[28] There the poet asks what honour would Augustus have preferred to earn, showing that he certainly recognised the priesthood's significance for the *princeps*. The sixth of March was made an annual holiday to memorialise the event.[29] His new priestly position was advertised on coins and monuments, in inscriptions and poetry, and through sculptures of the emperor.[30] Of particular note is the way it was commemorated and glorified in the grand complex that included the Horologium Augusti and that most Augustan monument, the Ara Pacis Augustae. The inscriptions on the obelisk at the centre of the Horologium and on the one in the Circus Maximus have *pontifex maximus* carved directly below Augustus' name as a clear demonstration of its significance.[31] It comes before mention of his other highest honours, namely his acclamations as *imperator*, his consulships and his years of tribunician power. Indeed, Augustus' chief pontificate often has such prominence in inscriptions. The priesthood is a key element of the design of the Ara Pacis. The reliefs continue to generate much discussion and disagreement, yet the procession on the northern and southern exterior walls almost certainly feature Augustus as head of the pontifical college. He appears dressed as a priest leading his fellow *pontifices* and the *flamines maiores*, together with Agrippa and members of the imperial family. The Vestals were almost definitely present in one of the sections that have been badly damaged.[32] Bowersock has argued that the procession friezes memorialise Augustus' election as *pontifex maximus*. It was clearly a large event worthy of depiction in such a monument, and it occurred within the brief period when it was possible for all the figures represented to have appeared together.[33] Another suggestion is that the procession was part of a *supplicatio* held after Augustus' and Agrippa's returns to Rome in 13 BC.[34]

Whatever the occasion represented by the procession friezes, the pontifical associations of the monument are clear and can be seen elsewhere in its decoration. The panel that has often been identified as depicting Aeneas actually shows Numa, Rome's second king.[35] Numa was renowned for his religious measures and was either the first *pontifex maximus* or alternatively appointed the

---

[28] CALENDARS: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.245, 13.2.74, 120-121, 279. Ov. *Fast.* 3.415-428.
[29] HOLIDAY: *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.120-121. Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.189.
[30] COINS: e.g. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 219-220, 229-230, 426-442. MONUMENTS: e.g. the Ara Pacis Augustae (see below), the Sorrento Base (Kleiner 1992: 88; Bell 2007: 217-241), the Palermo Relief of the Vestals and perhaps the Belvedere Altar (Thompson 2005: 93-94). SCULPTURE: e.g. the statue of Augustus from the Via Labicana (Galinsky 1996: 36, 175). For examples of the other media, see below.
[31] *ILS* 91.
[32] Thompson 2005: 52-64.
[33] Bowersock 1990: 390-393. Note, however, this requires an earlier date for the appointment of a new *flamen Dialis* than has generally been assumed.
[34] Billows 1993: 80-92.
[35] Rehak 2001.

first, identified as one Numa Marcius, who became a relative by marriage.[36] Furthermore, his reign was associated with peace and prosperity, which was eminently suitable for a monument celebrating peace and the achievements of Augustus.[37] Numa was credited with introducing the institution of the Vestal Virgins at Rome.[38] Others assert it was Romulus and that Numa made other changes.[39] In any case, both appear on the monument and were evidently intended to recall aspects of the *princeps*. The Vestals performed annual rites at the Ara Pacis along with the pontiffs, and besides probably being included in the procession friezes, their images do survive on the inner altar.[40] The chief pontificate and the Vestals therefore form a major theme of the Ara Pacis Augustae. This reflects the priesthood's prominence after Augustus' election in 12 BC and the period of extensive religious measures that coincided with the construction of the altar and the surrounding complex on the Campus Martius.[41] Part of the complex' purpose was to show Augustus' principate as a fated and divinely motivated development in Rome's history, marking the beginning of a golden age.[42] The chief pontificate is thus depicted as a central aspect of the new order and a position that was destined to belong to Augustus.

There are several reasons for Augustus placing such great emphasis on being *pontifex maximus*. The chief pontificate had distinguished itself as an office that represented propriety and tradition.[43] This eminently fitted the image he was striving to present, of being a restorer of traditional Roman values and practices. Although the *pontifex maximus* was not endowed with great individual power, historically he did play an important, father-like role within the pontifical college by enforcing discipline. For example, the chief pontiff had taken action several times during the Republic to ensure *flamines maiores* remained in Rome to attend to their duties rather than pursue their personal interests.[44] The Vestal Virgins were members of the pontifical college and also under the supervision and disciplinary power of the *pontifex maximus*.[45] Besides selecting them as young girls, he oversaw their trial if they were accused of unchastity (*incestum*) and their entombment if found guilty.[46] He punished them too if they failed in their duties, particularly care of the eternal flame of Vesta.[47] The chief pontiff thus acted as a righteous figure responsible for

---

[36] NUMA AS *PONTIFEX MAXIMUS*: Plut. *Num*. 9.1; Zos. 4.36.3. NUMA MARCIUS AS *PONTIFEX MAXIMUS*: Livy 1.20.5; cf. Cic. *Rep*. 2.26; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.73; *De vir. ill*. 3.1.
[37] Cic. *Rep*. 2.26-27; Livy 1.21; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.60.4, 2.76.3; Plut. *Num*. 20; Festus 510 L.
[38] Cic. *Rep*. 2.26; Livy 1.20; Plut. *Num*. 9-11, 14; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.64.5, 2.66.1; *De vir. ill*. 3.
[39] Plut. *Rom*. 22.1, cf. *Num*. 9.5, 10.1; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.65.
[40] *RG* 12.2. Thompson 2005: 42-46; Cooley 2009: 156-157.
[41] E.g. the establishment of a shrine to Vesta in Augustus' home and the transformation of the compital cults (see below).
[42] Bowersock 1990.
[43] Hamlyn 2011: 28-35.
[44] E.g. Livy 27.8.4-10, 37.51.1-6, 40.42.8-11. Hamlyn 2011: 28-35.
[45] Cf. Macrob. *Sat*. 3.13.10-11.
[46] SELECTION: Aul. Gell. *NA* 1.12. CASES OF *INCESTUM*: e.g. Livy 22.57.2-3, *Per*. 63; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.67.3-4, 9.40.3-4; Plut. *Num*. 10.4-7, *Quaest. Rom*. 96 (*Mor*. 286 E-287 A); cf. Ov. *Fast*. 6.455-460; Festus 277, 448 L.
[47] E.g. Livy 28.11.6; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.67.3; Festus 94 L; Plut. *Num*. 10.4; Obseq. 8.

maintaining propriety in a prominent cult considered fundamental to Rome's existence. Furthermore, Augustus' predecessors as *pontifex maximus* for at least the last 242 years were without exception pre-eminent figures from the cream of the aristocracy.[48] This had helped to give the priesthood enormous prestige. All the chief pontiffs since 254 BC had been *consulares*, and censorships, dictatorships and triumphs often feature among their other achievements.[49] Some chief pontiffs were also *princeps senatus*.[50] Therefore, being *pontifex maximus* highly suited a man who was styled *princeps* of the state. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine Augustus letting anyone else hold the position, even if he had had no personal ties at all to it. Yet the greatest motivation for Augustus to be *pontifex maximus* did in fact come from his links to the priesthood as heir to Iulius Caesar.

The mythical history of Caesar's family gave Augustus extensive close personal ties to the chief pontificate and to the foundation of the Roman state. These ties were of immense importance to his establishment of the Principate, with continual and explicit stress being laid upon them, most notably in Rome's new national epic, the *Aeneid*. The origins of the Julian bloodline were used to present Augustus as being invested with a special authority and legitimacy, so that he was in a unique position to mediate between the gods and the Roman people. This in turn justified his dominance of the state. From at least the mid-second century BC, the *gens Iulia* had claimed to be descended from Iulus-Ascanius, son of the Trojan prince Aeneas and grandson of the goddess Venus.[51] Aeneas brought the Palladium and the Trojan Penates from Troy to Italy, where they were eventually placed among the *sacra* of the Roman state and under the care and supervision of the *pontifex maximus*.[52] These sacred objects were among the *pignora imperii* that guaranteed Rome's strength and sovereignty over the world. The Iulii could thus argue that it was not only natural but desirable for one of the Iulii, Aeneas' direct descendants, to take this priesthood and become the guardian of Rome's most sacred items. This in turn implied that they were best suited to securing Rome's safety and success. These Julian claims form a prominent theme of the *Aeneid*, where Virgil draws clear parallels between *pius* Aeneas and his supposed descendant, Augustus. At its heart, it is the story of how the Trojan prince rescued his homeland's gods and heroically struggled to establish the beginnings of the great Roman state. This mirrors the travails of Augustus, the new founder, in restoring order and peace and thereby settling Rome anew. He is explicitly presented as a man of destiny, prophesied to carry on his ancestor's legacy and lead his country to ever-greater

[48] Hamlyn 2011: 47.
[49] Hamlyn 2011: 120-122.
[50] These were M. Aemilius Lepidus, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum and perhaps L. Cornelius Lentulus Caudinus (Hamlyn 2011: 120-122). It is an exaggeration to state that the *pontifex maximus* was often the *princeps senatus* (*contra* Münzer 1920: 414-415 = Münzer 1999: 350-351; Lewis 1955: 72-73).
[51] *OGR* 15.5; cf. Cato ap. Serv. *Aen*. 1.267. Hamlyn 2011: 58.
[52] E.g. Varro ap. August. *De civ. D*. 6.2; Verg. *Aen*. 1.6, 1.378-379, 2.293-297, etc.; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.65.2, 2.66.5; Ov. *Met*. 13.623-627, *Fast*. 1.527-528, 3.423-424; Plut. *Cam*. 20.3-6; *OGR* 9.1.

heights, by the decree of Iuppiter himself.[53] The same ideas are found in the other major poets and are expressed through other media like art and monuments.[54] There can be no doubting the significance of Augustus' mythical ancestry and its religious implications to his public image and his position within the state.

The Julian connection to the chief pontificate was not limited to Aeneas and his rescue of the Penates. The Iulii also propagated the myth of a priesthood granted to one of their ancestors in Alba Longa, Rome's mother-city.[55] Iulus and Silvius contended for the kingship of Alba, and although Iulus lost he was given control of religious matters as recompense. This priesthood is perhaps to be identified with the dictatorship of Alba, which still existed in Augustus' lifetime, or the Iulii's gentilician cult of Vediovis at Bovillae.[56] In either case, this story also served as a basis for asserting special religious authority at Rome. This is demonstrated by Dionysius' comment that Iulus' religious prerogative was continued among his descendants down to the present, which is perhaps a reference to the chief pontificate.[57] Caesar had additional family ties that augmented this even further. Caesar's paternal grandmother was a Marcia of the Marcii Reges, who claimed Ancus Marcius, Rome's fourth king, as their ancestor. Caesar drew public attention to this on the same occasion that he boasted of the Iulii's descent from Venus.[58] Ancus Marcius was the grandson of both Numa Pompilius and Numa Marcius, the two mythical figures linked to Rome's religious beginnings and variously called the first *pontifex maximus*.[59] Caesar, and consequently Augustus, therefore had manifold ancestral claims to Rome's single most prestigious priesthood.

Iulius Caesar is clearly the man responsible for the importance of the chief pontificate to Augustus and his principate. He was the first to fulfil his family's claims and make them meaningful in the public sphere. Caesar had gone to great effort to secure the priesthood in 63 BC, resorting to extensive bribery to win the election over his two more senior rivals.[60] This made his achievement all the more impressive. It obviously held great significance for him, as demonstrated by coins and inscriptions.[61] There is every likelihood that his priestly office was celebrated in the pro-Caesarian poetry that has not survived, which is a significant loss, much like the beginnings of

---

[53] Verg. *Aen*. 1.257-296, 6.788-807.
[54] E.g. Ov. *Met*. 15.746-870, *Fast*. 1.529-532. For examples of such art and monuments, like the Gemma Augustea, the Sorrento Base, important temple pediments and the decoration of the Forum Augustum, see previous chapter.
[55] Diod. Sic. 7.5.8; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.70.3-4; cf. Festus 460 L; *OGR* 17.4. Taylor 1931: 59 n. 3; Weinstock 1971: 29; Hamlyn 2011: 62. Here Iulus is the son of Ascanius and not Ascanius himself.
[56] DICTATORSHIP OF ALBA: *ILS* 4955; cf. Cato ap. Festus 196 L; Livy 1.23.4, 1.27.1; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 5.74.4, cf. 3.2.1, 3.5.3, 3.7.3, etc. Weinstock 1971: 323-324; Hamlyn 2011: 62-63, 80-81. BOVILLAE: *ILS* 2988 = *ILLRP* 270. Weinstock 1971: 5-12; Hamlyn 2011: 58-60.
[57] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.70.4. Hamlyn 2011: 62.
[58] Suet. *Iul*. 6.1. Cf. *RRC* nos. 346/1, 346/3-4, 425/1; Ov. *Fast*. 6.801-803; Val. Max. 4.3.4; Plut. *Cor*. 1.1.
[59] ANCUS MARCIUS' GRANDFATHERS: Cic. *Rep*. 2.33; Livy 1.32.1; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.76.5, 3.35.3; Plut. *Num*. 9.4, 21.3, *Cor*. 1.1. Cf. *RRC* nos. 346/1, 346/3-4.
[60] Sall. *Cat*. 49.2; Vell. Pat. 2.43.3; Plut. *Caes*. 7.1-3; Suet. *Iul*. 13; Cass. Dio 37.37.
[61] E.g. *RRC* nos. 443/1, 452/3, 467/1, 480/12-16, 480/19-20. *ILLRP* 406-408. Taylor 1931: 60 n. 5; Weinstock 1971: 31; Stevenson 2009: 100.

Suetonius' and Plutarch's biographies. There are perhaps echoes in Ovid.[62] His pride in his divine ancestry, which he displayed at his aunt's funeral in 69 BC, was prominent throughout his life and was renowned.[63] He must certainly have been aware of his bloodline's ties to this priesthood, especially as he was interested in antiquarian and religious matters. Indeed, some of his actions as dictator demonstrate his mythical heritage was at the forefront of his mind. Two examples are the red boots he wore and his celebration of an *ovatio* from the Alban Mount.[64] He used his descent to strengthen and support a number of aspects of his image, such as being a new founder and the divine saviour of Rome, just like Augustus after him.[65] He apparently planned to establish autocracy at Rome, and the dictatorship and chief pontificate would have been two key pillars of his authority. The measure of 44 BC that made the chief pontificate hereditary was completely in accordance with the myths propagated by the Iulii. If it was not devised by Caesar, then it was at least not at odds with his wishes. With Augustus, the priesthood did finally become hereditary, being passed on to Tiberius after him. This also cemented it as a key element of the emperors' authority and titulature, which had begun with Caesar. Therefore, when Augustus mentions that Caesar had been *pontifex maximus* in the *Res Gestae*, this should be seen as an acknowledgement of Caesar's influence on the Principate and of the importance of his Julian lineage.

The speed with which Augustus implemented his first important reform after becoming *pontifex maximus* strongly suggests that he was eager to start enacting some long-held intentions for the priesthood. This reform involved bringing Vestal worship into his home on the Palatine, a deliberate move to more closely align his household with the state. Indeed, it would be the first of many during his tenure as chief pontiff. The *pontifices maximi* had traditionally made their home in the *domus publica* next to the Atrium Vestae where the Vestal Virgins lived. Rather than shift from his residence on the Palatine in 12 BC, he made part of his home public as a gesture of complying with and continuing the custom. The *domus publica* he gave to the Vestals.[66] Moreover, on 28 April, within mere weeks of his election as chief pontiff, he established in his home a shrine to Vesta which appears to have contained a sacred flame and a copy of the Palladium.[67] If there was a flame, as was the case for the main cult and would conform with tradition, then it would surely have

---

[62] Ov. *Fast*. 1.527-534, 3.697-710, 5.573, *Met*. 15.763, 778.
[63] Cicero ap. Suet. *Iul*. 49.3; Caelius ap. Cic. *Fam*. 8.15.2; Suet. *Iul*. 6.1. See also previous chapter.
[64] RED BOOTS: Cass. Dio 43.43.2. *OVATIO*: see previous chapter.
[65] See previous chapter.
[66] Cass. Dio 54.27.3. Rich 1990: 206; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.189.
[67] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.66, 132-133. Ov. *Fast*. 4.949-954, *Met*. 15.864-865. There has been much debate as to the details of Augustus' action. One especially contentious point is whether the *signum* mentioned in the *fasti* was a statue, a flame or a copy of the Palladium. As Ovid states (*Fast*. 6.295-298), the Temple of Vesta did not have an image of the goddess or of the flame. It would therefore have been untraditional for Augustus to have a statue of Vesta in his home. This makes it less likely but not impossible. EXAMPLES OF DISCUSSION: Guarducci 1964; Herbert-Brown 1994: 74-78; Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.189; Buxton 2003: 340-341, 369-371. One should note that it is certainly mistaken to think that a passage in the third book of Ovid's *Fasti* (3.415-428) mentions the Palatine shrine (*contra* Buxton 2003: 341 n. 2, 369-371). The lines, which celebrate Augustus' election as *pontifex maximus*, clearly refer to the Temple of Vesta.

been lit from the one in the Temple of Vesta. The flame would need to have been tended, and one would expect the Vestals to do this. In any case, the Vestals probably performed rites there. This is not mere speculation, since evidence shows that the priestesses were indeed involved in the establishment of the shrine.[68] The date of the shrine's dedication was made a holiday by decree of the Senate and Ovid implies that there was a senatorial decree to create the shrine itself.[69] It was therefore not simply a domestic action for Augustus but one that was carried out and memorialised in the public sphere.

Augustus had deliberately made Vesta a part of the religious precinct he was developing on the Palatine. The strong implication is that Vesta now had Augustus and his household as her chief concern, in addition to the Roman state.[70] Indeed, they are effectively presented as one and the same. The connection was all the more intimate because Vesta had once watched over the hearth of Troy's royal household. Now she watched over that of its descendant. Augustus' Penates and Lares could, indeed, be interpreted as identical with those Aeneas had rescued, since they were inherited down the family line. As a result, the protective deities Aeneas had brought from Troy to Rome were united under the one roof.[71] The connection would have been made even stronger by Augustus' links to the Magna Mater, another deity in his Palatine precinct. All this meant that not only was Augustus' dominance of the state being legitimised using myth and religion but that his whole family was being permanently elevated to a special status. It is difficult to see how this could not aid in dynastic succession and especially the inheritance of the chief pontificate. Moreover, this action can clearly be ascribed to Augustus himself and is consistent with his moves in the preceding decades that served to secure his leadership of Rome.

Augustus made a clear effort to emphasise the importance of the Vestal Virgins and strengthen his ties to them. As *pontifex maximus*, he already had quite a close relationship to the priestesses, yet this started to become more personal once he built a shrine to Vesta in his home. He took several other steps to align himself with the Vestals. The first of these had occurred long before he became chief pontiff. Once again, this shows that Augustus did have long-term aims for this priestly office but had been frustrated to a large extent by Lepidus holding the chief pontificate. During the Triumviral Period, his agreements with Antonius and Sex. Pompeius were deposited with the Vestals.[72] With his fellow *triumviri*, Octavian also gave the priestesses the right of having a *lictor*.[73] In 30 BC, his name was included in the Vestals' vows for the Roman people, and they

[68] Namely, the Sorrento Base (Kleiner 1992: 88; Bell 2007: 229-230), the Palermo Relief of the Vestals and perhaps the Belvedere Altar (Thompson 2005: 93-94).
[69] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.132-133, cf. 66. Ov. *Fast.* 4.950.
[70] Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 3.426, 4.949-954, *Met.* 15.864-865.
[71] Cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.864-865.
[72] App. *B Civ.* 5.73; Cass. Dio 48.12.2, 48.37.1, 48.46.2.
[73] Cass. Dio 47.19.4; cf. Plut. *Num.* 10.3.

were sent to meet him when he returned from the East in the following year.[74] It was decreed in 19 BC that the Vestals should take part in the annual sacrifice at the altar of Fortuna Redux, and in 13 BC likewise at the Ara Pacis.[75] Indeed, the Vestals were a key part of the Ara Pacis' significance, serving to symbolise the security and prosperity of Augustus' rule that was a fundamental part of his image.[76] Augustus increased the priestesses' privileges, gifted them the *domus publica* and gave them special seats from which to watch gladiatorial games.[77] He also entrusted his will to the Vestals' keeping and they carried it into the Senate after his death.[78] He once swore that he would have gladly nominated his own grand-daughter to be a Vestal except he did not have one of an eligible age.[79] There was a supplication to Vesta on his birthday and on the birthdays of other members of the imperial family.[80] Poetry also emphasised his and his family's link to the goddess.[81]

Augustus himself took on some attributes of a Vestal. This served to endow him personally with some of their positive associations and to strengthen his ties to the priestesses even further. He was made permanently sacrosanct in 36 BC.[82] Dio says this was logical since he had the right to sit on the benches of the plebeian tribunes. This is quite a trivial and silly explanation for such a measure, especially as Octavia and Livia were made sacrosanct the very next year and clearly for no such reason as that. What is more, Dio himself mentions the grant of inviolability in conjunction with that of having a public residence. These measures came after Octavian's refusal to strip Lepidus of the chief pontificate, and it has already been noted that these two honours were apparently compensation for not gaining the personal sanctity and *domus publica* that came with being *pontifex maximus*. This strongly suggests that his inviolability was not merely an imitation of that belonging to the plebeian tribunes, and the prior example of Iulius Caesar confirms it.[83] Rather it aimed to make him more of a sacred figure, akin to the Vestals, who possessed a true sacrosanctity and holiness, superior to the tribunes' status, as a famous incident in the second century BC demonstrated.[84] Tribunician inviolability had repeatedly proved ineffective in the late Republic and was thus of limited value as protection and of questionable value as an honour. Therefore, endowing Octavian with personal sanctity must have been the real motive. In 30 BC,

---

[74] Cass. Dio 51.19.2, 51.19.7, cf. 51.20.4; cf. *RG* 9.1. Dio's 'priestesses' (51.19.7) clearly means the Vestals, since they were the state priestesses who prayed for the Roman people as part of their regular duties (cf. Cic. *Font*. 46, 48; Hor. *Carm*. 1.2.26-28).
[75] *RG* 11, 12.2.
[76] See above.
[77] Suet. *Aug*. 31.3, 44.3; Cass. Dio 54.27.3, 56.10.2; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 4.16. For the gladiatorial games, he appears to have been upholding an older privilege (cf. Cic. *Mur*. 73).
[78] Suet. *Aug*. 101.1; Tac. *Ann*. 1.8.
[79] Suet. *Aug*. 31.3. Swan 2004: 157.
[80] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.279.
[81] E.g. Ov. *Fast*. 1.527-534, 3.415-428, 4.949-954.
[82] *RG* 10.1; Cass Dio 49.15.5-6.
[83] See below.
[84] CLAUDIA INCIDENT: Cic. *Cael*. 34; Val. Max. 5.4.6; Suet. *Tib*. 2.4.

among Octavian's great many honours for vanquishing Antonius and Cleopatra was what Dio calls the tribunician power but seems specifically to have been the ability to aid those who called upon him (*ius auxilii*). He was also empowered to judge appeal cases.[85] Octavian's right to assist people calls to mind a rule related to the Vestals, where if a criminal about to be executed happened by chance to meet one of the priestesses his life was spared.[86] The similarity is even clearer with the practice of not punishing anyone whenever Augustus entered Rome.[87] What Octavian-Augustus and a Vestal had in common in this respect was that each was a symbol of safety and acted as a sort of asylum. For the priestesses, this eminently accorded with their importance as the guarantee of Rome's welfare and success. Likewise, for Augustus, it underscored his position as the saviour of the state and the man who would restore peaceful order and prosperity. As will become evident, Augustus' chief motivation for forging the personal ties to the priestesses that he did during his principate was to acquire their associations of being essential to Rome's existence and well-being. All this shows that his links to the priestesses through his power to aid and his sacrosanctity are not imaginary or mere coincidence but very much deliberate, and the parallels with Iulius Caesar's dictatorship prove it also.[88]

Augustus not only strengthened his ties to the Vestals directly but also indirectly by identifying female members of his family with the priestesses. Livia was the principal target but some measures applied to Iulia, and a comparable image would have been created for her if not for her disgrace. Octavia was also the subject of Vestal associations, as reflected her great importance

---

[85] Cass. Dio 51.19.6-7. Reinhold 1988: 150-151, 230.
It has been argued that Octavian did not receive any sort of tribunician power in 30 BC (cf. Rich 1990: 169; Pelling, *CAH*^{2} 10.68-69). Dio, it is true, is incorrect in stating that he received the *tribunicia potestas* for life at this time. Yet there is good reason to think that Dio is right to say he was given the *ius auxilii*. There is no doubt that Augustus received the *tribunicia potestas* in 23 BC, as Dio knew full well. He records it in the proper place of his history (53.32.5-6). This strongly suggests that Dio did not simply make a silly error. Furthermore, his singling out of Octavian's new power to assist those who asked him for help would appear to be a result of his research and not his own spontaneous comment. As such, it carries some weight. In 23 BC, Augustus needed to be compensated for his laying down of the consulship. *Tribunicia potestas* gave him some of the powers that he had lost but might need in the future. The changes in 23 BC were therefore for practical legal reasons, whereas the ability to aid granted in 30 BC was more honorific in nature and significant for his image as much as anything else. The other honours at this time emphasise Octavian's role as Rome's saviour, and so the *ius auxilii* would have been eminently suitable. Dio's evidence should thus not be dismissed completely. It might be added that Augustus in the *Res Gestae* (10.1) lists his *tribunicia potestas* amidst various religious honours, such as the vows for his safety, the chief pontificate and the two major altars decreed by the Senate. This points to his tribunician power having a special significance beyond the merely legal. In any case, similarities with Iulius Caesar provide a strong basis for believing that Octavian received the *ius auxilii* in 30 BC (see below).
[86] Plut. *Num*. 10.3. There was a regulation of much the same kind regarding the *flamen Dialis* (Aul. Gell. *NA* 10.15.10). This suggests that the rules were a sign of special holiness on the part of these priestly figures.
[87] Suet. *Aug*. 57.2.
[88] See below.
An objection could be raised that Augustus refused a senatorial motion that he be regarded as a source of asylum inside the *pomerium* (Cass. Dio 54.25.3). Yet this was probably because it was redundant, effectively repeating the *ius auxilii* he already possessed, and the product of flattery. It seems to have been a recurrent problem that the Senate voted honours exceeding the ones desired by the ruler in order to ingratiate themselves with him. Iulius Caesar had probably faced this as well (Hamlyn 2011: 86-87; see previous chapter). An example contemporary to this was that the Senate attempted to have the altar that would become the Ara Pacis built in the Curia rather than as part of the great complex that Augustus evidently wished for and planned (Cass. Dio 54.25.3).

in the Triumviral Period particularly. In 35 BC, he gave Octavia and Livia the privileges of statues, administering their own affairs and being inviolable.[89] Their elevation to being sacrosanct women who controlled their interests without a guardian was clearly modelled on the exceptional status of the Vestal Virgins.[90] After Augustus established the shrine to Vesta on the Palatine, Livia too shared a home with the goddess and quite probably participated in her cult. The supplications to Vesta on imperial birthdays linked not only the individuals to the goddess but their mothers as well.[91] On Augustus' death in AD 14, Livia became Iulia Augusta and the Senate decreed her various honours, including her appointment as the *sacerdos divi Augusti*, who had the privilege of being accompanied by a *lictor*.[92] Prior to this, the Vestals had been the only priestesses with *lictores*, so the model and associations of Livia's new position were again clear.

Art and literature linked Livia to the Vestal cult. Livia is prominent in the procession on the Ara Pacis, and is thus, like Augustus, linked to the Vestals through the monument. This was made all the clearer by the decision to dedicate it on Livia's birthday, 30 January, in 9 BC.[93] Other imperial women like Octavia appear as well.[94] Livia, veiled and garlanded, is the female counterpart to her husband, Augustus, the *pontifex maximus* and guardian of the Vestals. The goddess portrayed on the eastern external frieze, who is perhaps Pax, Tellus or Italia, bears some resemblance to Livia.[95] Whatever the identity of the goddess, the message of the panel is obviously one of harmony, prosperity and abundance. This eminently suited the significance of the Vestal cult and the shared connotations being cultivated for Livia. As for literature, Ovid calls Livia 'the Vesta of chaste matrons' and describes her making offerings to the gods alongside *matronae* and the Vestal Virgins.[96] Similarly, Valerius Maximus links Vesta, Iuno and Livia together by way of Pudicitia, the divine personification of chastity.[97] Away from Rome, Livia was linked to Vesta by way of her Greek counterpart, Ἑστία. She and Iulia were included in the goddess' cult at Athens, and Livia was given Ἑστία as a cult name at Lampsacus.[98] As far as the East was concerned, one may add that Livia and Octavia were listed alongside the Vestals in thanks given by ambassadors from Mytilene.[99] The connections to the Vestals were, however, naturally of greatest importance at Rome and so most evident there.

---

[89] Cass. Dio 49.38.1.
[90] Cf. Gai. *Inst*. 1.145; Aul. Gell. *NA* 1.12.9, cf. 7.7.4.
[91] See above.
[92] Vell. Pat. 2.75.3; Tac. *Ann*. 1.8, 14; Cass. Dio 56.46.1-2. The privilege of a *lictor* was opposed by Tiberius.
[93] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.65, 116-117, 160-161, 279. Cf. Ov. *Fast*. 1.709-722. LIVIA'S BIRTHDAY: *AFA* XXXIVe, XLIIIc. Barrett 2002: 9, 42.
[94] Thompson 2005: 65.
[95] Wood 1999: 99-102; Severy 2003: 136.
[96] Ov. *Pont*. 4.13.29, *Trist*. 4.2.11-14.
[97] Val. Max. 6.1 praef.
[98] ATHENS: *IG* 3.316. LAMPSACUS: *IGR* 4.180.
[99] *IGR* 4.39b = *OGIS* 456b.

Livia's own actions reinforced her relationship with Vesta and the Vestals. At some point, Livia restored the Temple of Bona Dea on the Aventine.[100] A festival of this goddess was celebrated by the Vestals and select high-born women each December.[101] Like the Vestal cult, these rituals were considered of great importance to the safety of the Roman people.[102] Livia undoubtedly took part in these rites on several occasions, and probably those that were held on 1 May, the anniversary of the temple she restored. Moreover, Bona Dea was identified as an earth-goddess and was equated with Ops in the pontifical books.[103] Ops, a deity of abundance, could be interpreted as Vesta's mother.[104] Livia's temple restoration therefore provided her with links to the Vestals. The Temple of Bona Dea at Forum Clodii featured in Livia's birthday celebrations there in AD 18, demonstrating that her ties to the goddess were significant and that their appreciation was not confined to a small circle.[105] Livia also built a shrine to Concordia, which she dedicated on 11 June.[106] This date coincided with the festival of the Matralia and the anniversary of the dedication of the temple of Fortuna Virgo. In addition, it fell within the period after the Vestalia when the Temple of Vesta was open to *matronae*.[107] The timing of the shrine's dedication served to portray Livia as a chaste and exemplary mother and to associate her further with the Vestal Virgins. In 9 BC, Livia and Iulia hosted a feast for *matronae* on the occasion of Tiberius' *ovatio*, and Livia did so again in 7 BC when Tiberius triumphed.[108] This created a female equivalent to the feast conducted by the victorious commander. The Vestals often had a leading role in events involving *matronae*.[109] Therefore, the feasts were another step towards creating a public role for Livia akin to that of the Vestals, just like her ties to the cult of Bona Dea.

The aim of closely associating Augustus and his household with Vesta and her priestesses was that the safety and prosperity of Rome should be seen as dependent upon the *princeps* and the imperial family, with them holding a crucial place in the state just like the cult of Vesta.[110] From the Augustan point of view, he was the one responsible for ending decades of civil strife and bringing Rome into a new age of security and success. Without him leading the state, the evils of the past could well return. One could go further, as Virgil did, and portray Augustus' principate as according with destiny and divine will.[111] The two greatest milestones on his way to rescuing the fortunes of the state were 36 and 30 BC. The year 36 saw the defeat of Sex. Pompeius, who had

---

[100] Ov. *Fast*. 5.148-158. According to Ovid, there was a Claudian connection to the temple (cf. Scullard 1981: 116).
[101] Scullard 1981: 199-201.
[102] Cic. *Har. resp*. 12.
[103] Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.21-22, 29.
[104] Ov. *Fast*. 6.285-286; Hyg. *Fab*. praef. 13.
[105] *ILS* 154. Cf. Purcell 1986: 91-92.
[106] Ov. *Fast*. 6.637-638. Richardson 1992: 99-100.
[107] Scullard 1981: 149-152.
[108] Cass. Dio 55.2.4, 55.8.2.
[109] E.g. the festival of Bona Dea (see above).
[110] Cf. Ov. *Fast*. 1.527-534, 719-722.
[111] See above.

long been a threat to Italy and the cause of famine. It also saw the further stabilisation of the western empire with the removal of Lepidus from command. Then in 30 BC, Octavian saved Rome from Antonius and his foreign queen, uniting and expanding the empire in the process. It is no coincidence that these occasions witnessed the bestowal of honours that portrayed Octavian's leadership as being essential to Rome's continued welfare and renewal. Besides his sacrosanctity and the measures featuring the Vestals, there were libations at all public and private banquets, thanksgivings on his birthday and vows for his safety.[112] Indeed, the vows for his welfare were numerous and they form a prominent feature of his principate.[113] A quadrennial festival was decreed after the capture of Egypt, the purpose of which was for the consuls and priests to undertake *vota pro salute mea*, to use Augustus' words.[114] The festival was first held in 28 BC and was performed by the consuls and the four major priestly colleges in turn.[115] Augustus was also included in the vows for the Republic and the Roman People performed in January each year.[116] These were in addition to the vows performed by the Vestals and other priests.[117]

There were, furthermore, vows and thanksgivings associated with particular occasions. These acted as further reminders of Augustus' ongoing importance and benefactions. The Senate decreed the altar of Fortuna Redux and instituted the Augustalia in 19 BC in thanks for Augustus safely coming back to Rome from the East and for his successful ventures there.[118] It perhaps also honoured his intervention in domestic unrest when he returned, which was an effective demonstration of his essential role in maintaining stability.[119] As part of the senatorial decree, the priests and Vestals were ordered to make an annual sacrifice at the altar to commemorate the date of his arrival.[120] In 16 BC, when Augustus left for Gaul, prayers were offered for him and a vow made for his safe return, which was fulfilled in 13 BC.[121] The Ara Pacis Augustae was also decreed at that time.[122] Once again, the priests and Vestals were ordered to perform an annual sacrifice at the new altar.[123] Votive games are known to have been held in 8 and 7 BC as well.[124] There were a great number of other honours that showed gratitude for Augustus' ongoing well-being and for successful guidance of the state. The prime example is the title of *pater patriae*.[125] There is an obvious and immense emphasis on Augustus and his safety being crucial to Rome's own security

---

[112] *RG* 9.1-2; Cass. Dio 51.19.2, 7.
[113] Cf. Cooley 1009: 145-146.
[114] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. no. 369 (16 BC). *RG* 9.1; Cass. Dio 51.19.2. Weinstock 1971: 311-312; Cooley 2009: 145-146.
[115] Plin. *HN* 7.158 (AD 9); Cass. Dio 53.1.4-6 (28 BC), 54.19.8 (16 BC).
[116] Suet. *Aug*. 57.1; Cass. Dio 51.19.7. Weinstock 1971: 218.
[117] Weinstock 1971: 218.
[118] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 53-56, 322. *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.194-195, 279. *RG* 11; Cass. Dio 54.10.3. Cooley 2009: 151.
[119] Vell. Pat. 2.91.3-92.4; Cass. Dio 54.10.1-5; cf. *RG* 12.1. Cooley 2009: 153-154.
[120] *RG* 11.
[121] *ILS* 88. Cass. Dio 54.19.7, 54.27.1.
[122] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.2.188-189, 208. *RG* 12.2; cf. Cass. Dio 54.25.3.
[123] *RG* 12.2.
[124] *ILS* 95, 8894. Cass. Dio 55.8.3. Cooley 2009: 146.
[125] See below.

and prosperity. It is therefore clear that this was to be a major implication of his close ties to Vesta and the Vestals.

The priestesses' extensive involvement in the vows and sacrifices decreed by the Senate was hardly coincidental or of little importance. Romans were intended to see Augustus as a divine figure fated to lead Rome to mastery over the world and whose authority was justified by his Julian descent and the links it provided to the state's very foundations. It is telling that in the *Res Gestae* Augustus groups together the vows for his safety, his sacrosanctity, his tribunician power, his chief pontificate and the honours associated with the altars of Fortuna Redux and Pax Augusta.[126] They all serve to underline his benevolent leadership of the empire and his vital role in Rome's government and prosperity, and each one has some sort of connection to the Vestals. Another honour listed in those chapters is Augustus' inclusion in the song of the Salii, who were the patrician priests associated with the *ancilia*.[127] These shields formed one of the *pignora imperii*, or guarantees of Rome's power, and were kept in the shrine of Mars in the Regia.[128] Their origins were closely linked to Numa.[129] Once more, one can see this measure's connections to the Vestals, the chief pontificate and Augustus' mythical ancestry.[130]

For Augustus to develop and emphasise a close relationship with the Vestal Virgins was not original or innovative on his part. One can see that he was in fact carrying out and furthering the design of Iulius Caesar, who sought close links to the Vestals himself. In 44, Caesar was decreed a quadrennial festival at which the priests and Vestals would give public prayers for his safety.[131] This is clearly the direct model for Augustus' own quadrennial festival. Caesar acted as a source of aid and asylum for others, similar to the Vestals and later Augustus. Anyone who sought Caesar's protection was not to be harmed and the temple to him as Divus Iulius, in conjunction with the goddess Clementia, was probably going to have the right of asylum.[132] This honour was an acknowledgement of the celebrated clemency he had exercised during the civil war. The Senate voted Caesar the right to have his tomb within the *pomerium*, an exceptional privilege that belonged to the Vestals.[133] Caesar was endowed with *sacrosanctitas*, or made 'sacred and inviolable' in Appian's words.[134] As with Augustus, this was not in imitation of the plebeian tribunes but the holy

---

[126] *RG* 9-12.
[127] *RG* 10.1; cf. Cass. Dio 51.20.1.
[128] *PIGNORA IMPERII*: Ov. *Fast*. 3.343-380; Serv. *Aen*. 7.188; cf. Festus 117 L. KEPT IN THE REGIA: Plut. *Rom*. 29.1; Aul. Gell. *NA* 4.6.1-2; Serv. *Aen*. 7.603, 8.3; Obseq. 36, 44, 47, 50; cf. Cass. Dio 44.17.2. Hamlyn 2011: 95.
[129] Enn. *Ann*. 125 W; Cic. *Rep*. 2.26; Livy 1.20.4; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.70-71; Ov. *Fast*. 3.343-392; Plut. *Num*. 13; Festus 117 L; Serv. *Aen*. 7.188, 8.285, 8.664. Hamlyn 2011: 95.
[130] Besides their links to the shields through Numa, the Vestals also used water from the spot where the first *ancile* landed to purify the Temple of Vesta every day (Plut. *Num*. 13.2).
[131] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.2. Taylor 1931: 67; Weinstock 1971: 310; Hamlyn 2011: 92.
[132] App. *B Civ*. 2.144; cf. Cass. Dio 47.19.2-3. Weinstock 1971: 242-243, 395-397; Hamlyn 2011: 92.
[133] Cass. Dio 44.7.1. VESTALS: Serv. *Aen*. 11.206. Cornell 1981: 33. SUPPOSED RECIPIENTS OF A SIMILAR HONOUR: Cic. *Leg*. 2.58; Plut. *Publ*. 23.3, *Quaest. Rom*. 79 = *Mor*. 282 F-283 A.
[134] Livy, *Per*. 116; Nic. Dam. 80; App. *B Civ*. 2.106, 118, 144; Cass. Dio 44.5.3, 44.50.1, cf. 44.49.1, 44.49.3.

persons of the Vestals. No source mentions Caesar's sacrosanctity in connection with the tribunes except Dio.[135] Caesar is supposed to have said that it was of great importance to the state that he should go on living, and Cicero echoed that belief in his speech on the pardon of Marcellus in 46.[136] This is essentially the same message that was conveyed by his closeness to the Vestals.

Caesar had good reason to think that he had an affinity with the Vestal Virgins. Early in his life, when he had been designated *flamen Dialis*, the Vestals intervened with Sulla on Caesar's behalf.[137] He displayed great attachment to his mythical ancestry, with his descent from Aeneas and Numa providing extensive ties to the Penates, the Vestals and the chief pontificate.[138] He managed to attain this prestigious priesthood before having even served as a praetor despite competition from two distinguished *nobiles*.[139] This achievement could well have seemed like fate and divine favour, especially given the long period during which his family had been pushed to the political background. He certainly displayed pride in his priestly position.[140] During his dictatorship, Caesar wore the red shoes belonging to the Alban kings, in whose city the Vestals had originated, and Caesar might even have been appointed dictator of Alba himself.[141] In this case, he would have been in charge of the Alban Vestals, who still existed, as well as the Roman ones.[142] Caesar was the first man to entrust his will to the Vestals for safekeeping, in accord with his proprietary attitude towards them.[143] He was followed in this practice by Antonius and Augustus, which is no doubt a sign of rivalry for connections with the Vestals in the wake of Caesar's actions.[144] Indeed, the Vestals had an increased presence in public affairs in the years following Caesar's assassination, evidently sparked by the great importance he placed on the priestesses.[145] There were other links between Caesar and the Vestals as well.[146] Caesar was then the model for Augustus' ties to the Vestals and the author of this aspect of his principate, the aim of which was to depict him as a sacred figure essential to the state's existence.

---

[135] Hamlyn 2011: 93.
[136] Cic. *Marcell*. 22-32; Suet. *Iul*. 86.2.
[137] Suet. *Iul*. 1.1-2; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.41.2; Plut. *Caes*. 1.3-4 (erroneous). Hamlyn 2011: 55.
[138] See above.
[139] Sall. *Cat*. 49.2; Vell. Pat. 2.43.3; Plut. *Caes*. 7.1-5; Suet. *Iul*. 13; Cass. Dio 37.37. *MRR* 2.171; Weinstock 1971: 31; Hamlyn 2011: 56-58.
[140] E.g. *RRC* nos. 443/1, 452/3, 466/1, 467/1, 480/12-16, 480/19-20. *ILLRP* 406-408. Taylor 1931: 60 n. 5; Weinstock 1971: 31; Stevenson 2009: 100; Hamlyn 2011: 58.
[141] Cass. Dio 43.43.2. Weinstock 1971: 324; Hamlyn 2011: 81, 93. ALBAN ORIGIN OF VESTALS: Livy 1.20.3; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.76.4, 2.65.1; Ov. *Fast*. 3.9-48; Strabo 5.3.2; Plut. *Rom*. 3.2-3; etc.
[142] ALBAN VESTALS STILL IN EXISTENCE: Juv. 4.60-61. Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.51, 323.
[143] Suet. *Iul*. 83.1.
[144] M. ANTONIUS: Plut. *Ant*. 58.3. AUGUSTUS: Suet. *Aug*. 101.1; Tac. *Ann*. 1.8. Hamlyn 2011: 95.
[145] Hamlyn 2011: 95. Agreements were entrusted to the Vestals and the priestesses were granted a *lictor* (see above). It is perhaps no coincidence that the *triumviri* gave the Vestals *lictores* at the same time as they were enacting divine honours for Caesar (Cass. Dio 47.18-19).
[146] Hamlyn 2011: 92-96. For example, Caesar was closely identified with Romulus, who was the son of an Alban Vestal.

The Genius, the Lares and the Dioscuri

After he became *pontifex maximus*, Augustus enacted measures with respect to the Lares and Genius, deities that were linked to Vesta and the Penates. This was apt since family cult was a pontifical matter and these were household gods who had tutelary functions at both state and domestic levels. The Genius was the life force or procreative power of a man, as well as his tutelary god.[147] Every man had one while he was alive, and the female equivalent was generally called the Iuno.[148] This personal form of the Genius appears to have been a feature of Roman religion from its early history.[149] It did have its counterparts in Greek religion, however, with the Τύχη and Δαίμων. By the Middle Republic, a Genius was assigned to the state as a whole, and eventually the concept was applied across a range of bodies and places, such as the Senate, colonies, legions and *collegia*.[150] In household cult, the Genius of the *pater familias* was of great importance. It represented the ability of the family line to continue itself and produce new generations. Thus the marriage bed was called the *lectus genialis* after the Genius, which was honoured as part of the wedding ceremonies.[151] The god especially received cult on his birthday, being given offerings like wine, incense and honey-cakes.[152] Oaths and entreaties could invoke the Genius of a benefactor.[153] The deity is commonly shown in *sacraria* as a togate figure, often with a *patera* or *cornucopia*.[154] The Genius had a strong association with serpents, which also frequently appear in the decoration of shrines.[155]

The Genius and the Lares were very closely associated in domestic cult, to the extent that antiquarians like Granius Flaccus argued they were one and the same.[156] The origin of the Lares is uncertain. It has been argued that they were once agricultural deities that eventually were brought into household worship from outdoor shrines in the fields, groves and *compita* (crossroads).[157] An alternative suggestion is that they were initially ancestral ghosts.[158] In any case, by the Middle Republic the Lares had become a standard feature of household cult, being regarded as divinities

---

[147] Varro ap. August. *De civ. D.* 7.13; Festus 84 L; Censorinus, *DN* 3.1-5; Mart. Cap. 2.152. Wissowa 1912: 175; Weinstock 1971: 205; Orr 1978: 1569-1570.
[148] E.g. Plaut. *Capt.* 290-292; [Tib.] 3.12.1; Petron. *Sat.* 25; Sen. *Ep.* 110.1; Plin. *HN* 2.16. Wissowa 1912: 175; Orr 1978: 1570.
[149] Orr 1978: 1570.
[150] Weinstock 1971: 205-206; Orr 1978: 1571-1572.
[151] Festus 83 L; Arn. *Adv. nat.* 2.67; Serv. *Aen.* 6.603; cf. Juv. 6.22. Wissowa 1912: 176.
[152] Tib. 1.7.49-54, 2.2.5-8; Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.144; Maecenas ap. Sen. *Ep.* 114.5; Ov. *Tr.* 3.13.14-18; [Tib.] 3.11.9; Censorinus, *DN* 2.1-3. Weinstock 1971: 205; Orr 1978: 1571.
[153] Plaut. *Capt.* 977; Ter. *An.* 289; Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.94-95; [Tib.] 3.11.8; Sen. *Ep.* 12.2. Weinstock 1971: 205; Orr 1978: 1571.
[154] Orr 1978: 1572, 1575.
[155] Serv. *G.* 3.417; cf. Cic. *Div.* 2.62; Pers. 1.113. Orr 1978: 1572-1575, 1579.
[156] Censorinus, *DN* 3.2. Cf. e.g. *ILS* 3604, 3605, 3641.
[157] Cf. Orr 1978: 1564-1566.
[158] Varro ap. Arn. *Adv. nat.* 3.41; Festus 108 L. Samter 1901: 105-123; Waites 1920: 241-250; Weinstock 1960: 116-118. Cf. Orr 1978: 1564; Palmer 1974: 115-117.

who guarded and protected the family.[159] Thus 'Lar' or 'Lares' was sometimes used as a metonym for 'home' or 'household'.[160] Lares were also attributed to other places and spheres, and so the gods often had descriptive epithets to specify their interests.[161] Yet all Lares were very similar in that their tutelary function was paramount. *Lares viales*, for example, guarded roads and those who travelled on them. *Lares permarini* protected those on sea voyages, and *Lares militares* looked after soldiers. The Roman state had its own guardian Lares, the *Lares praestites*. The Lares of the home, the *Lares familiares* or *domestici*, received regular worship, and attested offerings include grain, grapes, garlands and animals.[162] These gods were also honoured at key moments of Romans' lives, such as coming of age and marriage.[163] The Lares were generally depicted as happy, dancing youths, in keeping with their benevolent nature.[164] Some Greek and Eastern influence is evident in their imagery, with the gods often carrying a *rhyton*, for instance.[165]

The worship of the Lares of the crossroads, the *Lares compitales*, was a very old practice and its institution was ascribed to the king Servius Tullius.[166] Compital shrines were built to honour the Lares of the adjoining properties, and at the *ludi compitalicii*, which were held around the beginning of January, each household would hang dolls at the shrine to represent its free members and woollen balls to represent its slaves.[167] This was apparently part of the purifying aspect of the festival.[168] Each household would also supply a honey-cake as an offering.[169] The holiday was a time of merriment and festivity, much like the Saturnalia which preceded it.[170] Despite the popular nature of the cults, the *collegia* responsible for them were banned in 64 BC because of the role such bodies were playing in political unrest.[171] They were reinstated by Clodius in 58 BC.[172] It is often stated in modern works that the *collegia compitalicia* were suppressed again by Iulius Caesar but this does not seem to have been the case.[173] The cults may, however, have been neglected during the disorder and hardship after his assassination.[174]

---

[159] E.g. Plaut. *Aul*. 1-5, *Merc*. 834, 836, *Trin*. 39; Cato, *Agr*. 2.1; Tib. 1.10.15-26. Orr 1978: 1565.
[160] *OLD* s.v. Lar; Orr 1978: 1566.
[161] Orr 1978: 1566-1567.
[162] E.g. Plaut. *Aul*. 24-25, 385-386, *Rud*. 1206-1208; Cato, *Agr*. 143.2; Hor. *Sat*. 2.3.164-165, 2.5.12-14, *Carm*. 3.23.3-4, 4.5.33-35; Tib. 1.1.21-23, 1.3.34, 1.10.21-26, 2.1.59-60; Ov. *Fast*. 2.633-634; Juv. 9.137-138. Orr 1978: 1567.
[163] COMING OF AGE: Varro ap. Non. 863 L; Pers. 5.30-31; Petron. *Sat*. 60; cf. Ps.-Acro ad Hor. *Sat*. 1.5.65. MARRIAGE: Non. 852 L. Harmon 1978: 1598; Orr 1978: 1567 n. 59.
[164] Orr 1978: 1568, 1579. This is in spite of the gloomy interpretations present in Festus and Macrobius (cf. Harmon 1978: 1595).
[165] Orr 1978: 1568-1569.
[166] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 4.14.3-4; Plin. *HN* 36.204.
[167] E.g. Varro, *Ling*. 6.25; Festus 108, 272-273 L; cf. Macrob. *Sat*. 1.7.34-35. Scullard 1981: 58-59.
[168] Cf. Prop. 4.1.23. Harmon 1978: 1595.
[169] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 4.14.3.
[170] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 4.14.3-4; cf. Cic. *Att*. 2.3.4, 7.7.3; Cato, *Agr*. 57. Scullard 1981: 59-60.
[171] Cic. *Pis*. 8; Asc. 7 C; cf. Cic. *Red. sen*. 33, *Sest*. 34.
[172] Asc. 7 C; Cass. Dio 38.13.2.
[173] Fine 1932: 268-273. Cf. Suet. *Iul*. 42.3, *Aug*. 31.4, 32.1. SUPPRESSED BY CAESAR: e.g. Scullard 1981: 60; Gradel 2002: 117; cf. Lott 2004: 62.
[174] Fine 1932: 273.

Augustus reformed the compital cults of the Lares in such a way as to centre them on himself. The *Lares compitales* were turned into *Lares augusti*, and the *Genius Augusti*, Augustus' personal Genius, was included in their worship.[175] In the latter instance, 'Augusti' is naturally a genitive noun identifying the possessor, but in the former instance it is actually an adjective agreeing with 'Lares', so that they became 'august Lares'.[176] Nevertheless, there is a clear and close association of the gods with the person of the *princeps* so that they too could be seen as belonging to Augustus.[177] This is especially the case because of the addition to the cults of his Genius, which already received worship in his home alongside his household's Lares, and because he personally presented the Lares to the *magistri vicorum*, as though they were his to give. The term *Lares augusti* is in fact attested from an inscription dated to 59 BC.[178] This perhaps provided Augustus with a convenient precedent for the change and helped it seem less self-aggrandising and autocratic. New shrines were constructed as part of the reform and a new festival for the Lares was held on the 1 August each year, the anniversary of the fall of Alexandria to Octavian's forces. While Augustus was alive, this was generally also the date on which the *magistri vicorum* and their *ministri* took up office.[179] Bulls were sacrificed to Augustus' Genius, and these were much more expensive than the typical bloodless offerings, while the *Lares augusti* received pigs as victims.[180]

Despite being frequently ascribed to 7 BC by modern scholars, the transformation of the compital cults did in fact start in 12 BC.[181] There is explicit inscriptional evidence and the move suits the context of other actions taken by Augustus in that year.[182] It is thus another Augustan religious measure apparently sparked by his election as *pontifex maximus*. This further testifies to the priesthood's importance to Augustus and also suggests that he saw reform of the Lares cults as relevant to his new role. Such a view would be reasonable given the chief pontificate's strong associations with Vesta and the Penates, who were also tutelary gods of the household. The year 7 BC is noteworthy because it was then that Augustus himself handed the *Lares augusti* to the *magistri vicorum*.[183] It was also the year in which Augustus reorganised the city into 14 *regiones* and 265 *vici* and gave the *magistri vicorum* new responsibilities.[184] The *magistri*, the majority of

[175] E.g. *ILS* 3613, 3614. Ov. *Fast*. 5.145-146; Suet. *Aug*. 31.4.
[176] Gradel 2002: 127.
[177] Cf. Gradel 2002: 127.
[178] *ILLRP* 200.
[179] E.g. *ILS* 3308, 3613, 3617, 3620. Gradel 2002: 127; Buxton 2003: 375 n. 88; cf. Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital*. 13.1.290.
[180] Gradel 2002: 121, 128.
[181] Buxton 2003: 280-282; Scheid 2005: 191-192. ASCRIBED TO 7 BC: e.g. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.84; Rich 1990: 227; Lott 2004: 84-86; cf. Gradel 2002: 116-117.
[182] E.g. *ILS* 3090 (8 BC), 3617 (9 BC), 3620 (12 BC).
[183] *Inscr. Ital*. 13.1.285; cf. Ov. *Fast*. 5.145. Buxton (2003: 280 n. 52) misdates the inscription to 5 BC.
[184] Plin. *HN* 3.66; Suet. *Aug*. 30.1; Cass. Dio 55.8.6-7. The number of *regiones* and *vici* was that which existed in AD 73, if not under Augustus' original reorganisation.

whom were freedmen, enjoyed certain privileges, such as being accompanied by *lictores*.[185] Moreover, *fasti* began to be kept for the cults in many *vici*, which provided a means for recording the officials' names.[186] This shows that the positions were considered to be significant and worthy of commemoration.

There can be no doubting the importance of the reformed compital cults. Augustus' personal involvement in their establishment, the choice of sacrifical victims, the creation of new altars and the bolstered profile and status of the *magistri vicorum* all indicate that he intended the cults to be a prominent feature of the city's religious life under his principate. His reforms were perhaps even advertised on a *denarius* issued in Rome in 12 BC.[187] The uniformity across the different *vici* of the principal aspects of the new cult, such as the sacrificial victims, confirms that the initiative and driving force came from Augustus and his circle rather than the People.[188] Although it appears that the *magistri vicorum* normally financed the compital cults in the Principate, it is quite conceivable that Augustus provided some funds at this time, to build new altars, for example.[189] This is especially likely given the high quality of some of the altars that survive.[190] He was frequently generous, such as when he provided money to senators so they could maintain the census qualification, and Tiberius is known to have provided funding for the worship of the *Lares augusti*.[191] The Compitalia was a festival that was celebrated in individual households as well as at the crossroads, and Augustus' measures seem to have had an effect there too. Private homes adopted Augustan imagery used on the compital shrines, particularly the laurels.[192] Moreover, the reform's influence was not restricted to Rome but spread throughout Italy, judging from Pompeii.[193] One cannot be certain how many people now specifically identified their own Lares with the *Lares augusti* or Augustus' household Lares. Presumably, there were those who continued to think of their domestic gods as particular to their abode. Yet even then the implications of the Augustan reform must have been obvious and hard to ignore.

Given the functions and significance of the Lares and the Genius, the main implication of the reformed compital cults was that Augustus was a patron of the *vici* and their inhabitants. Like those gods, he provided them with protection and offered them prosperity. Indeed, he was a manifest being who was able to intervene on their behalf, somewhat like the Lar in Plautus'

---

[185] Cass. Dio 55.8.7. The privileges of having the *toga praetexta* and *lictores* had existed under the Republic (Cic. *Pis*. 8, 23; Livy 34.7.2; Asc. 7 C). Cf. Gradel 2002: 118.
[186] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.1.285; cf. *ILS* 3615, 3617, 3618, 3619, 3620, etc. Also, the names of *magistri* who erected altars were advertised on the monuments themselves.
[187] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. no. 418. Buxton 2003: 272-282. In the future, I intend to suggest that the coin may commemorate Augustus' election as *pontifex maximus* and that CC could stand for *comitia calata*.
[188] Cf. Gradel 2002: 127-128.
[189] *Contra* Gradel 2002: 119. Cf. Buxton 2003: 375.
[190] Cf. Gradel 2002: 119; Swan 2004: 80.
[191] AUGUSTUS: e.g. Suet. *Aug*. 41.1, cf. 41.2, 45.2. Wardle 2014: 309, 311. TIBERIUS: Suet. *Tib*. 76. Gradel 2002: 119.
[192] Gradel 2002: 122-124
[193] Gradel 2002: 121-122.

Aulularia. Certainly, there is an obvious similarity to the Hellenistic kings who were praised as 'manifest' (ἐπιφανής). Here one can see the links to other Augustan measures, such as his *ius auxilii*, his *sacrosanctitas* and his ties to the Vestal Virgins. Augustus was promoting himself as a sacred figure associated with benevolence and safety. The renaming of the Lares and the introduction of his Genius to their worship also presented Augustus as a father-figure, since it was the Genius of the *pater familias* that normally received cult. As such, he was not merely a benevolent figure but also one with a certain moral authority and a legitimate position of leadership over his household, which in this case was the Roman state. Such a person was entitled to make decisions regarding the members of his *familia* and they owed him their loyalty. The selection of a bull as the sacrifice to his Genius, as to the *Genius populi Romani*, may have been a deliberate choice to identify Augustus further with the Roman state.[194] Another implication of all this was that Augustus' real household, the *domus Augusti*, was portrayed as having extraordinary significance.[195] His relatives were the people closest to the supposed source of Rome's newfound stability and success, which is to say Augustus and the deities who lived in his home. These gods were not only his Genius, the Lares that could now be identified as the *Lares augusti*, and the Penates that could be identified with the Trojan Penates of the state, but Vesta and apparently Apollo.[196] One can also include Romulus, Victoria and the Magna Mater. In fact, Livia and Augustus' adopted sons were actively presented as being of intrinsic importance to the state, along with the *domus Augusti* in general.[197] A son or close family member would naturally have a very strong claim to taking over his mantle after his death, particularly as the *pater familias* was an inherited position. It would indeed have been difficult to expect any other outcome, given the dominance of Augustus' family and his own status as a father to the Roman people. As such, reforms and honours like those involved in the new cult of the Lares at the crossroads were sensitive topics. Augustus had to tread carefully in implementing them. This is perhaps evident from the initial steps taken between 12 and 7 BC, before the reforms began to be effected in earnest. Such caution is probably a key reason for the ambiguities and subtleties in the cult, the most obvious being the nature of the name *Lares augusti*. Augustus took pains to keep up the Republican façade as far as possible and to frame himself as the first among equals. Therefore, his transformation of the compital cults was less direct than simply creating a state cult of himself or his Genius, but still very effective.

---

[194] Cf. Gradel 2002: 136-137. It should be noted, however, that animal sacrifices for the *Genius populi Romani* are attested only as *hostiae maiores* (fully-grown victims) during the Republic (Livy 21.62.9). They are not identified as bulls until well into the Principate (*AFA* XCII, XCIV).

[195] This would especially be the case for those who interpreted the Lares as one's deified ancestors (see above; cf. Beard, North and Price 1998: 1.185).

[196] See above and previous chapter.

[197] See above and below.

It is clear that Augustus deliberately transformed an old Roman cult for his own benefit. The changes gave him a significant public and private presence in localities throughout the city of Rome and outside it, and they effectively created indirect worship of himself among the People with mass participation. Scholars have offered political and social interpretations for Augustus' reform, arguing that it was to reinforce his position of power or create greater stability at Rome.[198] Although it no doubt had these effects, one should not depreciate the religious elements of the cults. To view the reform in political and social terms is to imply that people participated because of conformity, obedience or deference to Augustus' authority, or personal rewards for those involved. Yet the compital cults lasted long into the Empire, and the adoption of their imagery in homes demonstrates a certain attraction for individuals.[199] Besides connotations of prestige and status, genuine religious sentiments on the part of many are a likely explanation for this. Whether out of reverence for the Lares or Augustus or both, a great number of Romans willingly worshipped and honoured the deities of the Augustan compital cults. This is not to say that everyone felt positive emotions towards the reform. It is hard to believe that no one felt indifferent or hostile to the changes. There was an advantage, however, in the ambiguity surrounding the exact meaning of *Lares augusti* and their relationship with the *princeps*, as it was able to accommodate a broader range of emotions and beliefs than some prescribed orthodoxy.[200]

Augustus certainly drew inspiration from Caesar for his reforms of the compital cults in a very broad sense, since Caesar had already depicted himself as a protective deity for Rome and its people. Augustus perhaps followed his adoptive father more directly too, at least as far as the introduction of his Genius to the cults is concerned. Caesar promoted his connection to Fortuna and even apparently his own personal Fortuna.[201] Fortuna at Rome was influenced by the Greek concept of Τύχη, which could mean both luck and the personal guardian spirit, the Δαίμων or Genius.[202] The Fortuna Caesaris was perhaps then linked to Caesar's Genius. This gains some support from the fact that an oath by Caesar's Τύχη was introduced in 44 BC.[203] Dio's Greek probably means Genius, since oaths were sometimes sworn by the Genius at Rome. There is other circumstantial evidence that Caesar's Genius might have been important during his dictatorship. Caesar's spirit is supposed to have pursued Brutus and the assassins after his murder and to have announced the forthcoming victory of Octavian and Antonius at Philippi.[204] Caesar was honoured

[198] E.g. Fine 1932: 269; Rich 1990: 227; cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.85; Gradel 2002: 117, 127-128; Lott 2004: 117-120, 177-178.
[199] Cf. Gradel 2002: 122-124.
[200] Cf. Stevenson 1996: 16-18.
[201] See previous chapter.
[202] Weinstock 1971: 112-113, 205-206, 212.
[203] Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.50.1. Weinstock 1971: 212.
[204] See esp. Plut. *Caes*. 69.2. PHILIPPI: Suet. *Aug*. 96.1; Cass. Dio 47.41.2.

as a *triumphator* during his dictatorship and he promoted his relationship with Dionysus-Liber.[205] Among the *sacra* kept by the Vestals, the priestesses closely tied to him through his ancestry and priesthood, was the *fascinum*, a phallus. The *fascinum* was placed under the triumphal chariot.[206] The phallus was associated with Dionysus-Liber, who was also linked to the triumph, and could be thought to represent the Genius. Indeed, the *fascinum* being kept by the Vestals in the hearth of the state along with the Penates encouraged the identification of the phallus with the Genius, another key household deity. Moreover, Vesta, Fortuna and Dionysus were gods frequently found in household shrines.[207] Servius Tullius may be relevant. He had supposedly been fathered by a phallus from the royal hearth, although it was more commonly identified as the Lar rather than the Genius.[208] Servius Tullius was famous for his relationship with Fortuna, like Caesar was, and was credited with establishing the compital cults.[209] He was also thought to have created the *vici*.[210] The king perhaps served as a model for Augustus.[211] Whether Caesar provided a direct contribution to Augustus' transformation of the compital cults is unclear but it is a possibility.

In recent times, it has been asserted that the cults of the *Lares augusti* and *Genius Augusti* were essentially private worship and did not have any implications for the state cult.[212] Gradel goes so far as to state that there were 'tight shutters' between worship at the *compita* and worship in the public cult.[213] Such an argument is very misleading and seems to be an over-reaction to the mistaken idea that there was a state cult of Augustus' Genius from 12 BC when he created a shrine to Vesta in his home. Gradel doggedly follows the definition of *sacra publica* and *privata* that survives in Festus, arguing that the compital cults were funded by the *magistri vicorum* rather than the state and so were not part of the public cult.[214] One may doubt whether a definition given in an epitome accurately accounts for the entire range of religious practices at Rome, especially those that were very ancient, like the crossroads cults. Roman law was, after all, not always clear-cut and logical, and some matters were mysterious to the Romans themselves. Nevertheless, the compital cults are very much like the second group of *sacra publica* Festus mentions, which were performed on behalf of particular areas. In fact, collectively the *vici* accounted for everyone in Rome and so the cults could be considered *pro populo* as well. Moreover, the state was not uninvolved in the cults' administration. The Compitalia were *feriae conceptivae*, which is to say they were not

---

[205] See previous chapter.
[206] Plin. *HN* 28.39.
[207] Orr 1978: 1580.
[208] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.1-2, 4.14.3; Plin. *HN* 36.204; Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 10 (*Mor.* 323 A-C); cf. Livy 1.39; Ov. *Fast.* 6.627-636; Claudius ap. *ILS* 212; Macrob. *Sat.* 1.7.34-35.
[209] SERVIUS TULLIUS AND FORTUNA: e.g. Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 10 (*Mor.* 322 C-323 A). COMPITAL CULTS: see above.
[210] Livy 1.42.4-44.5; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.13-23.
[211] Cf. above.
[212] Gradel 2002: 128-132.
[213] Gradel 2002: 130.
[214] Festus 284 L. Gradel 2002: *passim*, esp. 9-12.

performed at a fixed time each year, and so the date on which the festival was held was announced by the *praetor urbanus*.[215] The *magistri vicorum* performed public duties and had the appearance of a public official when they wore the *toga praetexta* and were attended by a *lictor*. Livy actually indicates that they were Roman officials, albeit of the lowest rank.[216] Augustus' reforms of the cult and personal involvement in handing over the gods are obvious examples of direction from above. In addition, a senatorial decree was involved in the restoration of altars in AD 116.[217] All this means that the compital cults could hardly be considered 'irrelevant' to the state religion.[218]

A broad cross-section of society participated in the Compitalia and the festival involved a combination of private and collective rites and celebration, much like the Saturnalia.[219] Thus the compital cults had a greater presence and relevance to the state than small public cults like the Arval Brethren. Since it was celebrated by citizens in general, the Compitalia should probably be categorised as *sacra popularia*.[220] Even if the compital cults were technically private, however, the difference between public and private cult was often not nearly as important as Gradel would have one believe, and there is inherent danger in excising certain religious practices from the state religion on the basis of who was accountable for their funding. Private activities often accompanied important public festivals and this would have been how many people experienced them. The Lemuria, for instance, is recorded in public calendars but the extant evidence only attests to the rites carried out by households and private individuals. It is in fact assumed to have been part of the public cult only because of its inclusion in the *fasti*.[221] A cult being legally classed as private on the basis of funding would hardly make it less important to the community. Similarly, games and festivals belonging to the state cult were no less public when given at the expense of an individual, which was often the case.[222] Occasions where the Senate intervened in private cults are testimony to how important they could be considered to the state, and the compital cults had been singled out in the Late Republic for official action.[223] It is worth pointing out that there was often significant overlap of public and private in the religious sphere more generally. For example, the *pontifex maximus* and the pontifical college oversaw such private matters as burial of the dead, adoptions and family cults.[224]

---

[215] Aul. Gell. *NA* 10.24.3; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.4.27.
[216] Livy 34.7.2.
[217] *CIL* 6.30958. Cf. Gradel 2002: 127 n. 42.
[218] *Contra* Gradel 2002: 129.
[219] See below.
[220] Festus 298 L. *Contra* Gradel 2002: 12 n. 15. Cf. Iddeng 2012: 20.
[221] Scullard 1981: 118; Iddeng 2012: 20.
[222] Noteworthy examples are the *ludi Apollinares* given by Brutus and the *ludi Veneris Genetricis* given by Octavian in 44 BC (see previous chapter), and the *ludi Apollinares* paid for by Caesar in 45 BC (Cass. Dio 43.48.3).
[223] See above. The Bacchic cult is another famous example (*ILS* 18 = *ILLRP* 511; Cic. *Leg*. 2.37; Livy 39.8-19, 40.19.9-10).
[224] E.g. Cic. *Leg*. 2.47-53, 55, 57; Livy 1.20.6-7; Plut. *Num*. 12.1; Aul. Gell. *NA* 5.19.6, 15.27.3. Hamlyn 2011: 12.

Gradel also raises the objection that the Lares of the crossroads were not the same gods as the Lares that protected the state. Yet the close link between them is obvious. Thus Ovid discusses them together in his *Fasti*.[225] Both were concerned with the safety and prosperity of the Roman people, merely on different scales. Augustus' actions with respect to gods associated with protection and the household, like Vesta and the Dioscuri, strongly suggest that the *Lares augusti* were a key part of his range of reforms to Roman religion, working in conjunction with his other actions in the public sphere, not in isolation from them. Indeed, Augustus also took action with respect to the state Lares. He restored their temple *in summa Sacra Via*, as well as that of the Penates on the Velia.[226] He also made a dedication to the public Lares in 4 BC, as recorded on an inscription.[227] Therefore, Gradel's view of the crossroads cults as separate to the state religion is unreasonably legalistic and does not accurately reflect religious life at Rome.[228]

Gradel's chief motive in depreciating the importance of the compital cults is to bolster his thesis that Genius-worship was 'a cult form for persons of slave and freedman status only'.[229] Thus he argues that the compital cults too had strong servile connotations.[230] It has in fact been long averred in modern scholarship on the subject that Lares-worship was servile in character.[231] These judgements are not well-supported and are not fair representations of the worship paid to the Lares or the Genius, both at the *compita* or in households. For the Late Republic, arguments for slaves and freedmen dominating the cults concentrate on the gangs operating in Rome in the 60s and 50s BC.[232] Various *collegia* in the city started to be employed in political struggles, including those responsible for the *Lares compitales*.[233] It has been asserted that freedmen formed a large proportion of the tradesmen who were members of such *collegia*, and that a significant number of supporters of the likes of Catilina and Clodius were freedmen and slaves.[234] This is used to substantiate the notion that the compital cults had strong servile associations, despite the evidence being sparse and unreliable and not directly related to the cults.[235] As far as the *magistri vicorum* are concerned, Gradel in particular makes much of the fact that most of those who are known to have filled the position were freedmen. First, it is not a telling point that those who performed the rites for the compital cults were generally of servile origins. This was, in fact, a deliberate feature

---

[225] Ov. *Fast*. 5.129-146.
[226] *RG* 19.2.
[227] *ILS* 99.
[228] His legalistic treatment of the topic is also evident where he writes of 'the Roman constitution' and 'the constitutional level of the state cult' (Gradel 2002: 129, 130). The term 'constitution' should not be applied to Rome, and especially its religion, without great care and justification.
[229] Gradel 2002: 132, cf. 124.
[230] Gradel 2002: 118, 124. For the Republic he simply cites the work of Treggiari (1969).
[231] E.g. Waites 1920: 246-249; Treggiari 1969: 198-199.
[232] Treggiari 1969: 168-177.
[233] See above.
[234] Treggiari 1969: 95, 168-177.
[235] In particular, the aristocratic, anti-Catilina, anti-Clodius bias of Cicero should be reason for caution.

of the worship, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and was related to the myths surrounding Servius Tullius.[236] Second, very few names of the *magistri* survive and there are free men among them, for both the Republic and the Principate. They include some of the first *magistri vicorum* to take up office after Augustus' reforms.[237] Most importantly, the performers of the rites do not determine the participants of the cult or the general worship of the Lares in households. Indeed, the evidence indicates that there was broad participation in the Compitalia, across the social classes. The household of Pompeius celebrated the occasion, as did Cicero and his family and friends.[238] Dionysius, the same writer who noted the role of slaves in the rites, wrote that Romans celebrated the festival even in his own time.[239] He speaks of people in general and gives no indication that the cult was confined to a particular rank of society.[240] Ovid and Tibullus do not indicate that worship of the Lares was exclusively or even predominantly servile.[241] Widespread participation among the free population is suggested by the woollen dolls hung up during the festival. The use of balls to represent slaves was a sign of their lower status, which would be somewhat incongruous if the cults were dominated by slaves and freedmen.[242] Recent examinations of the archaeological evidence from places like Delos and Pompeii provide strong support for the view that Romans of all classes took part in the Compitalia and paid cult to the Lares.[243] Once again, a comparison may be drawn with the Saturnalia, which had a certain significance for slaves but was by no means restricted to them.[244]

Further objections could be raised to the notion of Genius- and Lares-worship being servile in nature, a few of which can be briefly mentioned here. The evidence shows that family members did partake in the household cult and that it was not dominated by slaves and freedmen. The Genius and Lares were honoured at key points in Romans' lives, like marriages.[245] Plautus' *Aulularia* attests to the worship a free Roman could pay to their Lar and to the close attachment they could feel. Emperors performed worship at their *lararia*, and even though this evidence is later than Augustus, it conforms with the picture presented for the Republic and early Principate.[246] One would scarcely expect home-owners to have commissioned art associated with their domestic cult, which is such a prominent part of the archaeological record, unless it formed a major part of their

---

[236] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.14.3-4. Cf. Cato, *Agr.* 5.3.
[237] Cf. Lott 2004: 97.
[238] Cic. *Att.* 2.3.4, 7.7.3. Scullard 1981: 59-60.
[239] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 4.14.4.
[240] Cf. Stek 2008: 114, 117. Stek argues that the passage interprets the compital cults as a measure to form the citizenry into cohesive units.
[241] E.g. Tib. 1.1.19-24, 1.3.33-34, 1.10.15-29, 2.1.59-60; Ov. *Fast.* 2.631-634, 5.138-146.
[242] This aspect of the festival may have originally been a method of counting the population (Stek 2008: 114). Alternative explanations are that it aimed at purification or protection of the living (Scullard 1981: 59).
[243] Hasenohr 2003: 217-218; Stek 2008: 115-117.
[244] Cf. Scullard 1981: 205-207.
[245] See above.
[246] Suet. *Aug.* 7.1; SHA, *Marc.* 3.5, *Alex. Sev.* 29.2, 31.4-5. Cf. Wardle 2014: 102-103.

lives. Gods central to the household cult like the Lares and Genius were of exceptional importance to its safety and prosperity. This is reflected in the crucial nature of household gods in state cult. One could hardly suggest that worship of the state Lares, Penates or Vesta was servile in character or that the Roman pontiffs were the equivalent of slaves in domestic cult. Therefore, arguments for Lares- and Genius-worship being strongly associated with slaves depreciate the significance of the household deities and misrepresent domestic religion overall.

Augustus' transformation of the *Lares compitales* appears to have built on earlier precedents of important figures being honoured in a similar manner to the gods of the crossroads. Soon after the death of C. Gracchus in 121 BC, the People set up statues of him and his brother in a public place at which offerings and sacrifices were made, and they consecrated the sites of their deaths.[247] In *c*. 85 BC, out of gratitude for a currency reform enacted during his praetorship, the People erected statues of Marius Gratidianus in supposedly every *vicus* and made offerings of incense and wine to them.[248] Both these cases display some broad similarities to the cult of the *Lares compitales*, and just like those deities, the recipients were being honoured for their beneficence and protection. Such an act of veneration for the Gracchi brothers was perhaps inspired by the paired Lares. After Rome's defeat of the Cimbri in 101 BC, the People made offerings of food and libations to Marius as well as the gods in their homes.[249] This too appears to show a mortal being honoured in the manner used for the household deities, and because he safeguarded Rome and its population. As it happens, these incidents confirm that neither the compital cults nor domestic cults were dominated by slaves and freedmen, as it is clear each time that it was Roman people in general who participated. In the case of the elder Marius, explicit mention is made of men celebrating with their wives and children at home.[250] At any rate, the People had spontaneously paid tribute to certain individuals in the late Republic in a similar way to the Lares, and Augustus made use of this to emphasise his patronage and protection of the Roman population with the compital cults. The key difference is, of course, that the initiative came from above rather than below. The new cults of the *Lares augusti* and *Genius Augusti* reinforced the other reforms that aimed to depict Augustus as the source of safety and success for Rome and its people.

Augustus further linked himself and his house with Rome's tutelary deities by presenting members of the imperial family as the Dioscuri, especially his natural grandsons, C. and L. Caesar. The primary goal was that Augustus' adopted children should be seen as intrinsic to the safety and success of the state, just like himself. The Dioscuri (Διόσκουροι) were Greek gods originally and

---

[247] Plut. *C. Gracch*. 18.2-19.1.
[248] Cic. *Off*. 3.80; Sen. *Ira* 3.18.1; Plin. *HN* 33.132. *MRR* 2.57.
[249] Val. Max. 8.15.7; Plut. *Mar*. 27.5.
[250] Plut. *Mar*. 27.5.

are mentioned in Homer, Hesiod and other early writers.[251] Castor and Pollux are the Latin versions of their Greek names, Κάστωρ and Πολυδεύκης.[252] According to myth, they were the twin sons of Leda by either Tyndareos or Zeus, and Sparta was a major centre of their cult.[253] Their influence was by no means confined to there, however, and they were popular in Italy from an early date.[254] Considered protectors and saviours by the Greeks, they were likewise adopted at Rome as tutelary divinities, particularly with regards to war.[255] Legend has it that during the battle against Tarquinius Superbus and the Latins at Lake Regillus (*c*. 496 BC), Castor and Pollux appeared as youths on horseback and fought alongside the Romans.[256] For this divine assistance, they were vowed a temple. On the same day, they also manifested themselves in Rome at the *lacus Iuturnae* near the temple of Vesta, cooling and watering their horses there. Their temple was thus built on that site. The Dioscuri were in fact associated with horses, white ones especially, and became the patrons of the equestrian order.[257] In the late fourth century BC, Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus established the custom whereby each year on 15 July, the anniversary of the victory at Lake Regillus, the *equites* would parade through the city on horseback past the Temple of Castor wearing *trabeae*.[258] The Dioscuri made appearances on the occasion of other important Roman victories, underlining their significance for success in war. They reported Perses' defeat at Pydna and the Cimbri's defeat at Vercellae in Rome on the same day as the battles occurred.[259] Something similar was said to have happened after the Battle of Pharsalus in 48 BC.[260] Besides success and safety in the military sphere, the Dioscuri also appear to have represented liberty, and the occasions on which they manifested themselves were ones where the Romans could be viewed as securing freedom from tyranny, either for themselves or others. This includes Pharsalus, from the Caesarian viewpoint. It was probably because of this aspect of the Dioscuri that T. Flamininus made a

---

[251] E.g. Hom. *Il*. 3.236-244, *Od*. 11.298-304; Hes. fr. 197-199 MW; Pind. *Nem*. 10.38, 49-90.
[252] Cf. Varro, *Ling*. 5.73.
[253] PARENTAGE: e.g. Hom. *Od*. 11.298-304; Hes. fr. 24 MW; *Hom*. *Hymn* 17, 33.1-5; Pind. *Nem*. 10.80-82; Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 1.146-150; Hyg. *Fab*. 77. CULT IN SPARTA: e.g. Pind. *Nem*. 10.49-54; Hdt. 5.75; Pl. *Leg*. 7.796 B; Paus. 3.13.1, 3.13.6, 3.14.6-7.
[254] Weinstock 1960: 112-114; Champlin 2011: 74.
[255] GREEKS: e.g. *Hom*. *Hymn* 33.6-17; Alc. fr. 34 LP; Hdt. 5.75; Just. *Epit*. 20.2.12, 20.3.8; Plut. *Lys*. 12.1, *Thes*. 33.1-2; Paus. 4.16.9; Ael. *VH* 1.30, cf. 4.5. ROME: see immediately below. Cf. Strabo 5.3.5. This is the chief reason for the Dioscuri appearing on so many Roman coin-types (e.g. *RRC* nos. 14/1, 28/1-5, 44/5-7, 139/1, 147/1, 152/1, 201/1, 278/1-2, 304/1, 335/10).
[256] Cic. *Nat*. *D*. 2.6, 3.11-13; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. *Rom*. 6.13.1-3; Val. Max. 1.8.1a, cf. 1c; Plut. *Cor*. 3.4, *Aem*. 25.2-4; Suet. *Ner*. 1.1; Flor. 1.5.4, cf. 1.28.15; cf. Livy 2.20.12, 2.42.5.
[257] HORSES: e.g. *Hom*. *Hymn* 17.5, 33.18; Ov. *Am*. 3.2.54; Plut. *Flam*. 12.6. WHITE HORSES: e.g. Cic. *Nat*. *D*. 2.6, 3.11; Just. *Epit*. 20.3.8; Val. Max. 1.8.1b; Flor. 1.5.4; Lucian, *Dial*. *D*. 25 (26); cf. Stat. *Theb*. 6.327-331. Their uncle, whose daughters they abducted and married, was named Λεύκιππος ('with/of white horses') (e.g. Theoc. *Id*. 22.137-140; Ov. *Fast*. 5.699-702; Apollod. *Bibl*. 3.10.3, 3.11.2; Hyg. *Fab*. 80).
[258] Livy 9.46.15, cf. 2.42.5; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. *Rom*. 6.13.4-5; Val. Max. 2.2.9a; Plin. *HN* 15.19; *De vir*. *ill*. 32.3; cf. Plut. *Cor*. 3.4.
[259] PYDNA: Cic. *Nat*. *D*. 2.6, 3.11-13; Val. Max. 1.8.1b; Plin. *HN* 7.86; Min. Fel. *Oct*. 7.2; cf. Val. Max. 1.8.1c; Plut. *Aem*. 24.4-6; Flor. 1.28.14-15. VERCELLAE: Flor. 1.38.19-20; cf. Plin. *HN* 7.86.
[260] Cass. Dio 41.61.4; cf. Caes. *B Civ*. 3.105. Richardson 2013: 911.

dedication to the twins at Delphi to mark his liberation of Greece.[261] Moreover, the Dioscuri wore the *pileus* or πῖλος, a symbol of liberty for the Romans.[262] There may have been some anti-monarchical sentiment attached to the Dioscuri in this regard.[263] They tended to manifest themselves when the enemy was a king or, in Pompeius' case, someone who could be accused of regal aspirations. It is even possible that Brutus and Cassius wished to be identified with the Dioscuri in the wake of Caesar's assassination.[264]

It is particularly significant for Augustus' measures regarding the Dioscuri that they could be identified with Rome's tutelary deities of the state and household, the Penates and the Lares. The Penates were said to have originated in Samothrace, either having been taken to Troy by Dardanus and then to Lavinium by Aeneas, or directly conveyed from there by Aeneas.[265] The Great Gods at Samothrace, the Κάβειροι, were equated with the Dioscuri.[266] Both groups of deities were considered the protectors of sailors and the Dioscuri could be called 'Great Gods' as well.[267] Furthermore, the Penates were generally represented as male youths in military dress, including in their temple on the Velia.[268] Thus it was asserted that the Roman Penates were the Dioscuri, and not without good reason.[269] An inscription found in Lavinium, a place of great importance in the Penates' cult, supports the idea of ancient links with the twins' worship.[270] One might add that, like the Penates, the Dioscuri were often invoked in oaths.[271]

The Lares shared many similarities with Castor and Pollux. This was all the more likely because of the uncertainty and confusion that surrounded the specific details of the various household gods and their relationships with each other. Both pairs of gods were depicted as twin youths and both were considered the protectors of sailors, of the home and of people in general.[272] The Lares and the Dioscuri were also connected through myth. The Lares' mother, Lara (or

---

[261] Plut. *Flam*. 12.6. Cf. *RRC* no. 267/1.
[262] Lycoph. *Alex*. 506-507; Catull. 37.2; Festus 225 L; Paus. 3.24.5, 4.27.2; cf. Lucian, *Dial. D*. 25 (26); Apul. *Met*. 10.31. Cf. *RRC* nos. 98A/3-4, 98A/8, 181/1-4, 278/2, 342/7, 353/1-3, 515/1, etc. Richardson 2013: 912.
[263] Richardson 2013: 907-917.
[264] Richardson 2013: 912.
[265] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.68-69, 2.66.5; Serv. *Aen*. 1.378, 2.325, 3.12, 3.148, 3.264, 8.679, cf. 2.296; Macrob. *Sat*. 3.4.7, 3.4.9.
[266] E.g. Ar. *Pax* 276-285; *OGIS* 430.5-6; Varro, *Ling*. 5.58; Philo Byblius, *FHG* 3.567 (fr. 2.11); Polemon Iliensis, *FHG* 3.137 (fr. 76a); cf. Paus. 10.38.7; Serv. *Aen*. 3.12. They were also connected through myth (Diod. Sic. 4.43.1-2, 4.48.6, 4.49.8, 5.49.6). It should be noted that it is not strictly accurate to simply say that the Samothracian gods were the Κάβειροι, although this was the opinion of many ancient writers (cf. Strabo 7 fr. 50; Paus. 9.25.5-10). There was great uncertainty as to the nature of these gods, to an even greater degree than the Roman Penates.
[267] KABEIPOI AND SAILORS: e.g. Cic. *Nat. D*. 3.89, cf. Diog. Laert. 6.59; Diod. Sic. 4.43.1-2, 4.48.6. DIOSCURI AND SAILORS: e.g. *Hom. Hymn* 33.6-17; Alc. fr. 34 LP; Eur. *Hel*. 1495-1511; Hor. *Carm*. 1.3.2-8; Strabo 1.3.2; Plin. *HN* 2.101; Plut. *Lys*. 12.1; Lucian, *Dial. D*. 25 (26); cf. Diod. Sic. 4.43.1-2; Sen. *Q. Nat*. 1.1.13. Cf. *RRC* nos. 181/1-4, 278/2, 342/7, 353/3. St Elmo's Fire was believed to be one means by which they manifested themselves. DIOSCURI AS 'GREAT GODS': e.g. Paus. 1.31.1, 8.21.4; cf. Serv. *Aen*. 3.12.
[268] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.68.2.
[269] Serv. *Aen*. 3.12; cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 1.68-69. Cf. *RRC* nos. 307/1a, 312/1, 455/2. Weinstock 1960: 112-113.
[270] Weinstock 1960: 112-114.
[271] E.g. Ar. *Pax* 214, *Lys*. 81, 142-143, 206, etc.; Xen. *Hell*. 4.4.10, *Ages*. 5.5; Plaut. *Aul*. 172, 730; Aul. Gell. *NA* 11.6.3-6; Festus 112 L. Romans often used the words *mecastor* and *edepol* when swearing. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 212.
[272] See above.

Mania), had her tongue removed by Iuppiter for warning the nymph Iuturna of his sexual designs on her.[273] This nymph was said to inhabit the spring where the Dioscuri were supposed to have manifested themselves.[274] Moreover, both pairs of gods are often shown flanking another figure, such as Zeus-Iuppiter in the case of the Dioscuri and the Genius in that of the Lares.[275] It has been argued that the imagery of the Dioscuri affected the way the Lares were represented.[276]

Augustus undertook a number of measures in order to identify C. and L. Caesar with the Dioscuri at Rome and across the empire. In 12 BC, he exhibited armed contests at the Panathenaic festival in the names of his adopted sons, and he also patronised athletic competitions, boxing and ephebic training more generally.[277] Such activities were associated with the Dioscuri, as was natural given that they were youthful Greek warriors.[278] Augustus' promotion of the *lusus Troiae* would have been important for this too and may have helped strengthen the connection of the Dioscuri to the Penates.[279] In 8 BC, coins were minted to commemorate Gaius taking part in military exercises for the first time with the northern legions and they were presumably used for the donative given to the soldiers to celebrate the milestone.[280] They feature Gaius riding a horse and holding a spear. Although this imagery was suitable for the occasion, it perhaps also sought to recall the Dioscuri. There can be no doubt, however, about subsequent measures. Augustus revived the so-called *transvectio equitum* that had been instituted by Rullianus, which honoured Castor and Pollux as the patrons of the equestrian class and commemorated their divine assistance at Lake Regillus.[281] In 5 BC, having assumed the consulship to help mark the occasion, Augustus enrolled Gaius among the *iuvenes*, the youths of military age. Gaius was then acclaimed *princeps iuventutis* by the *equites*, who also presented him with a silver shield and spear, and he was appointed *sevir turmae*, one of the commanders of the six cavalry divisions. Lucius was later granted the same honours.[282] Coins were issued to commemorate the boys' new title, featuring them standing together with their shields and spears.[283] All this clearly evokes the Dioscuri, the young warriors closely associated with horses and considered patrons of the *equites*. The fact that

---

[273] Ov. *Fast*. 2.583-616; cf. Varro, *Ling*. 9.61; Lactant. *Div. inst*. 1.20.35; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.7.35.
[274] Ov. *Fast*. 1.705-708, cf. 1.463-464; cf. Varro, *Ling*. 5.71; Serv. *Aen*. 12.139. Thus the Dioscuri feature on the altar of Iuturna (Buxton 2003: 343).
[275] Cf. Buxton 2003: 348. Evidence from Delos appears to confirm that the Lares were depicted flanking the Genius prior to Augustus (cf. Gradel 2002: 125).
[276] Waites 1920: 251-261; cf. Orr 1978: 1568.
[277] Suet. *Aug*. 43.1, 44.3, 45.2-3, 98.3, 98.5. PANATHENAIC FESTIVAL: Cass. Dio 54.28.3. Buxton 2003: 225-226. It may be especially significant that he made a gesture of dining in a Spartan mess-hall (Cass. Dio 54.7.2; Spawforth 2012: 91), since the Dioscuri had a strong presence in Sparta.
[278] Cf. Pind. *Nem*. 10.49-54. Of course, this is not to say that the sole reason he sponsored athletics was links to the Dioscuri, as it also appears to have accorded with his tastes.
[279] Suet. *Aug*. 43.2, *Tib*. 6.4; Cass. Dio 48.20.2, 49.43.3, 51.22.4, 54.26.1, 55.10.6.
[280] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 198-199. Cass. Dio 55.6.4. Buxton 2003: 289-290.
[281] Suet. *Aug*. 38.3; cf. Ov. *Tr*. 2.89-90, 541-542. See also above.
[282] *RG* 14.2; Cass. Dio 55.9.9-10, cf. 55.12.1; cf. Tac. *Ann*. 1.3. Swan 2004: 91.
[283] *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 205-212.

the shields and spears were silver is especially suggestive, having long been associated with divinity, and Augustus made a gesture of melting down statues of himself made from the metal.[284] When in Rome, Gaius and Lucius would have led their cavalry divisions in the *transvectio equitum*, and it has been suggested that they rode white horses, like the Dioscuri.[285]

Augustus placed in his new forum, dedicated in 2 BC, a painting by Apelles depicting Alexander the Great, Victory and the Dioscuri, and this also helped to reinforce the image of his sons as Castor and Pollux.[286] Augustus was linked to Alexander the Great, as other powerful Romans had been, and indeed, Claudius later had Alexander's face in this painting replaced with that of Augustus.[287] This encouraged viewers to interpret the Dioscuri as representing Roman imperial figures too, with Gaius and Lucius being the obvious choices.[288] The image of them as the divine twins was further fostered by them frequently being paired together and by parity being kept between their honours and titles as much as possible.[289] Thus, despite the differences in their ages, Gaius and Lucius are called twins on some coin-types from Tarraco and in an inscription from Cyprus.[290] The inscription also calls Augustus Zeus, so that the equation of his sons with the Dioscuri is clearly implied.[291] The identification of Gaius and Lucius Caesar as Castor and Pollux is indeed evident outside Rome. Statues of them at Corinth show them as the Dioscuri, as do two statues at Aphrodisias.[292] There, the princes probably flanked Augustus, who appears with Victory and a bound prisoner. This recalls the paintings by Apelles in the Forum Augustum, as well as the common depiction of the Dioscuri alongside Zeus-Iuppiter and the Lares alongside the Genius, especially in the wake of Augustus' transformation of the compital cults.[293] At Ephesus, there was a joint cult of the Ἀνάκτορες, Alexander, and Gaius and Lucius.[294] Ἄνακτες was used as a title for the Dioscuri and the Κάβειροι, so this cult could be further evidence of Augustus' sons being closely associated with Castor and Pollux.[295]

The view that the young Caesares were ever strongly linked to the Dioscuri has been challenged but the objections are not convincing.[296] For instance, Champlin says the Caesares were

---

[284] *RG* 24.2; Suet. *Aug*. 52; Cass. Dio 53.22.3. Silver shields formed part of Flamininus' dedication to the Dioscuri (Plut. *Flam*. 12.6).
[285] Poulsen 1991: 123; Buxton 2003: 411. Both scholars actually treat it as fact that Gaius and Lucius rode white horses, although there is no mention of it in the sources.
[286] Plin. *HN* 35.27, 93-94.
[287] Plin. *HN* 35.94.
[288] Poulsen 1991: 124.
[289] Buxton 2003: *passim*.
[290] COIN-TYPES: *RPC* 1.103 nos. 211-213. INSCRIPTION: Mitford 1974: 115.
[291] Poulsen 1991: 125.
[292] Buxton 2003: 218-219, 236-237.
[293] PAINTINGS BY APELLES: Plin. *HN* 35.27, 93-94; cf. Serv. *Aen*. 1.294. The similarities to the paintings are striking, since the Dioscuri appeared with Victory and there was an image of War with its hands bound behind its back.
[294] *SEG* 4.521. The evidence is from the early second century AD.
[295] E.g. Plut. *Thes*. 33.2; Paus. 10.38.7. Cf. Poulsen 1991: 125.
[296] *Contra* Champlin 2011: 98-99.

never represented as the Dioscuri on coins, yet the coins showing them together with their silver shields and spears essentially did exactly this. Moreover, in arguing that they did not have a prominent role in the *transvectio equitum*, Champlin states that all the participants wore the same clothing, which hardly matters, and that all rode on white horses, which is completely without evidence and exceedingly fanciful in any case, given the large number of *equites* who would have to be supplied with such mounts, which were a special honour. Champlin also questions whether Gaius and Lucius ever rode in the procession together. Again, this is not really relevant, as there was no escaping the fact that they were brothers and the adopted sons of Augustus who bore the attributes of the Dioscuri, whether they were present together or not. Given the association of Augustus with Iuppiter, which was reinforced when he was hailed as *pater patriae* in 2 BC, it was natural for his sons to be compared to the Dioscuri on this basis alone.[297] There is more than sufficient reason to believe that Gaius and Lucius were actively identified with Castor and Pollux under Augustus' principate. Further confirmation can be found in the fact that the same thing was done with other members of the imperial family later.[298] It is right, however, to criticise the focus on Gaius and Lucius in this regard to the detriment of Tiberius and Drusus, and especially the suggestion that the brothers Claudii were chosen by Augustus to replace the Caesares as the Dioscuri.[299]

A key reason for Augustus having his sons identified with the Dioscuri is so that they, like himself, would be seen as Rome's protectors and the pledges of its security and prosperity. Castor and Pollux were seen as tutelary deities and were linked with the Penates and Lares, gods with whom Augustus had taken pains to associate himself. There were other reasons as well. The Dioscuri represented deification based on merit, much like Hercules, Romulus and Dionysus-Liber. This would have had an obvious attraction for him, as it reinforced a crucial aspect of the public image he had developed. Horace compared him to these very heroic figures, noting that Augustus was exceptional in having altars in his own lifetime.[300] Castor and Pollux had long been associated with stars and were significant in astrology and cosmology.[301] This was relevant for the subject of apotheosis but could well have appealed to Augustus' astrological interests too. As symbols of fraternal love and devotion, the Dioscuri underlined the theme of concord that was crucial to the stability and acceptance of Augustus' regime.[302] Likewise, their association with freedom would help to cast his reign in a positive light. The divine twins' patronage of the *equites* aided Augustus

---

[297] See previous chapter.
[298] Poulsen 1991: 127-129.
[299] *Contra* Poulsen 1991: 122, 126, 145.
[300] Hor. *Epist*. 2.1.5-17.
[301] STARS: e.g. Eur. *Hel*. 140; Diod. Sic. 4.43.2; Hor. *Carm*. 1.3.2; Sen. *Q. Nat*. 1.1.13; Plin. *HN* 2.101; Plut. *Thes*. 33.2, *Lys*. 12.1; Lucian, *Dial. D*. 25 (26); Apul. *Met*. 10.31. ASTROLOGY AND COSMOLOGY: e.g. Philo, *Dec*. 56; Hyg. *Poet. astr*. 2.22; Julian. 147 A-C.
[302] See previous chapter.

in winning this class' favour. His efforts to achieve this can be seen, for instance, in the prominence he gave to the *equites* in his *Res Gestae*.[303] Among the equestrians were young nobles who had not yet earned a place in the Senate. The *equites* are described in Livy as the 'nursery of the Senate'.[304] Augustus was therefore fostering loyalty to himself and his sons within the elite, including future senators. Indeed, one aspect of Gaius and Lucius being associated with the Dioscuri is that they were being prepared to succeed to Augustus' position.[305] As Ovid saw, they would in time progress from being leaders of the youth to being leaders of the elders, like their father.[306] One could once apply the title of *princeps iuventutis* to any of the cream of the young aristocracy, as Livy did. Yet Augustus monopolised the position for his family members so they could be marked out for special authority and privilege, just as he was as *princeps* of the state and *princeps* of the Senate. The boys' silver shields paralleled the golden *clipeus virtutis* of Augustus, since each was intended to represent the outstanding merit, magnanimity and superhuman status of its possessor. In short, likening Augustus' sons to the Dioscuri presented them as his youthful counterparts and the heirs to his paternal dominance. This is not to say that such preparations for succession were straightforward and unproblematic. Suspicions of a plan to make Rome a hereditary autocracy had been a cause for resentment and opposition, such as in 23 BC.[307] Augustus' power had grown more secure with the passage of time but there was still a need to be cautious and avoid discontent within the nobility. Honours linking his sons to the Dioscuri were a relatively subtle way of promoting their claims to primacy. They acted as a platform to be built on with further honours and offices, such as consulships, priesthoods and Gaius' Eastern command.

An accompanying point to be noted here is that all this was very much deliberate on Augustus' part. The key measures identifying the young Caesares with the Dioscuri were clearly his initiatives and cannot be attributed to other groups or individuals. He personally sponsored the activities that evoked the Dioscuri. He was responsible for the review of the *equites equo publico* as part of the revived procession of the cavalry. This was part of his policy towards the status of the *equites* as a class. The *equites* could conceivably have honoured Gaius and Lucius independently but it is much more logical to view it as having been coordinated by Augustus and his inner circle. The *princeps* would also have given his approval for the works of Apelles to decorate his forum. There is disagreement among scholars as to the role played by the emperor and his supporters in the design of coin-types.[308] It is highly likely that there often was direction from above, especially for important issues and those destined for the soldiery, as some of the coins featuring Gaius and

[303] *RG* 14.2, 35.1. Cooley 2009: 165-166.
[304] Livy 42.61.5.
[305] Cf. Augustus ap. Aul. Gell. *NA* 15.7.3.
[306] Ov. *Ars am.* 1.194.
[307] Cf. Cass. Dio 53.30-31.
[308] Cf. Howgego 1995: 70-71.

Lucius were. The coinage also accords with Augustus' other religious measures. The natural conclusion is that Augustus was paving the way for his adopted sons to one day play a similar role in the state as himself.

A great many of Augustus' measures originated with the actions of Iulius Caesar, and there are hints of a connection between Caesar and the Dioscuri. It was said that two young men in Syria announced his victory at Pharsalus before disappearing, a tale that strongly resembles other manifestations of the Dioscuri.[309] Likewise, at his funeral, two men with swords and javelins were supposed to have suddenly set fire to his bier.[310] There was also a miraculous apparition before Caesar crossed the Rubicon.[311] As there was only a single being on this occasion, this does not specifically recall the Dioscuri, except for his extraordinary stature and beauty. The appearance of a comet in 44 was popularly thought to be a sign of Caesar being raised into the heavens to reside among the gods, and a star was subsequently affixed to the head of his statue.[312] The Dioscuri were identified with the constellation Gemini and were often represented with a star above each of their heads.[313] Caesar, and Augustus after him, forged an image for himself of being a saviour and liberator following his successes in the civil war.[314] This of course paralleled the role of the Dioscuri. Therefore, Caesar could be compared to Castor and Pollux as a divine figure who embodied safety and protection. Moreover, there were the strong ties between Caesar and the Penates through his ancestry and his chief pontificate. All this suggests that Caesar may have associated himself with the Dioscuri to some extent. On the other hand, much of the evidence for this belongs after his death or is in the form of myths and omens rather than his own verifiable actions. Therefore, it remains uncertain as to whether a strong relationship existed between Caesar and the Dioscuri during his lifetime.

Pater Patriae

Augustus eventually received the title *pater patriae*, or 'father of the fatherland'. This was an extremely important honour and accordingly the one with which he chose to end the *Res Gestae*, his public account of his achievements.[315] In accepting the title, Augustus stated, with tears in his eyes, that his wishes had been fulfilled and that he could ask for no more from the immortal gods than to have the senators' unanimous approval to the very end of his life.[316] The title was officially

[309] Cass. Dio 41.61.4; cf. Caes. *B Civ*. 3.105.
[310] Suet. *Iul*. 84.3.
[311] Suet. *Iul*. 32.
[312] See previous chapter.
[313] Weinstock 1971: 372.
[314] See previous chapter.
[315] *RG* 35.1; Ov. *Fast*. 2.119-128; Suet. *Aug*. 58.1-2; Cass. Dio 55.10.10.
[316] Augustus ap. Suet. *Aug*. 58.2; cf. Ov. *Fast*. 2.122.

granted by the Senate and Roman people on 5 February, 2 BC.[317] Augustus is portrayed as relenting to popular pressure to receive the honour, having declined it on previous occasions as a show of moderation.[318] His acclamation as *pater patriae* had been foreshadowed in 27 BC, and he had been referred to as *pater* or *parens* before 2 BC, including on various coins minted *c.* 18 BC.[319] His identification with Romulus and his moral legislation also indicate that he anticipated being the *pater patriae* well before he received the title officially.

Cicero apparently coined the term, calling Marius *pater patriae* and *parens* in 63 BC and then being acclaimed as such himself, no doubt with his encouragement, after he quashed the Catilinarian conspiracy.[320] It was also proposed at this time that Cicero should be awarded the *corona civica*.[321] The statements of Cicero and the other ancient writers clearly demonstrate that the primary significance of the title was that the honorand had been the saviour of the Republic, its citizens and their families.[322] One should once again be wary, however, of ascribing too much significance to Cicero.[323] Although a key figure, he did not invent the title and its associated features from nothing. Cicero seems to have been influenced by the *Annales* of Ennius, where Romulus is hailed as 'guardian of the fatherland' (*custos patriae*) and 'father'.[324] Indeed, Cicero later called Romulus *parens urbis*.[325] He cites Ennius' lines in *De re publica* where he has Scipio Aemilianus discussing the inherent benefits of one-man rule, as long as that individual is just.[326] There is clear Greek and Hellenistic influence in honouring a man as a saviour and benefactor. The role of the father in Roman society and traditional rewards like the *corona civica* offered a clear means of doing this within a native context.[327] Sulla perhaps took the first steps. He had been hailed as a saviour and a father and he had received the *corona obsidionalis*, the crown superior to the *corona civica*.[328] He thus served as an obvious example for Cicero and others to follow. Indeed, Caesar and Augustus both received the *corona obsidionalis*.[329] One should not rule out suggestions from Cicero's friends and supporters. Cato, one of the senators who acclaimed Cicero *pater patriae*, later attested to his virtues instead of advocating for the supplications he wanted.[330]

---

[317] *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2.118-119. Ov. *Fast.* 2.119-128.
[318] Suet. *Aug.* 58.1.
[319] With regards to 27 BC, see below. PREVIOUSLY CALLED *PATER* OR *PARENS*: e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 1.2.50, cf. 3.24.27; *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 96-101; *ILS* 96, 6755. Cf. Cass. Dio 55.10.10.
[320] MARIUS: Cic. *Rab. perd.* 27. CICERO: Cic. *Sest.* 121, *Pis.* 6, cf. *Att.* 9.10.3, *Phil.* 2.12; Plin. *HN* 7.117; Plut. *Cic.* 23.3; Juv. 8.243-244; App. *B Civ.* 2.7. Weinstock 1971: 201-202.
[321] Cic. *Pis.* 6; Aul. Gell. *NA* 5.6.15. Weinstock 1971: 165.
[322] Esp. Cic. *Pis.* 6, *Phil.* 2.12; App. *B Civ.* 2.7.
[323] Cf. previous chapter.
[324] Enn. *Ann.* 117-120 W. Similarly, Cicero described Marius, the man he first called *pater patriae*, as the guardian of the state (Cic. *Cat.* 3.24, *Red. pop.* 9, *Sest.* 37, 116).
[325] Cic. *Div.* 1.3; cf. Livy 1.16.3, 1.16.6. Weinstock 1971: 202.
[326] Cic. *Rep.* 1.64.
[327] See below.
[328] Plin. *HN* 22.12; Plut. *Sull.* 34.1. Weinstock 1971: 149; Keaveney 1983: 72-73.
[329] See below.
[330] See below.

These virtues were later a central element to the honour of being *pater patriae*, so this indicates that he might have made an important contribution in 63. At the very least, it shows the ability of others within the elite to draw on the same influences that affected Cicero. It is perhaps relevant that the other senator named as proposing the title for Cicero, Q. Catulus, was a Sullan who had helped the dictator to receive a magnificent public funeral.[331] In any case, Cicero did not create a completely novel and innovative honour.

Besides self-aggrandisement, Cicero's motivation for becoming *pater* or *parens patriae* was to justify his summary execution of the leading conspirators. By assuming the role of father to the Roman people, he could exercise a sort of *patria potestas* over them and thus rightfully put citizens to death, contrary to the laws that governed Roman magistrates. This was especially the case since his actions, to his mind, prevented the very destruction of the state and safeguarded the citizenry.[332] This background gives further meaning to the words Cicero assigns to Scipio in that part of his *De re publica*. There he argues that in times of crisis matters should be entrusted to a single person.[333] Furthermore, all Rome's kings except the last had acted in accordance with justice and protected the state. They had thereby earned the loyal obedience of the People, and they were called *custodes patriae* or *patres* rather than *reges*.[334] Clearly, Cicero wished some parallels to be drawn with himself and his consulate. He also compared himself to Romulus, the first *pater* and *custos patriae*, by extolling the date on which the Senate had voted to execute the Catilinarian conspirators and treating it as the new birthday of the city, as though he had re-founded it by delivering it from grave danger.[335]

It is no coincidence that the *corona civica* was suggested as an honour for Cicero alongside him being acclaimed *pater* or *parens patriae*. The civic crown was traditionally presented to a Roman soldier who had saved the life of a comrade in battle, and the rescued man was obliged from that point forwards to treat his preserver as though he were his father.[336] The honorand also received a number of prominent public privileges.[337] In Cicero's case, it was plainly implied that he deserved the crown for saving all Rome's citizens rather than a single one, even though he had not partaken in any battle. At the same time, the proposal asserted that Romans should regard Cicero as a father in return for the service he had rendered. The natural corollary of the honour, which was not actually conferred on Cicero, would be that the executions he had ordered were just and lawful.

---

[331] App. *B Civ*. 1.105.
[332] E.g. Cic. *Cat*. 3.15, 3.25-26, *Fam*. 5.7.3, *Att*. 1.19.6-7, 1.19.10, *Dom*. 72-73, 94, 132, *Vat*. 7, *Pis*. 6, 23, 34, *Planc*. 89-90. See also previous chapter.
[333] Cic. *Rep*. 1.62-63.
[334] Cic. *Rep*. 1.62, 64.
[335] Cic. *Flac*. 102, cf. *Cat*. 3.2, *Att*. 1.19.6, *Red. sen*. 12, *Fam*. 1.9.12; cf. Brutus ap. Cic. *Ad Brut*. 1.17.1; Cass. Dio 46.21.4. Cf. Cic. *De consul*. fr. 12 B ap. [Sall.] *In Cic*. 7; etc. Weinstock 1971: 189.
[336] Polyb. 6.39.6-7; Cic. *Planc*. 72; Plin. *HN* 16.12; Plut. *Cor.* 3.3, *Quaest. Rom*. 92 (*Mor*. 285 F-286 A); Aul. Gell. *NA* 5.6.11-13; Festus 37 L; Serv. *Aen*. 6.772.
[337] Plin. *HN* 16.13; cf. Polyb. 6.39.9-10.

The depiction of Cicero as a kind of public father-figure was an attempt to expand the role that the *pater familias* played in the household to encompass the state. For members of a Roman household, the *pater familias* was seen as the source of their safety and prosperity, whence came the worship and honour paid to his *Genius*. Furthermore, the *pater familias* exercised great authority, including the power of life and death, even if it was rarely used.[338] Certainly, he could expect obedience from the members of his household. Therefore, the position of 'father of the fatherland' that Cicero promoted for himself was no small honour and was fully in accord with his belief that he had prevented Rome's ruin. The greatness of the honour is also evident in the fact that the reasons for its bestowal on him, which is to say being a saviour and re-founding the city, were the same as those used for deification, including by Cicero himself.[339]

Iulius Caesar was the next man to be honoured in this manner, receiving the title *parens patriae* in late 45 or early 44 BC.[340] As with Cicero, it cast Caesar as the saviour of the state, but on this occasion for saving citizens by bringing an end to the Civil War and acting with such striking clemency. Needless to say, Caesar was not identifying himself with Cicero but adopting the title for its positive connotations. If anything, there was a contrast between Caesar sparing the lives of enemies and Cicero taking them away.[341] The image of Caesar as the great liberator and protector of the state was emphasised by a number of prominent honours. These include statues of him on the Rostra wearing the *corona civica* and the *corona obsidionalis*, as well as temples to Libertas, Concordia Nova and Clementia.[342] Once again, outstanding benefactions and just leadership are presented as making an individual worthy of a fatherly position at Rome, together with the loyalty and deference that entailed. Indeed, Caesar being honoured as *parens patriae* accorded with the ideas Cicero presented in *De re publica*. The title depicted Caesar's role as dictator as being much like a *pater familias* who successfully guides and protects his household. It was also particularly suitable because of his chief pontificate.[343] This had given him a father-like position in the pontifical college, especially as far as discipline was concerned.[344] He also had a father-like position in the state religion more broadly, in as much as he was responsible for cults and rites critical to Rome's existence. Moreover, Caesar was closely identified with Rome's founder, Romulus, during his dictatorship. One of the aims of this was to cast Caesar as a second founder of

---

[338] Cf. Saller 1986: 18-20.
[339] See previous chapter.
[340] Cic. *Phil*. 2.31, 13.23, 13.25; Livy, *Per*. 116; Nic. Dam. 80; Val. Max. 6.4.5; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1, 85, cf. 88; App. *B Civ*. 2.106, 144; Flor. 2.13.91; Cass. Dio 44.4.4, 44.48.3. Cf. *RRC* nos. 480/19-20. Cf. *ILS* 71, 72; *ILLRP* 408. Weinstock 1971: 200, 202-204.
[341] See previous chapter. Cf. Sen. *Clem*. 1.26.5; Plin. *HN* 16.7.
[342] STATUES ON THE ROSTRA: App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.4.5. TEMPLE TO LIBERTAS: Cass. Dio 43.44.1. TEMPLE TO CONCORDIA NOVA: Cass. Dio 44.4.5. TEMPLE TO CLEMENTIA: *RRC* no. 480/21; Plut. *Caes*. 57.4; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.4. Weinstock 1971: 133, 142, 148, 163, 233, 241, 260, 265, 309; Hamlyn 2011: 77-78, 82-83.
[343] Cf. Taylor 1931: 67.
[344] See above.

Rome, having established it anew by rescuing it from internal strife and bloodshed. Thus, for example, he was honoured in connection with the Parilia, which had come to be viewed as the celebration of Rome's birthday.[345] Yet Romulus was also the original model for being the guardian and father of the fatherland. The idea of being a new founder of Rome was certainly now closely tied to the title of *pater* or *parens patriae*, although the link was already evident in Ennius and had been strengthened by Cicero.[346] Camillus was another figure with whom Caesar was associated, and after his dictatorship one can find Camillus called *parens patriae* and a second founder of Rome.[347] This was perhaps already the case before Caesar but it is more likely to have come about as a result of the parallels drawn between them.

Being father of the fatherland gave Caesar obvious links to Iuppiter, the patron god of Rome whose very name was partly cognate with *pater*. Iuppiter had a fatherly role in relation to the state, as well as mankind in general, and he was associated with the *corona civica* because the oak from which it was made was sacred to him.[348] The recipient of a civic crown was to be treated like a father by whomever he had saved, and was perhaps viewed as Iuppiter-like by virtue of his beneficent intervention, in a similar way to how a successful commander celebrating his triumph was identified with the god. The *pater* or *parens patriae* was thus in a sense the earthly equivalent or likeness of the god. This was especially the case for Caesar, a famed *triumphator* who had genuinely won a *corona civica* of the traditional sort in his youth.[349] The title was all the more fitting since Caesar emphasised his descent from Aeneas, a father of the Roman people and a descendant of Iuppiter through both parents.[350] Therefore, being *parens patriae* was an honour of major significance for Caesar, reinforcing several key elements of his image: that he was a second founder, a new Romulus, a clement and benevolent father-figure, the saviour of Rome and the figure responsible for the state's safety and success. Such was the title's importance that it was conferred in the months before his death when the most extreme honours were implemented, such as his deification. It was accompanied by oaths of loyalty sworn to Caesar and the commitment of the Senate and *equites* to serve as his bodyguard.[351] Such actions were appropriate for the members of a household to perform for their father.

---

[345] See previous chapter.
[346] See previous chapter.
[347] Livy 5.49.7, 7.1.10; Plut. *Cam.* 1.1, cf. 31.2; Eutr. 1.20. Hamlyn 2011: 78-79.
[348] Plin. *HN.* 16.11; Plut. *Cor.* 3.3, *Quaest. Rom.* 92; cf. Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.35-36. According to Pliny, it was strictly speaking the type of oak known as *aesculus* that was sacred to Iuppiter.
[349] Suet. *Iul.* 2.
[350] His mother, Venus, was Iuppiter's daughter, and his father, Anchises, was directly descended from Iuppiter through Dardanus and Tros.
[351] See below.

The identification of Caesar as a father-figure did not cease with his death. His assassination was portrayed as patricide (*parricidium*) by his supporters.[352] At his funeral, M. Antonius emphasised the high honours that had been voted to the dictator, noting that the title *parens patriae* was a testament to his clemency.[353] By October 44, he had set up a statue of Caesar on the Rostra and had it inscribed *parenti optime merito*.[354] A monument was established on the site of Caesar's funeral pyre with the inscription *parenti patriae*, where people performed sacrifices, made vows and swore oaths by Caesar.[355] It may have been to this monument that Octavian pointed as he stated that he should be permitted to implement the honours of his parent.[356] In this case, 'parent' could well have referred to both Octavian's adoption and Caesar's title. Therefore, Caesar's murder had not destroyed his position as father of the state, and to some extent it had even helped to cement it. There was also an emphasis on the fact that it was his virtues, especially his *clementia*, that had earned him the title.

In 27 BC, having made gestures of restoring constitutional government, Octavian became Augustus and received honours closely related to the title *pater patriae*, although not the title itself. A *corona civica* was fixed above the entrance to his home and the doorposts were adorned with laurel.[357] He was also given a golden shield, the *clipeus virtutis*, which was kept in the Curia Iulia. The shield was awarded to Augustus on the basis of four virtues he had supposedly displayed, which were recorded on the shield itself: *virtus*, *clementia*, *iustitia* and *pietas*.[358] The oak-wreath, laurel and *clipeus virtutis* subsequently became distinctly Augustan symbols and often appeared alongside each other in different combinations.[359] As with Cicero and Caesar, the *corona civica* was clearly bestowed on Augustus for saving the lives of Rome's citizens as a collective.[360] This was also made explicit on coins depicting the oak-wreath and inscribed *OB CIVIS SERVATOS*.[361] The connection to being *pater patriae* was obvious because of the prior examples of Cicero and Caesar. Coins and jewellery depicting the *corona civica* with an eagle demonstrate that there was a public awareness of the crown's association with Iuppiter as well.[362] In addition, Ovid compares Augustus to Iuppiter in three places where he makes mention of the conferral of his new name and

---

[352] Cic. *Fam.* 12.3.1; Suet. *Iul.* 88; cf. Cic. *Off.* 3.83, *Phil.* 2.31; Val. Max. 1.8.8; Cass. Dio 47.19.1.
[353] App. *B Civ.* 2.144-145; cf. Suet. *Iul.* 84.2; Cass. Dio 44.45-49. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 351-352.
[354] Cic. *Fam.* 12.3.1. Weinstock 1971: 385-386.
[355] Suet. *Iul.* 85. Weinstock 1971: 364.
[356] Cic. *Att.* 16.15.3. Weinstock 1971: 365; cf. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.73.
[357] *RG* 34.2; Ov. *Met.* 1.562-563, *Fast.* 1.614, 4.953, *Tr.* 3.1.35-48; Val. Max. 2.8.7; Cass. Dio 53.16.4.
[358] *RG* 34.2; cf. *ILS* 82, 83. A marble shield from Arles appears to be a copy of the *clipeus virtutis* and it suggests that this particular honour actually belongs to 26 BC (Cooley 2009: 266-267). It also provides the additional detail that Augustus' *pietas* was specifically 'towards the gods and the fatherland' (*erga deos patriamque*).
[359] Cooley 2009: 262-271.
[360] Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.47-48; Cass. Dio 53.16.4; cf. Sen. *Clem.* 1.26.5; Plin. *HN* 16.7. The *triumviri* had been voted oak-wreaths for the same reason, although it was very much at odds with their behaviour (Cass. Dio 47.13.3-4).
[361] E.g. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 29, 40, 75, 278, 285, 302, 312, 323, 419, 549, cf. 277. These words appear to have accompanied the wreath itself as an inscription (Ov. *Tr.* 3.1.47-48; cf. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. no. 419).
[362] E.g. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. no. 277.

the civic crown.[363] The *clipeus virtutis* recalled the title *pater patriae* because it was virtues such as those inscribed on the shield that had given figures like Romulus and Caesar a claim to that position. One of the main connotations of the laurel was victory.[364] For instance, a laurel-wreath was worn by the *triumphator* as he proceeded in the guise of Iuppiter to the god's Capitoline temple, and laurel was placed in Iuppiter's lap there after a victory.[365] It too therefore linked Augustus to Rome's patron father-deity.[366] The laurel also underlined that it was Augustus' successes, particularly those against Sex. Pompeius and Antonius, that had restored peace and safety to Rome. The linking of Augustus with victory was strengthened by the fact the *clipeus virtutis* was kept with a statue of Victoria placed by him in the Julian Senate house, as well as that the shield was often depicted alongside Victoria.[367] Furthermore, the laurel grew around and was associated with religious buildings like the Regia and the temple of Vesta.[368] Thus the honour helped to tie Augustus further to the chief pontificate and its paternal role in Roman religion, even though the priesthood was not yet his. It moreover served to sacralise his person and his residence in a general sense, as the name Augustus did. Fortuitously for Augustus, the laurel was also associated with his patron deity, Apollo.[369] The honour of laurel decorating his doorway was novel in relation to the title of *pater patriae* but was a very apt addition. Otherwise, the honours were clearly drawn from those of his adoptive father, Caesar. Like his father, he had even received the *corona obsidionalis* and not just the *corona civica*.[370]

The honours accorded Augustus in 27 BC clearly have a strong connection to being *pater patriae*, and this is confirmed by subsequent events. Augustus' eventual award of the title in 2 BC was recorded in the forecourt of his home and in the Curia Iulia where the earlier honours were placed, as well as the Forum Augustum.[371] Augustus linked the acclamation with these privileges himself, separated though they were by 25 years, by describing them in consecutive chapters at the end of the *Res Gestae*. Moreover, the coins issued *c*. 18 BC naming him as *parens* and *conservator* of the Senate and Roman People followed ones advertising the *clipeus virtutis* and *corona civica*.[372] It is very likely, therefore, that Augustus was offered the title of *pater patriae* in or shortly after 27 BC and refused it.[373] Such was its importance and connotations that it could be seen as

---

[363] Ov. *Fast*. 1.587-616, 2.127-132, *Tr*. 3.1.35-48.
[364] Plin. *HN* 15.133-135; cf. Ov. *Tr*. 3.1.41, 44. Fishwick 1987-2005: 1.1.108-109.
[365] E.g. Plin. *HN* 15.127, 134.
[366] In addition, an anecdote about Livia and laurel features an eagle (Plin. *HN* 15.136-137). The suggestion there is that Iuppiter presented the imperial family with a special branch of laurel from heaven.
[367] VICTORIA IN CURIA IULIA: Cass. Dio 51.22.1-2. VICTORIA ALONGSIDE *CLIPEUS VIRTUTIS*: e.g. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 31, 45, 61, 88. Cooley 2009: 267-270.
[368] Ov. *Fast*. 3.137-144; Plin. *HN* 15.127; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.6. Zanker 1988: 93; Cooley 2009: 263.
[369] E.g. Ov. *Met*. 1.557-558, cf. *Tr*. 3.1.39-42; Plin. *HN* 15.134.
[370] Plin. *HN* 22.13.
[371] *RG* 35.1, cf. 34.2.
[372] E.g. *RIC* 1^2 Aug. nos. 61-62, 75-79, 90-95.
[373] Weinstock 1971: 203-204; Stevenson 2009: 99; Stevenson 2013: 123.

monarchical, which would undermine the acceptance and consensus he was striving to achieve and maintain. This is evident in the *Res Gestae*, where he stresses his place as a 'first among equals' immediately after listing the honours he received in 27 BC.[374] If he did abstain from becoming *pater patriae* at that time, it would have served as a conspicuous gesture of moderation to reassure the Senate and the broader elite. There was also the fact that the two men recently associated with the title, Cicero and Caesar, had suffered discord and dissension under their leadership. This was a further cause for reluctance and caution. Augustus still had much to do before he could be in a suitable position to accept the official title of *pater patriae* and not just honours implying it. He needed to implement measures to ensure the stability and endurance of his principate. The passage of time would also allow him to be seen as earning the title through long-term successful leadership and benefactions, rather than increasing his personal power after winning a civil war. In this respect, he may have been deliberately differentiating himself from his adoptive father.

When he did finally become *pater patriae* in 2 BC, Augustus had succeeded in meeting these conditions. His position had grown more secure since 27 BC and had been reinforced by a number of religious and political measures. His principate had also proved itself to have a broad base of support, or at least acceptance, despite the suppression of a few plots and conspiracies. Importantly, he had also made much headway in providing for succession to his principate and the continuation of his new form of government. This is relevant because of the familial and dynastic overtones that could be developed from the honour of being *pater patriae*. Lucius Caesar came of age in 2 BC, so Augustus now had two adult sons and heirs who had already attained significant distinction and were due to be consuls in the coming years. In acclaiming him *pater patriae*, the Senate's spokesman, Valerius Messalla, explicitly mentions Augustus' *domus* and connects the *princeps* and his family with the good fortune and happiness of Rome.[375] This reflects Augustus' efforts to have himself and his family identified with the safety and prosperity of the state, by such means as pursuing close ties to the cult of Vesta, transforming the worship of the Lares at the crossroads and associating his sons with the Dioscuri. A further clear demonstration of this was that the honours from both 27 BC and 2 BC were displayed in his and his family's home on the Palatine, where he had established a shrine of Vesta after becoming *pontifex maximus*.[376] The matter of succession to his position was also relevant in 2 BC because Augustus was approaching his 'climacteric year', the sixty-third.[377] In accordance with his astrological interests, Augustus subscribed to the belief that it would be a time of particular danger for him. He might have been all the more concerned because of the fragile health he had suffered throughout his life. This means

---

[374] *RG* 34.3.
[375] Suet. *Aug*. 58.2.
[376] *RG* 34.2, 35.1. See above.
[377] Cf. Augustus ap. Aul. Gell. *NA* 15.7.3.

that he probably wished to assume the title of *pater patriae* before then to help consolidate his sons' claims to authority in the event of his death. His new official status helped to cement the dominance of the Julian family in the state, which he had promoted throughout his principate. It also made his daughter's actions all the more intolerable and perhaps contributed to her exile.[378] Augustus might well have considered becoming *pater patriae* his supreme honour, given the title's history and implications. He suggested this to be the case in his *Res Gestae* by leaving it for the end and he described it as such when it was conferred on him. He had effectively succeeded where Caesar had failed. This is not to say that it was to be his final honour. The imperial cult, for example, continued to be developed.[379] At the same time, Augustus could not be sure how much time remained to him, and so the title might have been the last significant honour to which he had aspired from an early age. Any further achievement he perhaps considered a bonus.

Just as Augustus' acclamation as *pater patriae* and the associated honours like the *corona civica* were heavily indebted to recent history, and Caesar especially, so was the *clipeus virtutis*. The Romans had certain ideals and virtues that were promoted within their own culture and tradition, including *virtus*, *pietas* and clemency by various names.[380] Thus Virtus and Pietas, for instance, had received temples as divine personifications in the Middle Republic.[381] It was Greek philosophers, however, who first discussed a grouping of cardinal virtues that should be present in great statesmen, and these were generally given as four or five in number.[382] The adoption and influence of this notion is evident at Rome in the first century BC.[383] Hellenistic kings and Roman commanders in the East were honoured for virtue in general (ἀρετή) or specific qualities like εὐσέβεια ('piety').[384] The Latin inscription on Augustus' shield, as preserved on the marble copy from Arles, is very similar to the Greek formula used in Hellenistic honours.[385] Therefore, Greek influence is very apparent in Augustus' golden shield and its inscription. Cicero was again an important figure. He discussed the virtues of a statesman in his works and linked them to the title *pater patriae*.[386] He used such qualities as the ones later attributed to Augustus to justify the obedience owed to a righteous leader and *pater patriae* like Romulus, and by implication himself. Yet in doing this he was building on the foundations laid by literature and philosophy. Thus, the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* discussed virtues in a similar manner, and Cato offered a

---

[378] Cf. Stevenson 2009: 106-107.
[379] See previous chapter.
[380] Weinstock 1971: 228-236, 243-245, 248-251; Fears 1981b: 833-869; Clark 2007: 47-72.
[381] VIRTUS (vowed in 222 BC): Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.61; Livy 27.25.7-9, 29.11.13; Val. Max. 1.1.8; Plut. *Marc.* 28.1. PIETAS (vowed in 191 BC): Livy 40.34.4-6; Val. Max. 2.5.1.
[382] E.g. Pl. *Lach.* 199 D, *Prt.* 349 B, *Resp.* 4.427 E; Zeno fr. 200, *SVF* 1.49; Chrysippus fr. 262-265, *SVF* 3.63-65; cf. Xen. *Ages.* 3-6. Weinstock 1971: 228-229; Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 300-301.
[383] E.g. *Rhet. Her.* 3.3-6; Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 2.159, *De or.* 2.343-344, *Att.* 7.2.7, *Fin.* 5.67. Weinstock 1971: 228; Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 301-303; Stone 2008: 214-233.
[384] Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 306-307. Such honorands include Iulius Caesar (see below).
[385] Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 306-307; cf. Weinstock 1971: 229.
[386] See above and previous chapter.

testimonial of Cicero's *integritas*, *iustitia*, *clementia* and *fides* instead of the vote for supplications that Cicero wanted.[387] This suggests that Cicero did not provide an indispensable inspiration but that he is an example of the impact such influences were having at Rome.

Iulius Caesar became *parens patriae* because of his virtuous conduct in leading the state, at least according to the Caesarian point of view. Antonius credited the clemency with which he had distinguished himself as the reason for the title.[388] So strongly was Caesar associated with *clementia* that his cult was to share a temple with its divine personification.[389] After his great military successes, there could have been no doubting Caesar's *virtus*. Even so, it was glorified by a number of honours during his dictatorship, such as the right to wear the triumphal dress and a laurel-wreath.[390] Justice was frequently included among the main political virtues by both Greeks and Romans.[391] In Caesar's case, it does not seem at first glance that he had a strong connection to this quality.[392] Yet it was a crucially important concept in terms of the Gallic and Civil Wars. Caesar emphasised that his actions in Gaul were just, as was necessary given the fervent opposition led by Cato.[393] Justice was also a virtue he attributed to himself in the conquest, as well as to some of the Gauls.[394] Likewise, he placed the blame for the Civil War on the unjust and wrongful behaviour of his enemies, and he told the Senate in 49 that he wished to surpass the Pompeians in justice and equity (*iustitia et aequitate*).[395] As dictator, he set about implementing a number of legal reforms.[396] Besides the practical need for such measures, he was perhaps seeking to appear to be a law-giver like his model, Romulus. Suetonius may preserve Caesar's claims to be just.[397] He did, however, falter in his efforts to appear moderate and even-handed, the removal of two plebeian tribunes being a major blunder in this respect.[398]

Although piety was not frequently named as a cardinal virtue in the philosophers, it was often the subject of honours in the East.[399] Moreover, piety was viewed as a distinct and vitally important quality of the Romans by many Greeks and Romans alike. This virtue, and the divine favour it had earned, was identified as the source of Roman success and power, even if this explanation was not always accepted by those the Romans had conquered.[400] The word *pietas*

---

[387] *Rhet. Her.* 3.3-6; Cic. *Att.* 7.2.7. Weinstock 1971: 228.
[388] App. *B Civ.* 2.144.
[389] See previous chapter.
[390] See previous chapter.
[391] Weinstock 1971: 243.
[392] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 243; Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 305.
[393] Caes. *B Gall.* 1.43, 1.45, 4.16; cf. Cass. Dio 38.45.1. Weinstock 1971: 245.
[394] HIMSELF: Caes. *B Gall.* 5.41. GAULS: Caes. *B Gall.* 1.19, 6.24. Weinstock 1971: 245.
[395] Caes. *B Civ.* 1.32. Cf. Suet. *Iul.* 30.4; etc.
[396] E.g. Suet. *Iul.* 44.2.
[397] Suet. *Iul.* 43.1-2.
[398] See previous chapter.
[399] See above.
[400] E.g. Cic. *Har. resp.* 19; Diod. Sic. 28.3; Livy 44.1.11; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.4.2; cf. Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.1-16. Weinstock 1971: 249-250.

meant variously a sense of duty to the gods, one's family, and one's country, and it was a quality that could be justifiably ascribed to Caesar.[401] He displayed marked devotion to his family, performing funeral orations for his aunt, Iulia, and his wife, Cornelia, and holding lavish funeral games for his father and daughter.[402] He also exhibited immense pride in his ancestry, particularly his descent from Venus and her son, Aeneas.[403] Aeneas was a famous example of filial, national and religious piety in both the Greek and Roman worlds, since at the fall of Troy he had rescued his father, Anchises, the Palladium and the gods of the state and his royal household.[404] A coin Caesar issued in 47-46 BC depicted this rescue, with Venus' head on the reverse.[405] In addition, Anchises was described as pious by both Naevius and Ennius.[406] Caesar was a renowned devotee of Venus.[407] For instance, he wore a ring featuring Venus' image and built a Temple to Venus Genetrix as part of his new forum. He honoured other gods too, like Mars with his planned temple and Iuppiter when he rejected the diadem.[408] His campaign against the Parthians was to be the fulfilment of a duty of vengeance for Crassus' defeat.[409] In 46 BC, he gave a public display of *pietas* by climbing the steps of the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on his knees, because his chariot had broken down during his triumph.[410]

Being *pontifex maximus* was perhaps his greatest single distinction that denoted piety. It was, after all, a priesthood prominent for enforcing discipline and tradition across many of Rome's most important cults and religious practices.[411] Caesar placed great emphasis on his priestly position, advertising it on coins he produced and featuring himself with head veiled.[412] His reform of the calendar showed a concern for tradition and religious propriety. By remedying the pontiffs' failures to enact intercalary months, festivals would thenceforward regularly occur at the appropriate time of year, and the extra days were added in such a way that festivals' customary dates were unchanged.[413] Furthermore, Caesar showed an active concern for religious duties when he attacked his enemies for their failings in this area.[414] A coin issued in 48 BC by his then-adherent D. Iunius Brutus Albinus had the head of *Pietas* on the obverse with clasping hands and

---

[401] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 248-253. Although one could object that some of his actions served political purposes, they are nevertheless consistent with pious behaviour.
[402] FUNERAL ORATIONS: Plut. *Caes*. 5.1-2; Suet. *Iul*. 6.1. FUNERAL GAMES FOR FATHER: Plin. *HN* 33.53; Cass. Dio 37.8.1; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 5.5; Suet. *Iul*. 10.2. FUNERAL GAMES FOR DAUGHTER: Plut. *Caes*. 55.2; Cass. Dio 43.22.3; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.56.1; Plin. *HN* 19.23; Suet. *Iul*. 26.2, 39; App. *B Civ*. 2.102. Weinstock 1971: 89; Hamlyn 2011: 65.
[403] See above and previous chapter.
[404] E.g. Xen. *Cyn*. 1.15; Lycoph. *Alex*. 1270; Diod. Sic. 7.4. See further references above. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 253.
[405] *RRC* no. 458/1. Weinstock (1971: 253) suggests the head may be of the goddess Pietas.
[406] Naev. *B Poen*. 13-15 W; Enn. *Ann*. 16-17 W.
[407] See previous chapter.
[408] See previous chapter.
[409] See previous chapter.
[410] Cass. Dio 43.21.1-2, cf. 60.23.1; cf. Plin. *HN* 28.21; Suet. *Iul*. 37.2.
[411] See above.
[412] See above.
[413] Macrob. *Sat*. 1.14.7-12, 1.15.8. Wardle 2009: 104; Hamlyn 2011: 67.
[414] Caes. *B Civ*. 1.6, 2.21, 3.33, 3.105. Weinstock 1971: 27; Wardle 2009: 108.

the *caduceus*, symbolising concord and peace respectively, on the reverse.[415] The clear implication of this was that Caesar and his supporters had behaved in a dutiful and conciliatory manner, having pressed for a peaceful resolution to the conflict, whereas the Pompeians had been hell-bent on war.

Even though the honours Caesar received in the East were not unusual in their nature, it is still noteworthy that there are a number of inscriptions hailing him as εὐεργέτης ('benefactor') and σωτήρ ('saviour') and praising his ἀρετή ('virtue'), εὐσέβεια ('piety') and δικαιοσύνη ('justice').[416] Particularly significant is the statue dedicated to him at Pergamum 'on account of every virtue and piety towards both the gods and the city', since it closely resembles the inscription on Augustus' golden shield.[417] It is therefore demonstrative of both the Greek and Caesarian influences present in Augustus' honour. It can scarcely be overlooked that various actions of Caesar could be characterised as improper or irreligious, most famously his obstruction of M. Calpurnius Bibulus during their consulship in 59 BC.[418] Yet such incidents are more convincingly explained as Caesar taking advantage of the latitude given to practitioners of Roman religion rather than an attitude of disregard for his duties to the gods.[419]

Caesar also cultivated *pietas* towards himself. An oath of allegiance was sworn to him during his dictatorship, including that the Senate and *equites* would act as his bodyguard.[420] There was also the obligation of loyalty that came from dispensing benefactions, both to individuals and to groups. Examples include aiding the careers and fortunes of his adherents, acting leniently towards his enemies and re-establishing peace in Italy and the empire, which was portrayed as saving the entire citizen population.[421] Suetonius comments that the Jews particularly mourned Caesar's death and this was because of the goodwill he had shown them.[422] Caesar implemented a number of measures to build and reinforce lasting loyalty to himself within the state, including his worship as a god.[423] While this strategy did have some success, as evidenced by the popular grief and anger after his assassination, it also caused resentment. Many people, particularly members of the elite, found themselves in a position of being unwillingly bound to Caesar. M. Brutus is the obvious example. In fact, it was undeniably a key motive for Cato committing suicide that he preferred death to being pardoned by Caesar and being put in his debt.[424]

---

[415] *RRC* no. 450/2. Weinstock 1971: 251; Crawford, *RRC* 1.466.
[416] E.g. *IGRom*. 4.303-307, 928-929. Raubitschek 1954: 65-75.
[417] *IGRom*. 4.306. Weinstock 1971: 229; Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 306-307.
[418] Tatum 2008: 71-74; Hamlyn 2011: 97-99.
[419] Hamlyn 2011: 99-100.
[420] Suet. *Iul*. 84, 86; App. *B Civ*. 2.124, 130, 131, 145; Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.7.4; cf. Nic. Dam. 80. Weinstock 1971: 223-227. This oath may have been sworn by everyone (Weinstock 1971: 225-226).
[421] See previous chapter.
[422] Suet. *Iul*. 84.5.
[423] See previous chapter. Cf. Hamlyn 2011: 86.
[424] Val. Max. 5.1.10; Plut. *Cat. Min*. 72.2.

Although Caesar was not unique in espousing *pietas*, various claims by his enemies and by factional leaders after his death are strongly suggestive that it was a virtue that Caesar had prominently associated with himself.[425] The Pompeians used *pietas* as their watchword at Munda in 45.[426] This perhaps partly referred to a sense of duty to the Republic but it was principally used to highlight the duty of Pompeius' sons and their forces to avenge him.[427] Sex. Pompeius issued coins with the goddess Pietas in 45-44 BC and took on the *agnomen* 'Pius'.[428] He also produced coins referring to the tale of Sicilian brothers who rescued their parents from an eruption of Mt Etna by carrying them to safety.[429] This was obviously intended to stand in opposition to the Julian claims of piety. L. Antonius adopted 'Pietas' as a *cognomen*, either to boast of his loyalty to his brother or to support his claim to be the true heir of Caesar.[430] Lepidus had claims to noteworthy *pietas*. He was depicted on a coin-type of 42 BC along with the Vestal Aemilia, a famous example of purity and piety.[431] She also served to recall his office of *pontifex maximus*, in which he oversaw the fulfilment of Rome's most important duties to the gods, and his illustrious ancestor who had once held the priesthood. Therefore, while *pietas* had long been an important virtue at Rome, the emphasis on it in the wake of Caesar's assassination is most likely a sign of the great value he had placed on it as dictator.

It is probably reaching to assert, as Weinstock does, that the Augustan honours regarding virtues were directly copied from some conferred on or planned for Caesar. Yet it is more than probable that Caesar was the primary inspiration in broader terms. Certainly, Augustus' claims to *virtus* were in no way comparable to those of Caesar. Indeed, he heavily relied on others, Agrippa above all, for his victories. However, *virtus* was essential for the Roman statesman and would hardly have been excluded from his virtues. This was especially the case with Augustus since great emphasis was laid on him being the guarantor of Rome's victories and subsequent peace and prosperity. Thus, as part of his efforts to make up for his personal lack of great military achievements, Augustus promoted the idea that it was his auspices and favour among the gods that were responsible for Roman success.[432] In this way, he was able to take credit for the achievements of others and even seem to be divine.

Similarly, Augustus could not reasonably assert that he had exercised *clementia* to an extent that could rival Caesar. One need not deny that Augustus did perform notable acts of clemency. He

---

[425] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 254.
[426] App. *B Civ*. 2.104.
[427] Cf. Weinstock 1971: 254. Thus coins were issued by Gnaeus and Sextus with their father's portrait (e.g. *RRC* nos. 470/1, 477/1).
[428] *RRC* nos. 477/1-3, 511/1-4.
[429] *RRC* no. 511/3. Cf. Lycurg. *Leoc*. 95; *Mir. ausc*. 154; Strabo 6.2.3; Val. Max. 5.4 ext. 4; *Aetna* 625-646; Hyg. *Fab*. 254.4; etc.
[430] *RRC* nos. 516/1-5. Cass. Dio 48.5.4. Cf. Weinstock 1971: 255; cf. Crawford, *RRC* 2.742.
[431] *RRC* no. 494/1, cf. 419/3. See previous chapter.
[432] Cf. Suet. *Aug*. 96.1-2. See also Conclusion.

showed leniency or forgiveness to several opponents, like Lepidus and L. Antonius, and he tolerated dissent and opposition to a certain degree.[433] M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus is a particularly important figure with respect to Augustus' claims to this virtue and its significance for being honoured as father of the country. He fought under Brutus and Cassius at Philippi and surrendered to M. Antonius. By 40 BC, he had decided to shift his allegiance and was accepted by Octavian.[434] As the man who conferred the title *pater patriae* on Augustus on behalf of the Senate, Messalla acted as a symbol of Augustus' *clementia* and an example to the populace of the dutiful recipient of the *princeps*' benevolence. Nevertheless, Augustus was responsible for a number of deeds during his life that were very much contrary to a merciful disposition, and these lingered on in the public memory.[435] He committed or was party to a range of savage acts, especially in his earlier years, such as the executions at Perusia and the proscriptions in which Cicero was murdered. Despite asserting that he would emulate Caesar's *clementia* as early as 42, he did not shy away from executing those who were threats or potential threats.[436] Examples are Salvidienus, M. Antonius Antyllus, Caesarion and Lepidus' son. Even after the award of the *clipeus virtutis*, when one might suppose there was an obligation to live up to the honour, there were executions and exiles, such as those of Iulia and Iullus Antonius. Moreover, a great many enemies and rivals were eliminated one way or another in the course of the Triumviral Period, so he could afford to show leniency and tolerance much more than his adoptive father, whose behaviour had thus had greater weight and been far more impressive.[437] One can hardly doubt that Caesar's legacy was critical to Augustus being praised for *clementia*. It was Caesar's signature virtue and set him apart from other dominant individuals like Sulla and Pompeius, to whom Octavian had sometimes been very similar.[438] It was not a position merely adopted for the civil war either, since Caesar had opposed the executions of the Catilinarian conspirators in 63 BC. In the wake of Caesar's dictatorship, *clementia* was an essential feature of someone who wished to be viewed as a statesman and saviour of Rome, and this is the prime reason why it was ascribed to Augustus. Therefore, Augustus' *clementia* was clearly an echo of Caesar's.

Although the distasteful deeds of Augustus' past also undermined his claims to *iustitia*, he made pronounced efforts to behave in a righteous manner as *princeps*.[439] Caesar had attempted to act justly and moderately to help achieve concord but Augustus attained much greater success in this endeavour. It is clearly evident that in the long process of defining and maintaining his

---

[433] E.g. Suet. *Aug*. 54-56.1. Cf. Wardle 2014: 378-382.
[434] E.g. Vell. Pat. 2.71.1; App. *B Civ*. 4.38.
[435] E.g. Sen. *Clem*. 1.9.1, 1.11.1; Plin. *HN* 7.147-150; Tac. *Ann*. 1.10.
[436] ASPIRING TO CAESAR'S *CLEMENTIA*: Cass. Dio 48.3.6. Weinstock 1971: 240.
[437] Cf. Sen. *Clem*. 1.11.1.
[438] Sulla did show selective clemency, especially towards patricians, but it hardly outweighed his acts of brutality (cf. Dowling 2000).
[439] E.g. Suet. *Aug*. 32-34.

autocratic status he consciously took into account the sensibilities of those under his rule. He thus made explicit gestures of deference towards the Senate and *equites*, presented himself as respecting and upholding Republican traditions, and allowed the state to be governed, on the surface at least, according to law rather than his personal whim. In contrast to the proscriptions of the past or the *maiestas* trials of the future, Augustus' principate could well be characterised as just. The praise in the poets is, no doubt, not merely empty flattery but reflects genuine gratitude among the populace for the peace and stability his dominance had brought to Rome.[440] At the same time, *iustitia* was, like *clementia*, a means of building support and preventing opposition to that dominance. It must be remembered that the *clipeus virtutis* was awarded to him in 27 or 26 BC, before anyone could be certain that Augustus would stay committed to a strategy of moderation. One reason Augustus assumed the honour was to reassure the Senate and citizenry of the ideals behind his leadership, and one reason for senators supporting the proposal would have been to encourage him in his chosen manner of leadership. It is no coincidence that he was represented on an *aureus* of 28 BC as restoring law and order to the Roman people.[441] The evidence suggests that the choice of *iustitia* as one of the four virtues might have been influenced by Caesar's dictatorship. Indeed, Augustus, like Caesar, might have been attempting to evoke Romulus. On the other hand, justice had been a consistent inclusion among the virtues of the statesman, and this might have meant that *iustitia* would inevitably be named on the shield. Similarly, the reason four virtues were chosen was most likely to give them the appearance of fulfilling the statesman's canon, even though they did not match any previously attested selection.[442]

Augustus did have grounds for professing strong *pietas*. In the religious sphere, he was devoted to Apollo and paid honour to many other gods, and he placed great value on state priesthoods, the chief pontificate above all. He made considerable efforts to be seen as restoring traditional religion. With regards to family, he pursued vengeance for his adoptive father and laid great emphasis on his Julian heritage. Since he derived his legitimacy from his connection to Caesar, he had obvious political motives for doing this, but it was a mark of *pietas* nonetheless. As far as his country was concerned, he showed a sense of duty when he adopted the pose of upholding Roman customs and values, in contrast to the excessively oriental Antonius, or so he wished it to be perceived. This attitude carried forward with his mindfulness of traditional sensibilities as *princeps*, which led him to be cautious with his honours and powers, exemplified by his rejection of the office of dictator. Other actions like his contributions to the state treasury also demonstrated piety towards Rome. As with Caesar, Augustus aimed to cultivate *pietas* towards himself as well. He elicited oaths of allegiance from people within Italy and throughout the empire, and the benefactions he

[440] E.g. Verg. *Aen*.1.291-296, 6.791-794; Ov. *Met*. 15.832-834, *Fast*. 2.141-143.
[441] Rich and Williams 1999.
[442] Cf. Wallace-Hadrill 1981: 303-304.

made put people under a debt of obligation to him.[443] These include gifts like donatives, the offices and priesthoods he gave to individuals, and the clemency he showed to the likes of Messalla Corvinus. In fact, Messalla was described as the greatest example of piety and favour towards Augustus, and one of his sons was likewise praised for his *pietas* towards the whole Julian family.[444] Augustus implemented a raft of measures to foster allegiance to himself and create the impression of widespread popular support. In particular, he made himself a sacred figure through the possession of important priesthoods, through direct and indirect worship, and ultimately through the title *pater patriae*. In the *Res Gestae*, Augustus emphasises the consensus of Senate, *equites* and People in bestowing this title on him, which is intended to reflect the willing sense of loyalty and gratitude everyone supposedly felt.[445]

It is evident that Augustus' claims to *pietas* owed much to Caesar. Indeed, they would not have been possible without him. It was Caesar who had placed so much value on the chief pontificate and began making it part of a new autocratic government during his dictatorship. His immense pride in his Julian lineage with all its implications was directly adopted by Augustus and it formed a vital part of his principate's legitimacy. The justification of Augustus' political and religious authority by way of descent from Aeneas, as presented in so much art and poetry, originated with Caesar. Likewise, Caesar had set the precedent for creating a sense of *pietas* towards himself on the part of the Roman people. He had aimed at doing this by portraying himself as a benevolent father and god, Rome's most important priest and the source of its safety and success. Augustus used the same methods, with some variations of his own such as the worship of the *Lares augusti*. Augustus diverged from Caesar in his greater caution towards accepting honours and persistent concern for the Senate's sentiments regarding his position. Yet Caesar had paved the way in showing the consequences of being, or even simply appearing, arrogant and domineering. Moreover, Caesar had not been unaware of the importance of showing deference and a degree of humility. This is demonstrated, for example, by his response to Antonius' offer of a crown at the Lupercalia, where he stated that only Iuppiter is king of the Romans. He was not, however, consistent in maintaining this posture, most notably with his failure to stand for the senators in front of the Temple of Venus Genetrix, and he failed to douse the rumours promoted by his opponents that he had ambitions to revive the monarchy.

Therefore, Caesar did play a role in the virtues ascribed to Augustus on the *clipeus virtutis*, although the surviving evidence makes its extent difficult to judge. Although he probably did not provide a direct precedent for the golden shield, he at least influenced the selection of some of the virtues credited for it being awarded. There can be no doubt that Caesar was crucial for Augustus

[443] *RG* 25.2. Cooley 2009: 215-216.
[444] Ov. *Pont*. 2.2.21; Vell. Pat. 2.71.1. Weinstock 1971: 258.
[445] *RG* 35.1.

receiving the other key honours, namely the *corona civica*, the *corona obsidionalis* and the title *pater patriae*. Caesar had received each of them already, with essentially the same reasoning and connotations in his case as in that of Augustus. Other measures and honours, such as the chief pontificate, his identification with Romulus and his association with Iuppiter, also aided in portraying him as a father-figure. Each of these was closely emulated by Augustus. He did, of course, extend Caesar's plans and make additions of his own. He did not simply ape his adoptive father. Nevertheless, the incredible extent of Augustus' debt should be obvious. It was Caesar who first attempted to establish a form of divine autocracy where he was represented as fundamental to Rome's safety and success and where the whole country would be under an obligation of *pietas* towards him, like a household towards its *pater familias*. This blueprint was in turn adopted by Augustus in strengthening his own rule. Another key point to note is that all this must have been deliberate with respect to both the dictator and the *princeps*. There is too much that stemmed from their own actions and that too greatly suited their power. Indeed, their efforts in the religious arena are testimony to how much it mattered. Some Eastern influence is evident, especially with respect to the *clipeus virtutis*. On the other hand, there is so much that is distinctly Roman, such as the chief pontificate, the Genius and Lares, and the oak- and grass-crown. The underlying message was much the same as that which dominated ruler cult in the East: an outstanding, virtuous and divine individual had acted as a saviour and brought incredible benefactions; as a result, he was worthy of worship and loyalty. The fact that this message was communicated through traditional native means under Caesar and Augustus shows the active role that Romans often took in adapting foreign influences and inspirations.

Conclusion

Iulius Caesar played a vital role in the formation of the Principate and Augustus followed his example closely, even if he made gestures of moderation and restraint in order to minimise opposition to his dominance. Caesar was responsible for the principal measures of his dictatorship and not Cicero or the other senators. Having won the civil war, Caesar's intention was to found a divine autocracy where he would be worshipped as a father-figure and saviour who guaranteed the well-being and success of Rome. He thus identified or associated himself with various gods and personified virtues. He promoted his divine bloodline, which served as a key justification for his deification, along with his virtuous conduct. He emphasised his chief pontificate and enhanced his ties to the Vestal Virgins to acquire some of the connotations of their cult and to reinforce his paternal image. He portrayed himself as a new founder of the city and as the 'father of the fatherland'. Augustus imitated Caesar in all these respects. In fact, he copied him in many other ways too. For instance, he continued Caesar's revival of the *lusus Troiae*.[1] He exercised censorial powers but without holding the censorship, like Caesar did.[2] He carried on the geographical survey ordered by Caesar.[3] He performed a sort of human sacrifice as punishment, as Caesar had.[4] He planned an expedition to Britain.[5] His monopolisation of the auspices built on Caesar's plans to be represented as the source of Roman victories.[6] Caesar joined the augural college, and Augustus not only did the same but took on just about every other significant priesthood as well.[7] Some of these actions seem to have been part of a deliberate attempt by Augustus to emulate Caesar's antiquarian and academic interests.[8] Augustus' opinion on the *spolia opima* is another example of this.[9] The differences between Augustus' principate and Caesar's dictatorship are not nearly as great as are

---

[1] Suet. *Aug*. 43.2, *Tib*. 6.4; Cass. Dio 48.20.2, 49.43.3, 51.22.4, 54.26.1, 55.10.6. Weinstock 1971: 88-89. Augustus ceased to hold the *lusus Troiae* at some point between 2 BC and AD 4 because of an injury to Asinius Pollio's grandson (Suet. *Aug*. 43.2; cf. Cass. Dio 55.10.6). CAESAR AND THE *LUSUS TROIAE*: Suet. *Iul*. 39.2; Cass. Dio 43.23.6.

[2] E.g. *RG* 8.2-4; Suet. *Aug*. 27.5. Cooley 2009: 138-143; Wardle 2014: 215. Caesar selected the senators (e.g. Cic. *Div*. 2.23; Suet. *Iul*. 41.1, 76.3, 80.2; Cass. Dio 42.51.5, 43.27.2, 43.47.3) and was *praefectus morum* (Cic. *Fam*. 9.15.5; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1, cf. 43; Cass. Dio 43.14.4, cf. 44.5.3; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.68.5).

[3] Plin. *HN*. 3.17, 6.139, cf. 3.8, 3.16, 3.37, etc.; cf. Strabo 5.2.8, 6.1.11, 6.2.1, 6.2.11, 6.3.10. Wiseman 1992: 22-42.

[4] Sen. *Clem*. 1.11.1; Suet. *Aug*. 15; Cass. Dio 48.14.3-4; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.74.4; App. *B Civ*. 5.48-49. The number 300 appears in Suetonius and Dio but should not be taken literally. It was merely a way of saying 'a great many' (Weinstock 1971: 398 n. 10). CAESAR: e.g. Cass. Dio 43.24.3-4. Hamlyn 2011: 65-66, 68-69.

[5] Cass. Dio 49.38.2, 53.22.5, 53.25.2. Reinhold 1988: 73; Rich 1990: 156-157.

[6] E.g. *RG* 4.2; cf. Suet. *Aug*. 96.1-2. Cooley 2009: 124; Dalla Rosa 2011. Caesar, for example, was to have special thanksgivings performed in his name whenever a Roman victory occurred (Cass. Dio 43.44.6; Weinstock 1971: 64, 107). Caesar's model, Romulus, had special augural abilities, as apparently did his ancestor, Ascanius (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom*. 2.5.5). Note also that Caesar's cult statue in the Temple of Divus Iulius showed him *capite velato* and holding a *lituus* (*RRC* no. 540/1; Richardson 1992: 214).

[7] E.g. *RG* 7.3. CAESAR: Cass. Dio 42.51.4; cf. Cic. *Fam*. 13.68. Cf. *RRC* nos. 456/1, 466/1, 467/1, etc. *MRR* 2.293; Lewis 1955: 22; Weinstock 1971: 32; Szemler 1972: 156. Caesar may have joined the college of *quindecemviri* as well (Cass. Dio 42.51.4).

[8] Cf. Scheid 2005: 186. White (1988) argues against the notion that Augustus distanced himself from Caesar as *princeps*.

[9] Livy 4.20.7.

generally stated. The chief difference was that Augustus was more successful in managing how his rule was perceived. His supposed moderation and restraint consisted of gestures that were necessary to appease potential sources of resistance. Otherwise, Augustus' actions clearly aimed to establish a new system of autocratic government in the mould created by Caesar. Therefore, Weinstock's main thesis was broadly correct, even if it requires modification in some of its finer points. The relatively brief period of Caesar's dictatorship compared to Augustus' principate perhaps contributed to its diminished importance in modern views of the creation of the imperial system.

Weinstock's argument implied that religion was greatly important in the formation and maintenance of Caesar's and Augustus' power. Once again, this is correct. Both men implemented an extensive range of measures in the religious sphere to portray themselves as divine, divinely favoured or as possessing a special sacred authority and status. This would hardly have been the case had religion not been of immense significance, and not merely in a political sense. Emotion and belief are concepts that should be considered as applicable to ruler cult. Religion was a vital part of Caesar's and Augustus' positions, no less than their legal prerogatives, the military or other proposed factors. The measures employed by Caesar, and in turn Augustus, were a mix of Hellenistic and Roman elements. Since both men were the driving force behind their respective honours, Eastern influence was being actively and deliberately introduced from above. It was not a case of foreign contact and migration forcing foreign practices to be adopted at Rome. The fact that some of the Roman honours, like the *corona civica*, were being used to express ideas common in Hellenistic ruler cult shows that there was a conscious process of interpretation and adaptation rather than simple mimicry. Besides borrowing from Hellenistic practices, Caesar built on existing models and examples, as can be seen from the precedents related to Demetrius Poliorcetes, Sulla and Cicero. Caesar did not start with a blank slate but this does not diminish his importance as the effective founder of the Principate. No one had done so much or brought together so many religious and political elements in an attempt to revolutionise the government and society of Rome. It was the scale of his ambitions as much as anything else that made Caesar such an indispensable figure in the creation of the Principate, even if Augustus had not followed his plans as closely as he did.

Bibliography

Ancient Sources

Aelian, *De natura animalium*, in A. F. Scholfield (tr.) 1958-1959. *Aelian: On the Characteristics of Animals*. London: Heinemann.

Aelian, *Varia Historia*, in N. G. Wilson (tr.) 1997. *Aelian: Historical Miscellany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, *Eumenides* and *Supplices*, in A. H. Sommerstein (tr.) 2008. *Aeschylus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aetna, in J. W. Duff and A. M. Duff (trs.) 1934. *Minor Latin Poets*. London: Heinemann.

Alcaeus, in D. A. Campbell (tr.) 1990. *Greek Lyric I: Sappho and Alcaeus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ammianus Marcellinus, in J. C. Rolfe (tr.) 1940-1952. *Ammianus Marcellinus*. London: Heinemann.

Anthologia Palatina, in W. R. Paton (tr.) 1916-1918. *The Greek Anthology*. London: Heinemann.

Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, in J. G. Frazer (tr.) 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*. London: Heinemann.

Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*, in W. H. Race (tr.) 2008. *Apollonius Rhodius: Argonautica*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Appian, *Civil Wars*, *Hannibalic War*, *Punic Wars* and *Wars in Spain*, in H. White (tr.) 1912-1913. *Appian's Roman History*. London: Heinemann.

Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, in J. A. Hanson (tr.) 1989. *Apuleius: Metamorphoses*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aratus, *Phaenomena*, in A. W. Mair and G. R. Mair (trs.) 1921. *Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus*. London: Heinemann.

Aristides, *Orationes*, in C. A. Behr (tr.) 1981-1986. *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Aristides, *Orationes*, in W. Dindorf (ed.) 1829. *Aristides*. Leipzig: G. Reimer.

Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, *Pax* and *Plutus*, in J. Henderson (tr.) 1998-2007. *Aristophanes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Aristotle, *Ethica Nicomachea*, in H. Rackham (tr.) 1934. *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. London: Heinemann.

Aristotle, *Politica*, in H. Rackham (tr.) 1944. *Aristotle: Politics*. London: Heinemann.

Arnobius, *Adversus nationes*, in F. Oehler (ed.) 1846. *Arnobii Oratoris Adversus Nationes Libri Septem*. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.

Arnobius, *Adversus nationes*, in A. Reifferscheid (ed.) 1875. *Arnobii Adversus Nationes Libri VII*. Vienna: C. Geroldi.

Arrian, *Anabasis* and *Indica*, in P. A. Brunt (tr.) 1976-1983. *Arrian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Asconius, in R. G. Lewis (tr.) 2006. *Asconius: Commentaries on Speeches of Cicero*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, in S. D. Olson (tr.) 2006-2012. *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, in G. E. McCracken and others (trs.) 1957-1972. *Augustine: The City of God Against the Pagans*. London: Heinemann.

Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, in J. C. Rolfe (tr.) 1927-1952. *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*. London: Heinemann.

Ausonius, in R. P. H. Green (ed.) 1991. *The Works of Ausonius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ausonius, in R. Peiper (ed.) 1886. *Decimi Magni Ausonii Burdigalensis Opuscula*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Bacchylides, in D. A. Campbell (tr.) 1992. *Greek Lyric: Bacchylides, Corinna, and Others*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bellum Africum and *Bellum Alexandrinum*, in A. G. Way (tr.) 1955. *Caesar: Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*. London: Heinemann.

Caesar, *Bellum Civile*, in A. G. Peskett (tr.) 1914. *Caesar: The Civil Wars*. London: Heinemann.

Caesar, *Bellum Civile*, in C. Damon (tr.) 2016. *Caesar: Civil War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caesar, *Bellum Gallicum*, in H. J. Edwards (tr.) 1917. *Caesar: The Gallic War*. London: Heinemann.

Callimachus, *Hymns*, in in A. W. Mair and G. R. Mair (trs.) 1921. *Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus*. London: Heinemann.

Cassius Dio, in E. Cary (tr.) 1914-1927. *Dio's Roman History*. London: Heinemann.

Cassius Dio, in U. P. Boissevain (ed.) 1895-1901. *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Cato, *De agricultura*, in W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash (trs.) 1934. *Marcus Porcius Cato: On Agriculture; Marcus Terentius Varro: On Agriculture*. London: Heinemann.

Catullus, in F. W. Cornish, J. P. Postgate, J. W. Mackail and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1988. *Catullus, Tibullus, Pervigilium Veneris*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Censorinus, *De die natali*, in N. Sallmann (ed.) 1983. *Censorini De Die Natali Liber Ad Q. Caerellium*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Charisius, *Ars grammatica*, in H. Keil (ed.) 1857. *Grammatici Latini*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner.

Cicero, *Ad Caesarem Iuniorem*, *Epistulae ad Brutum* and *Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 2002. *Cicero: Letters to Quintus and Brutus, Letter Fragments, Letter to Octavian, Invectives, Handbook of Electioneering*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Brutus*, in G. L. Hendrickson and H. M. Hubbell (trs.) 1962. *Cicero: Brutus, Orator*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De consolatione* or *De luctu minuendo*, in J. C. Orelli, J. G. Baiter and K. Halm (eds.) 1861. *M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia*. 2nd ed. Vol. 4. Zurich: Orell Füssli.

Cicero, *De consulatu suo*, in J. Blänsdorf (ed.) 2011. *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum*. 4th ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Cicero, *De divinatione and De senectute*, in W. A. Falconer (tr.) 1923. *Cicero: De Senectute, De Amicitia, De Divinatione*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De domo sua*, *De haruspicum responso*, *Pro Archia*, *Pro Plancio*, *Post reditum in senatu* and *Post reditum ad populum*, in N. H. Watts (tr.) 1923. *Cicero: Pro Archia Poeta, Post Reditum in Senatu, Post Reditum ad Quirites, De Domo Sua, De Haruspicum Responsis, Pro Plancio*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De fato* and *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, in H. Rackham (tr.) 1948. *Cicero: De Oratore III, De Fato, Paradoxa Stoicorum, De Partitione Oratoria*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De finibus*, in H. Rackham (tr.) 1931. *Cicero: De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De inventione rhetorica*, in H. M. Hubbell (tr.) 1949. *Cicero: De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De lege agraria*, in J. H. Freese (tr.) 1930. *Cicero: Pro Publio Quinctio, Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino, Pro Quinto Roscio Comoedo, Pro Lege Agraria I, II, III*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De natura deorum*, in H. Rackham (tr.) 1933. *Cicero: De Natura Deorum, Academica*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De legibus* and *De re publica*, in C. W. Walker (tr.) 1928. *Cicero: De Re Publica, De Legibus*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De officiis*, in W. Miller (tr.) 1913. *Cicero: De Officiis*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De oratore*, in E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham (trs.) 1942-1948. *Cicero: De Oratore*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *De provinciis consularibus*, *Pro Balbo* and *Pro Caelio*, in R. Gardner (tr.) 1958. *Cicero: Pro Caelio, De Provinciis Consularibus, Pro Balbo*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 1999. *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 2001. *Cicero: Letters to Friends*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *In Catilinam*, *Pro Flacco*, *Pro Murena* and *Pro Sulla*, in C. MacDonald (tr.) 1976. *Cicero: In Catilinam, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *In Pisonem*, *Pro Fonteio*, *Pro Ligario*, *Pro Marcello*, *Pro Milone*, *Pro Rabirio Postumo* and *Pro rege Deiotaro*, in N. H. Watts (tr.) 1953. *Cicero: Pro T. Annio Milone, In L. Calpurnium Pisonem, Pro M. Aemilio Scauro, Pro M. Fonteio, Pro C. Rabirio Postumo, Pro M. Marcello, Pro Q. Ligario, Pro Rege Deiotaro*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *In Vatinium* and *Pro Sestio*, in R. Gardner (tr.) 1958. *Cicero: Pro Sestio and In Vatinium*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *In Verrem*, in L. H. G. Greenwood (tr.) 1928-1935. *Cicero: The Verrine Orations*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *Orationes Philippicae*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey, J. T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald (trs.) 2009. *Cicero: Philippics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cicero, *Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*, in H. G. Hodge (tr.) 1927. *Cicero: Pro Lege Manilia, Pro Caecina, Pro Cluentio, Pro Rabirio Perduellionis*. London: Heinemann.

Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes*, in J. E. King (tr.) 1945. *Cicero: Tusculan Disputations*. London: Heinemann.

Claudian, *Gigantomachia*, in M. Platnauer (tr.) 1922. *Claudian*. London: Heinemann.

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus*, in G. W. Butterworth (tr.) 1919. *Clement of Alexandria: The Exhortation to the Greeks, The Rich Man's Salvation, To the Newly Baptised*. London: Heinemann.

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus*, in O. Stählin (ed.) 1905. *Clemens Alexandrinus: Protrepticus und Paedagogus*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs.

Cornelius Nepos, in E. O. Winstedt (ed.) 1904. *Corneli Nepotis Vitae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cornelius Nepos, *Atticus*, in E. S. Forster and J. C. Rolfe (trs.) 1929. *Lucius Annaeus Florus: Epitome of Roman History; Cornelius Nepos*. London: Heinemann.

Cornutus, *Theologia Graeca*, in K. Lang (ed.) 1881. *Cornuti Theologiae Graecae Compendium*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Cornutus, *Theologia Graeca*, in R. S. Hays (tr.) 1983. *Lucius Annaeus Cornutus'* Epidrome. PhD thesis. University of Texas.

Curtius Rufus, in J. C. Rolfe (tr.) 1946. *Quintus Curtius*. London: Heinemann.

De mirabilibus auscultationibus, in W. S. Hett (tr.) 1936. *Aristotle: Minor Works*. London: Heinemann.

De praenominibus, in J. Briscoe (ed.) 1998. *Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart: Teubner.

De viris illustribus, in F. Pichlmayr and R. Gruendel (eds.) 1970. *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber De Caesaribus*. Leipzig: Teubner.

De viris illustribus, in W. K. Sherwin (tr.) 1972. *Deeds of Famous Men*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Demosthenes, in J. H. Vince and others (trs.) 1926-1949. *Demosthenes*. London: Heinemann.

Dinarchus, *In Demosthenem*, in J. O. Burtt (tr.) 1954. *Minor Attic Orators*. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann.

Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes*, in J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby (trs.) 1932-1951. *Dio Chrysostom*. London: Heinemann.

Diodorus Siculus, in C. H. Oldfather and others (trs.) 1933-1967. *Diodorus of Sicily*. London: Heinemann.

Diogenes Laertius, in R. D. Hicks (tr.) 1925. *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. London: Heinemann.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae*, in E. Cary (tr.) 1937-1950. *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus*. London: Heinemann.

Ennius, *Annales* and *Epigrammata*, in E. H. Warmington (tr.) 1935. *Remains of Old Latin*. Vol. 1. London: Heinemann.

Epigrammata Bobiensia, in W. Speyer (ed.) 1963. *Epigrammata Bobiensia*. Leipzig: Teubner.

[Eratosthenes], *Catasterismi*, in A. Olivieri (ed.) 1897. *Pseudo-Eratosthenis Catasterismi*. Leipzig: Teubner.

[Eratosthenes], *Catasterismi*, in T. Condos (tr.) 1997. *Star Myths of the Greeks and Romans: A Sourcebook*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes Press.

Euripides, *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Bacchae*, *Helen* and *Rhesus*, in D. Kovacs (tr.) 1994-2002. *Euripides*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Euripides, *Phaëthon*, in A. Nauck (ed.) 1889. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner.

Eutropius, in C. Santini (ed.) 1979. *Eutropii Breviarum Ab Urbe Condita*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Florus, in E. S. Forster and J. C. Rolfe (trs.) 1929. *Lucius Annaeus Florus: Epitome of Roman History; Cornelius Nepos*. London: Heinemann.

Frontinus, *Strategemata*, in C. E. Bennett and M. B. McElwain (trs.) 1925. *Frontinus: The Stratagems and the Aqueducts of Rome*. London: Heinemann.

Gaius, *Institutiones*, in E. Poste and E. A. Whittuck (trs.) 1904. *Gai Institutiones*. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Granius Licinianus, in N. Criniti (ed.) 1981. *Grani Liciniani Reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Herodian, in C. R. Whittaker (tr.) 1969-1970. *Herodian*. London: Heinemann.

Herodotus, in A. D. Godley (tr.) 1921-1926. *Herodotus*. London: Heinemann.

Hesiod, *Opera et Dies* and *Theogonia*, in G. W. Most (tr.) 2006-2007. *Hesiod*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hipponax, in D. E. Gerber (tr.) 1999. *Greek Iambic Poetry From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Homer, *Iliad*, in A. T. Murray and W. F. Wyatt (trs.) 1999-2003. *Homer: Iliad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Homer, *Odyssey*, in A. T. Murray and G. E. Dimock (trs.) 1995. *Homer: The Odyssey*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Homeric Hymns, in M. L. West (ed.) 2003. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Horace, *Carmen saeculare*, *Carmina* and *Epodi*, in N. Rudd (tr.) 2003. *Horace: Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Horace, *Epistulae* and *Satirae*, in H. R. Fairclough (tr.) 1929. *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. London: Heinemann.

Hyginus, *Fabulae*, in J.-Y. Boriaud (ed.) 1997. *Hygin: Fables*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Hyginus, *Fabulae*, in R. S. Smith and S. M. Trzaskoma (trs.) 2007. *Apollodorus'* Library *and Hyginus'* Fabulae*: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Hyginus, *Poetica astronomica*, in G. Viré (ed.) 1992. *Hygini De Astronomia*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Hyginus, *Poetica astronomica*, in T. Condos (tr.) 1970. *The* Katasterismoi *of the Pseudo-Eratosthenes: A Mythological Commentary and English Translation*. PhD thesis. University of Southern California.

Hyginus, *Poetica astronomica*, in T. Condos (tr.) 1997. *Star Myths of the Greeks and Romans: A Sourcebook*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes Press.

Hyperides, *Epitaphios* and *In Demosthenem*, in J. O. Burtt (tr.) 1954. *Minor Attic Orators*. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann.

Isidore, *Etymologiae*, in W. M. Lindsay (ed.) 1911. *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum Sive Originum Libri XX*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Isocrates, in G. Norlin and L. van Hook (trs.) 1928-1945. *Isocrates*. London: Heinemann.

Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* and *Bellum Judaicum*, in H. St J. Thackeray and R. Marcus (trs.) 1926-1963. *Josephus*. London: Heinemann.

Julianus, *Orationes*, in W. C. Wright (tr.) 1913-1923. *The Works of the Emperor Julian*. London: Heinemann.

Justinus, *Epitome*, in J. C. Yardley (tr.) 1994. *Justin: Epitome of the Philippic History of Pompeius Trogus*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Justinus, *Epitome*, in O. Seel (ed.) 1972. *M. Iuniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Juvenal, in S. M. Braund (tr.) 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* 1-2, in E. Heck and A. Wlosok (eds.) 2005. *L. Caelius Firmianus Lactantius: Divinarum Institutionum Libri Septem*. Fasc. 1. Munich: Saur.

Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* 3-7, in E. Heck and A. Wlosok (eds.) 2007-2011. *L. Caelius Firmianus Lactantius: Divinarum Institutionum Libri Septem*. Fasc. 2-4. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, in A. Bowen and P. Garnsey (trs.) 2003. *Lactantius: Divine Institutes*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Livy, in B. O. Foster and others (trs.) 1919-1951. *Livy*. London: Heinemann.

Livy, *Periochae*, in A. C. Schlesinger (tr.) 1959. *Livy: Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*. Vol. 14. London: Heinemann.

Lucan, in J. D. Duff (tr.) 1928. *Lucan*. London: Heinemann.

Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, in W. H. D. Rouse and M. F. Smith (trs.) 1992. *Lucretius: De Rerum Natura*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lucian, *Dialogi deorum* and *Macrobii*, in A. M. Harmon and M. D. Macleod (trs.) 1913-1967. *Lucian*. London: Heinemann.

Lycophron, *Alexandra*, in A. W. Mair and G. R. Mair (trs.) 1921. *Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus*. London: Heinemann.

Lycurgus, *In Leocratem*, in J. O. Burtt (tr.) 1954. *Minor Attic Orators*. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann.

Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, in R. A. Kaster (tr.) 2011. *Macrobius: Saturnalia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Manilius, *Astronomica*, in G. P. Goold (tr.) 1977. *Manilius: Astronomica*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Martial, *Epigrammata*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 1993. *Martial: Epigrams*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Martianus Capella, in J. Willis (ed.) 1983. *Martianus Capella*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Minucius Felix, *Octavius*, in T. R. Glover, G. H. Rendall and W. C. A. Kerr (trs.) 1931. *Tertullian, Minucius Felix*. London: Heinemann.

Naevius, *Bellum Poenicum*, E. H. Warmington (tr.) 1936. *Remains of Old Latin*. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann.

Nicander, *Theriaca*, in A. S. F. Gow and A. F. Scholfield (eds.) 2010. *Poems and Poetical Fragments: Nicander of Colophon*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nicolaus Damascenus, in J. Bellemore (tr.) 1984. *Nicolaus of Damascus: Life of Augustus*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Nonius, in W. M. Lindsay (ed.) 1903. *Nonii Marcelli De Conpendiosa Doctrina*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, in W. H. D. Rouse (tr.) 1940. *Nonnos: Dionysiaca*. London: Heinemann.

Obsequens, in A. C. Schlesinger (tr.) 1959. *Livy: Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*. Vol. 14. London: Heinemann.

Origo Gentis Romanae, in F. Pichlmayr and R. Gruendel (eds.) 1970. *Sexti Aurelii Victoris Liber De Caesaribus*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Orosius, in K. Zangemeister (ed.) 1889. *Pauli Orosii Historiarum Adversum Paganos Libri VII*. Lepzig: Teubner.

Ovid, *Amores* and *Heroides*, in G. Showerman and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1977. *Ovid: Heroides and Amores*. London: Heinemann.

Ovid, *Ars amatoria*, in J. H. Mozley and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1979. *Ovid: The Art of Love, and Other Poems*. London: Heinemann.

Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* and *Tristia*, in A. L. Wheeler and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1988. *Ovid: Tristia, Ex Ponto*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Fasti*, in J. G. Frazer and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1989. *Ovid: Fasti*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, in F. J. Miller and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1984. *Ovid: Metamorphoses*. London: Heinemann.

Pausanias, in W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod (trs.) 1918-1935. *Pausanias: Description of Greece*. London: Heinemann.

Persius, in S. M. Braund (tr.) 2004. *Juvenal and Persius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Petronius, *Satyricon*, in M. Heseltine, W. H. D. Rouse and E. H. Warmington (trs.) 1969. *Petronius; Seneca: Apocolocyntosis*. London: Heinemann.

Philo, *De decalogo*, in F. H. Colson (tr.) 1937. *Philo*. Vol. 7. London: Heinemann.

Philostratus, *Imagines*, in A. Fairbanks (tr.) 1931. *Philostratus: Imagines; Callistratus: Descriptions*. London: Heinemann.

Pindar, *Nemean Odes*, *Olympian Odes* and *Pythian Odes*, in W. H. Race (tr.) 1997. *Pindar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Plato, *Charmides*, in W. R. M. Lamb (tr.) 1927. *Plato: Charmides, Alcibiades I and II, Hipparchus, The Lovers, Theages, Minos, Epinomis*. London: Heinemann.

Plato, *Laches* and *Protagoras*, in W. R. M. Lamb (tr.) 1937. *Plato: Laches, Protagoras, Meno, Euthydemus*. London: Heinemann.

Plato, *Leges*, in R. G. Bury (ed.) 1926. *Plato: Laws*. London: Heinemann.

Plato, *Phaedo*, in H. N. Fowler (tr.) 1914. *Plato: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*. London: Heinemann.

Plato, *Respublica*, in C. Emlyn-Jones and W. Preddy (trs.) 2013. *Plato: Republic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Plato, *Theaetetus*, in H. N. Fowler (tr.) 1921. *Plato: Theaetetus, Sophist*. London: Heinemann.

Plautus, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia*, *Captivi*, *Casina*, *Mercator*, *Persa*, *Pseudolus*, *Rudens* and *Trinummus*, in W. de Melo (tr.) 2011-2013. *Plautus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pliny the Elder, *Historia Naturalis*, in H. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones and D. E. Eichholz (trs.) 1938-1963. *Pliny: Natural History*. London: Heinemann.

Plutarch, *Aemilius Paullus*, *Agesilaus*, *Alexander*, *Antonius*, *Brutus*, *Caesar*, *Camillus*, *Cato Minor*, *Cicero*, *Coriolanus*, *Crassus*, *Demetrius*, *Dion*, *Flamininus*, *Gaius Gracchus*, *Lycurgus*, *Lysander*, *Marcellus*, *Marius*, *Numa*, *Pompeius*, *Publicola*, *Romulus*, *Sertorius*, *Sulla*, *Theseus*, in B. Perrin (tr.) 1914-1926. *Plutarch's Lives*. London: Heinemann.

Plutarch, *De Alexandri fortuna*, *De cohibenda ira*, *De defectu oraculorum*, *De* Ei *apud Delphos*, *De fortuna Romanorum*, *De Iside et Osiride*, *De Pythiae oraculis*, *De se ipsum citra invidiam laudando*, *Quaestiones Romanae* and *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, in F. C. Babbitt and others (trs.) 1927-1976. *Plutarch's Moralia*. London: Heinemann.

Polyaenus, *Strategemata*, in P. Krentz and E. L. Wheeler (trs.) 1994. *Polyaenus: Stratagems of War*. Chicago, IL: Ares.

Polybius, in W. R. Paton (tr.) 1922-1927. *The Histories*. London: Heinemann.

Pompeius Festus, *De verborum significatu*, in W. M. Lindsay (ed.) 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu Quae Supersunt Cum Pauli Epitome*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Pomponius Mela, *De chorographia*, in K. Frick (ed.) 1880. *Pomponii Melae De Chorographia Libri Tres*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Porphyry, *Vita Pythagorae*, in A. Nauck (ed.) 1886. *Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici Opuscula Selecta*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Priscian, *Institutio de arte grammatica*, in H. Keil and M. Hertz (eds.) 1855-1859. *Grammatici Latini*. Vols. 2-3. Leipzig: Teubner.

Propertius, in G. P. Goold (tr.) 1990. *Propertius: Elegies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pseudo-Acro, in O. Keller (ed.) 1902-1904. *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetustiora*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ptolemy, *Geographia*, in K. Müller (ed.) 1883. *Claudii Ptolemæi Geographia*. Vol. 1.1. Paris: Didot.

Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, in H. E. Butler (tr.) 1920-1922. *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria*. London: Heinemann.

Res Gestae Divi Augusti, in J. Scheid (ed.) 2007. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Rhetorica ad Herennium, in H. Caplan (tr.) 1954. *[Cicero]: Ad C. Herennium*. London: Heinemann.

Sallust, *De Catilinae coniuratione*, in J. C. Rolfe and J. T. Ramsey (trs.) 2013. *Sallust: The War with Catiline, The War with Jugurtha*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[Sallust], *Epistula ad Caesarem senem* and *Historiae*, in J. T. Ramsey (tr.) 2015. *Sallust: Fragments of the Histories, Letters to Caesar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sallust, *Historiae*, in B. Maurenbrecher (ed.) 1891-1893. *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner.

[Sallust], *In Ciceronem*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 2002. *Cicero: Letters to Quintus and Brutus, Letter Fragments, Letter to Octavian, Invectives, Handbook of Electioneering*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scholia Bobiensia, in T. Stangl (ed.) 1912. *Ciceronis Orationum Scholiastae*. Vienna: Tempsky.

Scholia Veronensia ad Vergilii Aeneidem, in G. Thilo and H. Hagen (eds.) 1902. *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*. Vol. 3. Fasc. 2. Leipzig: Teubner.

Scholia in Demosthenem, in W. Dindorf (ed.) 1851. *Demosthenes*. Vols. 8, 9. Oxford: Typographeus Academicus.

Scriptores Historiae Augustae, *Aelius*, *Alexander Severus*, *Aurelian* and *Marcus Aurelius*, in D. Magie (tr.) 1921-1932. *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. London: Heinemann.

Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*, in M. Winterbottom (tr.) 1974. *The Elder Seneca: Declamations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, in M. Heseltine, W. H. D. Rouse and E. H. Warmington (trs.) 1969. *Petronius; Seneca: Apocolocyntosis*. London: Heinemann.

Seneca, *De brevitate vitae*, *De clementia* and *De ira*, in J. W. Basore (tr.) 1928-1935. *Seneca: Moral Essays*. London: Heinemann.

Seneca, *Epistulae*, in R. M. Gummere (tr.) 1917-1925. *Seneca: Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. London: Heinemann.

[Seneca], *Octavia*, in J. G. Fitch (tr.) 2002-2004. *Seneca: Tragedies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seneca, *Quaestiones naturales*, in H. M. Hine (ed.) 1996. *L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum Libros*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Seneca, *Troades*, in J. G. Fitch (tr.) 2002-2004. *Seneca: Tragedies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Servius, *Aeneid*, in G. Thilo (ed.) 1881-1884. *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Servius, *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, in G. Thilo (ed.) 1887. *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica Commentarii*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Silius Italicus, *Punica*, in J. D. Duff (tr.) 1927-1934. *Silius Italicus: Punica*. London: Heinemann.

Solinus, in T. Mommsen (ed.) 1895. *C. Iulii Solini Collectanea Rerum Memorabilium*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Weidmann.

Sophocles, *Philoctetes*, in H. Lloyd-Jones (tr.) 1994. *Sophocles*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Statius, *Silvae* and *Thebais*, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 2003. *Statius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Stephanus Byzantius, in M. Billerbeck and others (eds.) 2006-. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Strabo, *Geographia*, in H. L. Jones (tr.) 1917-1949. *The Geography of Strabo*. London: Heinemann.

Suda, in A. Adler (ed.) 1928-1938. *Suidae Lexicon*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Suetonius, *De grammaticis*, in J. C. Rolfe (tr.) 1914. *Suetonius*. Vol. 2. London: Heinemann.

Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*, *Divus Claudius*, *Divus Iulius*, *Nero* and *Tiberius*, in J. C. Rolfe (tr.) 1914-1951. *Suetonius*. London: Heinemann.

Tacitus, *Annales*, in C. H. Moore and J. Jackson (trs.) 1931-1937. *Tacitus: The Histories, The Annals*. London: Heinemann.

Terence, *Andria*, in J. Barsby (tr.) 2001. *Terence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tertullian, *Apologeticus* and *De spectaculis*, in T. R. Glover, G. H. Rendall and W. C. A. Kerr (trs.) 1931. *Tertullian, Minucius Felix*. London: Heinemann.

Tertullian, *De corona militis*, in J. Fontaine (ed.) 1966. *Q.Septimi Florentis Tertulliani* De Corona. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Theocritus, *Idylls*, in N. Hopkinson (tr.) 2015. *Theocritus, Moschus, Bion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, in J. C. T. Otto (ed.) 1861. *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi*. Vol. 8. Jena: F. Mauke.

Thucydides, in C. F. Smith (tr.) 1921-1930. *Thucydides*. London: Heinemann.

Tibullus, in F. W. Cornish, J. P. Postgate, J. W. Mackail and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1988. *Catullus, Tibullus, Pervigilium Veneris*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Valerius Maximus, in D. R. Shackleton Bailey (tr.) 2000. *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Varro, *De lingua Latina*, in R. G. Kent (tr.) 1938. *Varro: On the Latin Language*. London: Heinemann.

Varro, *De re rustica*, in W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash (trs.) 1934. *Marcus Porcius Cato: On Agriculture; Marcus Terentius Varro: On Agriculture*. London: Heinemann.

Velleius Paterculus, in F. W. Shipley (tr.) 1924. *Velleius Paterculus and Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. London: Heinemann.

Virgil, *Aeneid*, *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, in H. R. Fairclough and G. P. Goold (trs.) 1999-2000. *Virgil*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[Virgil], *Ciris* and *Lydia*, in H. R. Fairclough and G. P. Goold (trs.) 2000. *Virgil*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Xenophon, *Agesilaus*, *Cynegeticus* and *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*, in E. C. Marchant (tr.) 1925. *Xenophon: Scripta Minora*. London: Heinemann.

Xenophon, *Anabasis*, in C. L. Brownson (tr.) 1922. *Xenophon: Anabasis*. London: Heinemann.

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, in C. L. Brownson (tr.) 1918-1921. *Xenophon: Hellenica*. London: Heinemann.

Zonaras, in U. P. Boissevain (ed.) 1895-1901. *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Zonaras, in W. Dindorf (ed.) 1868-1875. *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome Historiarum*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Zosimus, in L. Mendelssohn (ed.) 1887. *Zosimi Comitis et Exadvocati Fisci Historia Nova*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Zosimus, in R. T. Ridley (tr.) 1982. *Zosimus: New History*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies.

Compilations of Sources

Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. 1906-1927. *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*. Paris: E. Leroux.

Burnett, A., M. Amandry and P. P. Ripollès. 1998. *Roman Provincial Coinage, Volume 1: From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC-AD 69)*. London: British Museum Press; Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Crawford, M. H. 1974-1983. *Roman Republican Coinage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Degrassi, A. 1957-1963. *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.

Dessau, H. 1892-1916. *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Diels, H. and W. Kranz (eds.) 1934-1937. *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 5th ed. Berlin: Weidmann.

Dillon, M. and L. Garland. 2015. *Ancient Rome: Social and Historical Documents from the Early Republic to the Death of Augustus*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

Dittenberger, W. (ed.) 1903-1905. *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Dittenberger, W. (ed.) 1915-1924. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 3rd ed. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Engelmann, H. and R. Merkelbach (eds.) 1972-1973. *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*. Bonn: Habelt.

Henzen, W. (ed.) 1874. *Acta Fratrum Arvalium Quae Supersunt*. Berlin: G. Reimer.

Lewis, N. and M. Reinhold (eds.) 1990. *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings*. Vol. 1. 3rd ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mazard, J. 1955. *Corpus Nummorum Numidiae Mauretaniaeque*. Paris: Arts et Métiers Graphiques.

Müller, K. (ed.) 1841-1870. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. Paris: A. Firmin Didot.

Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1862-. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: G. Reimer.

Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften. 1873-. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin: G. Reimer.

Sokolowski, F. (ed.) 1955. *Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. 1923-. Leiden: Brill.

Sutherland, C. H. V. and R. A. G. Carson (eds.) 1984. *Roman Imperial Coinage*. Vol. 1. Revised ed. London: Spink and Son.

Unione Accademica Nazionale. 1931-. *Inscriptiones Italiae*. Rome: Libreria dello Stato.

Von Arnim, H. (ed.) 1903-1905. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Modern Works

Adcock, F. E. 1932. 'Caesar's Dictatorship', pp. 691-740, in S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock and M. P. Charlesworth (eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History*. 1st ed. Vol. 9. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Alföldi, A. 1953. *Studien über Caesars Monarchie*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.

Alföldi, A. 1970. Review of H. Gesche, *Die Vergottung Caesars*. *Phoenix* 24.2: 166-176.

Alföldi, A. 1971. *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Alföldi, A. 1975. Review of S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*. *Gnomon* 47.2: 154-179.

Alföldy, G. 1996. 'Subject and ruler, subjects and methods: an attempt at a conclusion', pp. 254-261, in A. Small (ed.) *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Allen, W. 1954. 'Cicero's Conceit'. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 85: 121-144.

Altheim, F. 1938. *A History of Roman Religion*. London: Methuen.

Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ando, C. 2008. *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ando, C. 2009. 'Evidence and Orthopraxy'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 99: 171-181.

Badian, E. 1981. 'The deification of Alexander the Great', pp. 27-71, in H. J. Dell (ed.) *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honour of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.

Bailey, C. 1932. *Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1950. 'The "Divinity" of Alexander'. *Historia* 1.3: 363-388.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1951. 'Sulla Felix'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 41: 1-10.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1967. Review of G. Dobesch, *Caesars Apotheose zu Lebzeiten und sein Ringen um den Königstitel*. *Gnomon* 39.2: 150-156.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 1970. 'Caesar's Consecration'. Review of H. Gesche, *Die Vergottung Caesars*. *Classical Review* 20.1: 62-64.

Barnes, T. 2009. 'The First Emperor: The View of Late Antiquity', pp. 277-287, in M. Griffin (ed.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Barrett, A. A. 2002. *Livia: First Lady of Imperial Rome*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Bauman, R. A. 1981. 'Tribunician Sacrosanctity in 44, 36 and 35 BC'. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 124.2: 166-183.

Beard, M. 1980. Review of *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* by J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz. *Journal of Roman Studies* 71: 203-205.

Beard, M., J. North and S. R. F. Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, R. 2007. 'Power and Piety: Augustan Imagery and the Cult of the Magna Mater'. PhD thesis. University of Canterbury.

Bendlin, A. 2000. 'Looking Beyond the Civic Compromise: Religious Pluralism in Late Republican Rome', pp. 115-135, in E. Bispham and C. Smith (eds.) *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Billows, R. 1993. 'The religious procession of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Augustus' *supplicatio* in 13 B.C.' *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 6: 80-92.

Birley, E. 1978. 'The Religion of the Roman Army: 1895-1977', pp. 1506-1541, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.16.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Bosworth, A. B. 1999. 'Augustus, the Res Gestae and Hellenistic Theories of Apotheosis'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 89: 1-18.

Bouché-Leclercq, A. 1871. *Les pontifes de l'ancienne Rome*. Paris: Librairie A. Franck.

Bouché-Leclercq, A. 1886. *Manuel des Institutions romaines*. Paris: Hachette.

Bowersock, G. W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bowersock, G. W. 1990. 'The Pontificate of Augustus', pp. 380-394, in K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds.) *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bremmer, J. N. 2002. *The Rise and Fall of the Afterlife: The 1995 Read-Tuckwell Lectures at the University of Bristol*. London: Routledge.

Bremmer, J. N. and N. M. Horsfall. 1987. *Roman Myth and Mythography*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.

Brennan, T. C. 1996. 'Triumphus in Monte Albano', pp. 315-337, in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris (eds.) *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 BC, in honour of E. Badian*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Broughton, T. R. S. 1951-1952. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. New York: American Philological Association.

Brouwer, H. H. J. 1989. *Bona Dea: The Sources and a Description of the Cult*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Buxton, B. A. 2003. 'Rome at the Crossroads, 6 BC-4 CE'. PhD thesis. University of California, Berkeley.

Carson, R. A. G. 1957. 'Caesar and the Monarchy'. *Greece & Rome* 4.1: 46-53.

Carter, J. M. 1982. *Suetonius: Divus Augustus*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
Cary, E. 1914. 'Introduction', pp. vii-xxviii, in E. Cary (tr.) *Dio's Roman History*. London: Heinemann.
Champlin, E. 2011. 'Tiberius and the Heavenly Twins'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 101: 73-99.
Chaniotis, A. 2002. 'Old wine in a new skin: Tradition and innovation in the cult foundation of Alexander of Abonouteichos'. *Electrum* 6: 67-85.
Chaniotis, A. 2005. 'The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers', pp. 431-445, in A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Charlesworth, M. P. 1935. 'Some Observations on Ruler-Cult, Especially in Rome'. *Harvard Theological Review* 28.1: 5-44.
Chrimes, K. M. T. 1952. *Ancient Sparta: A Re-examination of the Evidence*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Clark, A. J. 2007. *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Cole, S. 2013. *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Collins, J. H. 1955. 'Caesar and the Corruption of Power'. *Historia* 4.4: 445-465.
Cooley, A. E. 2009. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Cornell, T. J. 1981. 'Some Observations on the Crimen Incesti', pp. 27-37, in *Le Délit Religieux dans la Cité Antique*. Rome: École Française de Rome.
Crook, J. A. 1970. 'Augustus: Power, Authority, Achievement', pp. 113-146, in A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. Lintott (eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd ed. Vol. 10. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Cumont, F. 1896-1899. *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*. Brussels: H. Lamertin.
Cumont, F. 1906. *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*. Paris: E. Leroux.
Dalla Rosa, A. 2011. 'Dominating the Auspices: Augustus, Augury and the Proconsuls', pp. 243-269, in J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo (eds.) *Priests and State in the Roman World*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
Deubner, L. 1925. *Römische Religion*. Leipzig: Teubner.
Dowling, M. B. 2000. 'The Clemency of Sulla'. *Historia* 49.3: 303-340.
Dowling, M. B. 2006. *Clemency and Cruelty in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Duff, T. E. 2003. *The Greek and Roman Historians*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
Dumézil, G. (tr. P. Krapp) 1970. *Archaic Roman Religion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Eck, W. (trs. D. L. Schneider and R. Daniel) 2007. *The Age of Augustus*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Eder, W. 2005. 'Augustus and the Power of Tradition', pp. 13-32, in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ehrenberg, V. 1964. 'Caesar's Final Aims'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68: 149-161.
Fears, J. R. 1981a. 'The Cult of Jupiter and Roman Imperial Ideology', pp. 3-141, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.17.1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Fears, J. R. 1981b. 'The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology', pp. 827-948, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.17.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Fears, J. R. 1981c. 'The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems', pp. 736-826, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.17.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Fine, J. V. A. 1932. 'A Note on the Compitalia'. *Classical Philology* 27.3: 268-273.
Fishwick, D. 1975. 'The Name of the Demigod'. *Historia* 24.4: 624-628.
Fishwick, D. 1987-2005. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Fishwick, D. 1992. 'On the Temple of Divus Augustus'. *Phoenix* 46.3: 232-255.

Fontenrose, J. 1939. 'Apollo and Sol in the Latin Poets of the First Century BC'. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 70: 439-455.

Fontenrose, J. 1940. 'Apollo and the Sun-God in Ovid'. *American Journal of Philology* 61.4: 429-444.

Fontenrose, J. 1968. 'The Gods Invoked in Epic Oaths, *Aeneid*, XII, 175-215'. *American Journal of Philology* 89.1: 20-38.

Fraser, P. M. 1996. *Cities of Alexander the Great*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Frazer, J. G. 1911-1915. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. 3rd ed. London: Macmillan.

Frazer, J. G. 1929. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex: The Fasti of Ovid*. London: Macmillan.

Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 1981. 'On the background of the Ruler Cult', pp. 145-156, in H. J. Dell (ed.) *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honour of Charles F. Edson*. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.

Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 1990. 'Alexander and Philip: Emulation and Resentment'. *Classical Journal* 85.4: 300-315.

Fredricksmeyer, E. A. 2003. 'Alexander's Religion and Divinity', pp. 253-278, in J. Roisman (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*. Leiden: Brill.

Friesen, C. J. P. 2015. *Reading Dionysus: Euripides'* Bacchae *and the Cultural Contestations of Greeks, Jews, Romans, and Christians*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Gale, M. 1994. *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Galinsky, K. (ed.) 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gelzer, M. (tr. P. Needham) 1969. *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gesche, H. 1968. *Die Vergottung Caesars*. Kallmünz: Lassleben.

Getty, R. J. 1950. 'Romulus, Roma, and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*'. *Classical Philology* 45.1: 1-12.

Glare, P. G. W. (ed.) 1968. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gradel, I. 2002. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grant, M. 2005. *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation*. London: Routledge.

Gruen, E. S. 2005. 'Augustus and the Making of the Principate', pp. 33-51, in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Guarducci, M. 1964. 'Vesta sul Palatino'. *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, römische Abteilung* 71: 158-169.

Hamlyn, T. 2011. *Pontifex Optimus Maximus: The Office of Pontifex Maximus from the Middle Republic to Caesar*. Saarbrücken: Lambert.

Hammond, N. G. L. 1994. *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman*. 3rd ed. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Hammond, N. G. L. 1998. 'Alexander's Newly-founded Cities'. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 39: 243-269.

Hanson, J. A. 1959. 'Plautus as a Source Book for Roman Religion'. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 90: 48-101.

Harmon, D. P. 1978. 'The Family Festivals of Rome', pp. 1592-1603, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.16.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Harrison, S. J. 1990. 'Cicero's "De Temporibus Suis": The Evidence Reconsidered'. *Hermes* 118.4: 455-463.

Hartung, J. A. 1836. *Die Religion der Römer*. Erlangen: Palm und Enke.

Hasenohr, C. 2003. 'Les *Compitalia* à Délos'. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 127.1: 167-249.

Helgeland, J. 1978. 'Roman Army Religion', pp. 1470-1505, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.16.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Hepding, H. 1907. 'Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon, 1904-1905, II. Die Inschriften'. *Mitteilungen des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 32: 241-377.

Herbert-Brown, G. 1994. *Ovid and the* Fasti*: An Historical Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hirschfeld, G. 1896. 'Apollonia', cols. 111-116, in G. Wissowa (ed.) *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* Vol. 2. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.

Hornblower, S. and A. Spawforth (eds.) 2003. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Revised 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howgego, C. 1995. *Ancient History from Coins*. London: Routledge.

Iddeng, J. W. 2012. 'What is a Graeco-Roman Festival? A Polythetic Approach', pp. 11-38, in J. R. Brandt and J. W. Iddeng (eds.) *Greek and Roman Festivals: Content, Meaning, and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jocelyn, H. D. 1977. 'The Ruling Class of the Roman Republic and Greek Philosophers'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 59: 323-366.

Joly, R. 1956. 'Vie idéale et apothéose philosophique'. *L'antiquité classique* 25.1: 73-84.

Judge, E. A. 2012. 'The Failure of Augustus'. *Classicum* 38.1: 2-7.

Kaster, R. A. 2006. *Cicero: Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Keaveney, A. 1983. 'Sulla and the Gods', pp. 44-79, in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History III*. Brussels: Latomus.

Keppie, L. 1984. *The Making of the Roman Army: From Republic to Empire*. London: B. T. Batsford.

King, C. 2003. 'The Organisation of Roman Religious Beliefs'. *Classical Antiquity* 22.2: 275-312.

Kleiner, D. E. E. 1992. *Roman Sculpture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Koortbojian, M. 2013. *The Divinisation of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kyle, D. G. 1998. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London: Routledge.

Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich: Beck.

Levene, D. S. 2012. 'Defining the Divine in Rome'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 142.1: 41-81.

Levick, B. 2009. 'Caesar's Political and Military Legacy to the Roman Emperors', pp. 209-223, in M. Griffin (ed.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lewis, M. W. H. 1955. *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians*. Rome: American Academy in Rome.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lindsay, H. 2009. *Adoption in the Roman World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Long, C. R. 1987. *The Twelve Gods of Greece and Rome*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Lott, J. B. 2004. *The Neighbourhoods of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Luce, T. J. 1968. 'Political Propaganda on Roman Republican Coins: circa 92-82 BC'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 72.1: 25-39.

Luke, T. S. 2014. *Ushering in a New Republic: Theologies of Arrival at Rome in the First Century BCE*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ma, J. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marquardt, J. 1856. *Römische Staatsverwaltung*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

McCarthy, J. H. 1931. 'Octavianus Puer'. *Classical Philology* 26.4: 362-373.

Mellor, R. 1981. 'The Goddess Roma', pp. 950-1030, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.17.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Meyer, E. 1922. *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus*. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Cotta.

Michels, A. K. 1955. 'Early Roman Religion, 1945-1952'. *Classical Weekly* 48.3, 4: 25-35, 41-45.
Millar, F. 1964. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Mitford, T. B. 1974. 'A Note From Salamis', pp. 110-116, in D. W. Bradeen and M. F. McGregor (eds.) *Phoros: Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt*. Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin.
Mommsen, T. 1854-1856. *Römische Geschichte*. Berlin: Weidmann.
Mueller, H.-F. 2002. *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*. London: Routledge.
Münzer, F. 1920. *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
Münzer, F. (tr. T. Ridley) 1999. *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Nock, A. D. 1928. 'Notes on Ruler-Cult, I-IV'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 48.1: 21-43.
Nock, A. D. 1930. 'ΣΥΝΝΑΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41: 1-62.
North, J. A. 1975. 'Praesens Divus'. Review of S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius*. *Journal of Roman Studies* 65: 171-177.
North, J. A. 1976. 'Conservatism and Change in Roman Religion'. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 44: 1-12.
North, J. A. 2008. 'Caesar at the Lupercalia'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 98: 144-160.
Ogden, D. 2009. 'Alexander, Scipio and Octavian: Serpent-Siring in Macedon and Rome'. *Syllecta Classica* 20: 31-52.
Orr, D. G. 1978. 'Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of the Household Shrines', pp. 1557-1591, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2.16.2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Östenberg, I. 2014. 'Animals and Triumphs', pp. 491-506, in G. L. Campbell (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Animals in Classical Thought and Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Pailler, J.-M. 1988. *Bacchanalia: La répression de 186 av. J.-C. à Rome et en Italie*. Rome: École française de Rome.
Palmer, R. E. A. 1974. *Roman Religion and Roman Empire*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.
Pandey, N. B. 2013. 'Caesar's Comet, the Julian Star, and the Invention of Augustus'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 143.2: 405-449.
Paterson, J. 2009. 'Caesar the Man', pp. 126-140, in M. Griffin (ed.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
Pelling, C. 1988. *Plutarch: Life of Antony*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Pelling, C. 1996. 'The triumviral period', pp. 1-69, in A. K. Bowman, E. Champlin and A. Lintott (eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd ed. Vol. 10. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Pelling, C. 2011. *Plutarch* Caesar*: Translated with an Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Peppard, M. 2011. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in its Social and Political Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Phillips, C. R. 1986. 'The Sociology of Religious Knowledge in the Roman Empire to AD 284', pp. 2677-2773, in W. Haase (ed.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.16.3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Phillips, C. R. 2007. 'Approaching Roman Religion: The Case for *Wissenschaftsgeschichte*', pp. 10-28, in J. Rüpke (ed.) *A Companion to Roman Religion*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Pollini, J. 1990, 'Man or God: Divine Assimilation and Imitation in the Late Republic and Early Principate', pp. 334-363, in K. A. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds.) *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Poulsen, B. 1991. 'The Dioscuri and Ruler Ideology'. *Symbolae Osloenses* 66: 119-146.
Price, S. R. F. 1980. 'Between Man and God: Sacrifice in the Roman Imperial Cult'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 70: 28-43.

Price, S. R. F. 1984. *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Price, S. R. F. 1987. 'From Noble Funerals to Divine Cult: the Consecration of Roman Emperors', pp. 56-105, in D. Cannadine and S. R. F. Price (eds.) *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Purcell, N. 1986. 'Livia and the womanhood of Rome'. *Cambridge Classical Journal* 32: 78-105.

Ramsey, J. T. and A. L. Licht. 1997. *The Comet of 44 BC and Caesar's Funeral Games*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Ramsey, J. T. 2003. *Cicero: Philippics I-II*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Raubitschek, A. E. 1946. 'Octavia's Deification at Athens'. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 77: 146-150.

Raubitschek, A. E. 1954. 'Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 44: 65-75.

Rawson, E. 1975a. 'Caesar's Heritage: Hellenistic Kings and Their Roman Equals'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 65: 148-159.

Rawson, E. 1975b. *Cicero: A Portrait*. London: Allen Lane.

Rawson, E. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London: Duckworth.

Rawson, E. 1992. 'Caesar: Civil War and Dictatorship', pp. 424-467, in J. A. Crook, A. Lintott and E. Rawson (eds.) *Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd ed. Vol. 9. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rehak, P. 2001. 'Aeneas or Numa? Rethinking the Meaning of the Ara Pacis Augustae'. *Art Bulletin* 83.2: 190-208.

Reinhold, M. 1988. *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's* Roman History*, Books 49-52 (36-29 BC)*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Rich, J. W. 1990. *Cassius Dio: The Augustan Settlement (*Roman History *53-55.9)*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Rich, J. W. and J. H. C. Williams. 1999. '*Leges et Ivra P. R. Restitvit*: A New Aureus of Octavian and the Settlement of 28-27 BC'. *Numismatic Chronicle* 159: 169-213.

Richardson, J. H. 2013. 'The Dioscuri and the Liberty of the Republic'. *Latomus* 72.4: 901-918.

Richardson, L. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rives, J. B. 1998. 'Roman Religion Revived'. *Phoenix* 52.3/4: 345-365.

Roller, L. E. 1999. *In Search of God the Mother: The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rose, H. J. 1926. *Primitive Culture in Italy*. London: Methuen.

Rose, H. J. 1934. 'Altheim: Revolutionary or Reactionary?'. *Harvard Theological Review* 27.1: 33-51.

Rose, H. J. 1948. *Ancient Roman Religion*. London: Hutchinson's University Library.

Rose, H. J. 1960. 'Roman Religion 1910-1960'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 50: 161-172.

Rüpke, J. (tr. R. Gordon) 2007. *Religion of the Romans*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Rüpke, J. 2011. 'Roman Religion and the Religion of Empire: Some Reflections on Method', pp. 9-36, in J. A. North and S. R. F. Price (eds.) *The Religious History of the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews and Christians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Saller, R. 1986. '*Patria potestas* and the stereotype of the Roman family'. *Continuity and Change* 1.1: 7-22.

Samter, E. 1901. *Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer*. Berlin: G. Reimer.

Scheid, J. 1987. 'Polytheism impossible; or the empty gods: reasons behind a void in the history of Roman religion'. *History and Anthropology* 3.1: 303-325.

Scheid, J. 1999. 'Auguste et le grand pontificat. Politique et droit sacré au début du Principat'. *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 77.1: 1-19.

Scheid, J. (tr. J. Lloyd) 2003. *An Introduction to Roman Religion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Scheid, J. 2005. 'Augustus and Roman Religion: Continuity, Conservatism, and Innovation', pp. 175-193, in K. Galinsky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, K. 1925. 'The Identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus'. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 56: 82-105.

Scott, K. 1928. 'The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes'. *American Journal of Philology* 49.2, 3: 137-166, 217-239.

Scott, K. 1929. 'Octavian's Propaganda and Antony's *De sua ebrietate*'. *Classical Philology* 24.2: 133-141.

Scullard, H. H. 1974. *The Elephant in the Greek and Roman World*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Scullard, H. H. 1981. *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Scullard, H. H. 1982. *From the Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome from 133 BC to AD 68*. 5th ed. London: Routledge.

Severy, B. 2003. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed.) 1980. *Cicero: Epistulae ad Quintum Fratrem et M. Brutum*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, C. J. 1998. 'Imp. Caesar Divi filius. His Second Imperatorial Acclamation and the Evolution of an Allegedly Exorbitant Name'. *Athenaeum* 86: 419-437.

Simpson, C. J. 2006. 'M. Aemilius Lepidus: Brief Speculations on His Appointment and Continued Tenure as *Pontifex Maximus*, 44-13 BC'. *Latomus* 65.3: 628-633.

Southern, P. 1998. *Mark Antony*. Stroud: Tempus.

Spawforth, A. J. S. 2012. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stark, R. 2006. 'Religious Competition and Roman Piety'. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 2.6: 1-30.

Stek, T. D. 2008. 'A Roman cult in the Italian countryside? The *Compitalia* and the shrines of the *Lares Compitales*'. *BABESCH – Annual Papers on Mediterranean Archaeology* 83: 111-132.

Stevenson, T. R. 1996. 'Social and Psychological Interpretations of Graeco-Roman Religion: Some Thoughts on the Ideal Benefactor'. *Antichthon* 30: 1-18.

Stevenson, T. R. 1998. 'The "Divinity" of Caesar and the Title Parens Patriae', pp. 257-268, in T. W. Hillard and others (eds.) *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Macquarie University, 8-13 July, 1993*. Vol. 1. Macquarie University, NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre.

Stevenson, T. 2003. Review of Emperor Worship and Roman Religion by I. Gradel. *Prudentia* 35.2: 221-226.

Stevenson, T. R. 2009. 'Acceptance of the Title *Pater Patriae* in 2 BC'. *Antichthon* 43: 97-108.

Stevenson, T. R. 2013. 'The Succession Planning of Augustus'. *Antichthon* 47: 118-139.

Stewart, R. 1997. 'The Jug and Lituus and Roman Republican Coin Types: Ritual Symbols and Political Power'. *Phoenix* 51.2: 170-189.

Stockton, D. 1971. *Cicero: A Political Biography*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stoll, O. 2007. 'The Religions of the Armies', pp. 451-476, in P. Erdkamp (ed.) *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Stone, A. M. 2008. 'Greek Ethics and Roman Statesmen: *De Officiis* and the *Philippics*', pp. 214-239, in T. R. Stevenson and M. Wilson (eds.) *Cicero's Philippics: History, Rhetoric and Ideology* (*Prudentia* 37-38). Auckland: Polygraphia.

Swan, P. M. 2004. *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's* Roman History*, Books 55-56 (9 BC-AD 14)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Szemler, G. J. 1972. *The Priests of the Roman Republic*. Brussels: Latomus.

Taeger, F. 1957-1960. *Charisma; Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.

Tatum, W. J. 2008. *Always I am Caesar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Tatum, W. J. 2011. 'The Late Republic: Autobiographies and Memoirs in the Age of the Civil Wars', pp. 161-187, in G. Marasco (ed.) *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity: A Brill Companion*. Leiden: Brill.

Taylor, L. R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown: American Philological Association.

Taylor, L. R. 1942. 'The Election of the *Pontifex Maximus* in the Late Republic'. *Classical Philology* 37.4: 421-424.

Thompson, J. E. 2005. 'Images of Vesta and the Vestal Virgins in Roman State Religion and Imperial Policy of the First and Second Centuries AD'. PhD thesis. Yale University.

Toynbee, J. M. C. 1973. *Animals in Roman Life and Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Treggiari, S. 1969. *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Turcan, R. 1977. 'César et Dionysos', pp. 317-325, in *Hommage à la mémoire de Jérôme Carcopino*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Usener, H. 1896. *Götternamen*. Bonn: F. Cohen.

Vanggaard, J. H. 1988. *The Flamen: A Study in the History and Sociology of Roman Religion*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Wagenvoort, H. 1947. *Roman Dynamism: Studies in Ancient Roman Thought, Language and Custom*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Waites, M. C. 1920. 'The Nature of the Lares and Their Representation in Roman Art'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 24.3: 241-261.

Walbank, F. W. 1957-1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Walbank, F. W. 1967. 'The Scipionic Legend'. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 13: 54-69.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1981. 'The Emperor and His Virtues'. *Historia* 30.3: 298-323.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1982. 'Civilis Princeps: Between Citizen and King'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 72: 32-48.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1986. 'Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 76: 66-87.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1990. 'Roman Arches and Greek Honours: The Language of Power at Rome'. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 36: 143-181.

Ward, M. M. 1933. 'The Association of Augustus with Jupiter'. *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 9: 203-224.

Warde Fowler, W. 1899. *The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic*. London: Macmillan.

Warde Fowler, W. 1911. *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*. London: Macmillan.

Wardle, D. 2002. 'Deus or Divus: The Genesis of Roman Terminology for Deified Emperors and a Philosopher's Contribution', pp. 181-191, in G. Clark and T. Rajak (eds.) *Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wardle, D. 2004. 'On the Divinity of the Roman Emperor Once More'. Review of *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* by I. Gradel. *Scholia* 13: 125-132.

Wardle, D. 2009. 'Caesar and Religion', pp. 100-111, in M. Griffin (ed.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wardle, D. 2014. *Suetonius: Life of Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warren, J. 2007. 'Lucretius and Greek Philosophy', pp. 19-32, in S. Gillespie and P. Hardie (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Weigel, R. D. 1973. 'The Aemilii Lepidi'. PhD thesis. University of Delaware.

Weigel, R. D. 1992. *Lepidus: The Tarnished Triumvir*. London: Routledge.

Weinstock, S. 1957. 'Victor and Invictus'. *Harvard Theological Review* 50.3: 211-247.

Weinstock, S. 1960. 'Two Archaic Inscriptions from Latium'. *Journal of Roman Studies* 50: 112-118.

Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Wernicke, K. 1896. 'Apollon', cols. 1-111, in G. Wissowa (ed.) *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
White, H. 1973. 'Interpretation in History'. *New Literary History* 4.2: 281-314.
White, P. 1988. 'Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome'. *Phoenix* 42.4: 334-356.
Wiseman, T. P. 1974. 'Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome'. *Greece and Rome* 21.2: 153-164.
Wiseman, T. P. 1992. 'Julius Caesar and the *Mappa Mundi*', pp. 22-42, in *Talking to Virgil: A Miscellany*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.
Wiseman, T. P. 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. Munich: Beck.
Wood, S. E. 1999. *Imperial Women: A Study in Public Images, 40 BC-AD 68*. Leiden: Brill.
Yavetz, Z. 1983. *Julius Caesar and His Public Image*. London: Thames and Hudson.
Zanker, P. (tr. A. Shapiro) 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Appendix 1: Caesar's Honours, 46-44 BC

After the Battle of Thapsus in April 46
(accepted according to Dio, with other unspecified honours refused)[1]

- supplications for 40 days[2]
- permission to use white horses in his triumph and to be accompanied by an extraordinary number of *lictores*[3]
- oversight of public morals[4]
- the dictatorship for 10 years[5]
- a curule chair in the Senate with the consuls and the right to offer his opinion first[6]
- the privilege of giving the signal for all games in the Circus[7]
- the power to assign magistracies and other honours[8]
- a chariot belonging to Caesar placed on the Capitol and dedicated to Iuppiter[9]
- a bronze statue on the Capitol of Caesar mounted upon the world and calling him a demigod[10]
- Caesar's name to replace that of Catulus on the Temple of Iuppiter Capitolinus[11]

After news of the Battle of Munda reached Rome on the 20th of April, 45[12]
(some honours rejected by Caesar)[13]

- supplications for 50 days[14]
- games permanently added to the Parilia in Caesar's honour[15]
- the privilege of wearing the triumphal dress at all the games and the laurel crown everywhere[16]
- the title of 'Liberator' and a public temple of Libertas[17]
- 'Imperator' as a hereditary name[18]
- a new home on state property[19]
- supplications in Caesar's name whenever a Roman victory is achieved[20]
- the right to hold any of the magistracies[21]
- the consulship for 10 years (which was refused)[22]
- control of the soldiery and public finances[23]

---

[1] Cass. Dio 43.14.7.
[2] Cass. Dio 43.14.3.
[3] Cass. Dio 43.14.3, cf. 43.19.3.
[4] Cic. *Fam*. 9.15.5; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 43.14.4.
[5] Cass. Dio 43.14.4.
[6] Cass. Dio 43.14.5; cf. Flor. 2.13.91.
[7] Cass. Dio 43.14.5.
[8] Cass. Dio 43.14.5, cf. 43.47.1, 43.51.3, 43.51.9; cf. Cic. *Att*. 14.6.2; Suet. *Iul*. 41.2, 76.2-3; App. *B Civ*. 2.128, 138.
[9] Cass. Dio 43.14.6, 43.21.2.
[10] Cass. Dio 43.14.6, 43.21.2; cf. Serv. *Ecl*. 9.47.
[11] Cass. Dio 43.14.6.
[12] Cass. Dio 43.42.3.
[13] Cass. Dio 43.46.1; cf. App. *B Civ*. 2.107.
[14] Cass. Dio 43.42.2.
[15] Cass. Dio 43.42.3. Cf. Cic. *Att*. 14.14.1, 14.19.3; Cass. Dio 45.6.4.
[16] Suet. *Iul*. 45.2; Cass. Dio 43.43.1; cf. App. *B Civ*. 2.106.
[17] Cass. Dio 43.44.1.
[18] Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 43.44.2, 52.41.4. Cf. Cic. *Parad*. 33, 41; *Syll*.[3] 763.6; Josephus, *AJ* 16.6.2 (162); etc.
[19] Cass. Dio 43.44.6.
[20] Cass. Dio 43.44.6, cf. 45.7.2; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 1.13.
[21] Cass. Dio 43.45.1.
[22] App. *B Civ*. 2.106, 107; Cass. Dio 43.45.1; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.

- an ivory statue of Caesar to be carried in the *pompa circensis* with the statues of the gods[24]
- a statue of Caesar in the Temple of Quirinus inscribed 'to/for the unconquered god'[25]
- a statue of Caesar alongside those of the kings and L. Brutus on the Capitol[26]

Late 45 and early 44[27]
(most honours accepted)[28]

- the privilege of wearing the triumphal dress everywhere[29]
- the use of a curule chair everywhere except at the games, where he was permitted to sit on the benches of the plebeian tribunes[30]
- the privilege of dedicating the *spolia opima*[31]
- Caesar's *lictores* to carry *fasces* decorated with laurel[32]
- permission to celebrate an *ovatio* on horseback in Rome after returning from the Feriae Latinae on the Alban Mount (26th of January)[33]
- the title *parens patriae*[34]
- the privilege of having his portrait on the coinage[35]
- public sacrifices on Caesar's birthday[36]
- statues of Caesar to be set up in the temples of Rome and in other cities[37]
- two statues of Caesar on the Rostra, one wearing the *corona civica* and the other the *corona obsidionalis*[38]
- a temple to Concordia Nova and an annual festival of the goddess[39]
- Temple of Felicitas[40]
- the month Quintilis renamed Iulius after him[41]
- a tribe renamed after him[42]
- the position of sole censor for life[43]
- sacrosanctity[44]
- Caesar's son to be appointed *pontifex maximus*[45]
- a golden chair[46]

---

[23] Cass. Dio 43.45.2; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 76.3.
[24] Cic. *Att*. 13.28.3, 13.44.1; Cass. Dio 43.45.2.
[25] Cic. *Att*. 12.45.3, 13.28.3, cf. 12.47.3; Cass. Dio 43.45.3.
[26] Cic. *Deiot*. 33-34; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 43.45.3-4.
[27] Cass. Dio 44.4.1.
[28] Cass. Dio 44.7.2; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.107.
[29] Cass. Dio 44.4.2.
[30] Cass. Dio 44.4.2.
[31] Cass. Dio 44.4.3.
[32] Cass. Dio 44.4.3.
[33] *Inscr*. *Ital*. 13.1.86-87; Cass. Dio 44.4.3, 44.10.1; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 60.2; Suet. *Iul*. 79.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.108.
[34] *RRC* nos. 480/19-20; Cic. *Phil*. 2.31, 13.23, 13.25; Livy, *Per*. 116; Nic. Dam. 80; Val. Max. 6.4.5; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1, 85, cf. 88; App. *B Civ*. 2.106, 144; Flor. 2.13.91; Cass. Dio 44.4.4, 44.48.3. Cf. *ILS* 71, 72; *ILLRP* 408.
[35] Cass. Dio 44.4.4; cf. *RRC* nos. 480/2-20.
[36] Cass. Dio 44.4.4; cf. App. *B Civ*. 2.106.
[37] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Flor. 2.13.91; Cass. Dio 44.4.4.
[38] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.4.5.
[39] Cass. Dio 44.4.5.
[40] Cass. Dio 44.5.2.
[41] Plut. *Num*. 19.4; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Flor. 2.13.91; Cass. Dio 44.5.2; Censorinus, *DN* 22.16; Macrob. *Sat*. 1.12.34.
[42] Cass. Dio 44.5.2.
[43] Cass. Dio 44.5.3; cf. Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.
[44] Livy, *Per*. 116; Nic. Dam. 80; App. *B Civ*. 2.106, 118, 144; Cass. Dio 44.5.3, 44.50.1, cf. 44.49.1, 44.49.3.
[45] Cass. Dio 44.5.3.

- the right to wear the purple *toga* used by early *triumphatores*[47]
- oath from the senators and knights (perhaps even citizens in general) to protect Caesar[48]
- annual public prayers for Caesar[49]
- oath by Caesar's Τύχη and Ὑγίεια in Dio's Greek (presumably Caesar's Genius and Salus)[50]
- oath sworn by magistrates not to oppose Caesar's acts[51]
- pentaeteric festival 'as to a hero', with the priests and Vestal Virgins offering public prayers for his safety[52]
- Caesar's own college of *luperci*[53]
- gladiatorial combats in Rome and Italy to have a special day in Caesar's honour[54]
- a golden crown that was probably the *corona aurea*[55]
- Caesar's golden chair and jewelled, golden crown were to be carried into theatres as was done for the gods[56]
- *tensa*, *ferculum*, *pulvinar*[57]
- a cult name, Divus Iulius[58]
- a temple shared with Clementia, and perhaps other temples and altars too[59]
- a *flamen maior* for Caesar's cult, who was to be M. Antonius[60]
- at least one divine image[61]
- a *fastigium* on his home[62]
- the privilege of having his tomb within the *pomerium*[63]
- the honorary decrees recorded in precious metals and deposited underneath Iuppiter Capitolinus[64]
- perpetual dictatorship[65]

Uncertain date

- a raised seat in the theatre[66]
- a fifth day added to the *ludi Romani* in Caesar's honour[67] (this was perhaps done at the same time as the creation of a cult of Concordia Nova, given the links of these measures to Camillus)

---

[46] Cic. *Div*. 1.119, *Phil*. 2.85; Nic. Dam. 71; Val. Max. 1.6.13; Plin. *HN* 11.186; Plut. *Caes*. 61.3; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.11.2, 44.17.3, cf. 44.4.2.
[47] Cic. *Div*. 1.119, *Phil*. 2.85; Nic. Dam. 71; Val. Max. 1.6.13; Plin. *HN* 11.186; Plut. *Caes*. 61.3, *Ant*. 12.1 ('triumphal'); Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.11.2, 46.17.5 ('royal').
[48] Suet. *Iul*. 84.2, 86.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.145, cf. 124, 130, 131; Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.7.4; cf. Nic. Dam. 80.
[49] Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.50.1.
[50] Cass. Dio 44.6.1, 44.50.1.
[51] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.1.
[52] App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.2.
[53] Cic. *Ad Caes*. *Iun*. 2, fr. 19 (Non. 418 L), *Phil*. 13.31; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.2, cf. 45.30.2.
[54] Cass. Dio 44.6.2.
[55] *RRC* no. 480/2; cf. Cic. *Phil*. 2.85; Cass. Dio 44.6.3, 44.11.2. Cf. Flor. 2.13.91.
[56] Cass. Dio 44.6.3, cf. 45.6.5; cf. Cic. *Att*. 15.3.2; *RRC* no. 497/2; Nic. Dam. 108; Plut. *Ant*. 16.2; App. *B Civ*. 3.28.
[57] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.3.
[58] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110; cf. Cass. Dio 44.6.4.
[59] *RRC* no. 480/21; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.6.4; cf. Plut. *Caes*. 57.3.
[60] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111, 13.41, 13.47; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; Cass. Dio 44.6.4.
[61] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.
[62] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110-111; Plut. *Caes*. 63.6 (explicitly citing Livy); Suet. *Iul*. 81.3; Flor. 2.13.91; Obseq. 67.
[63] Cass. Dio 44.7.1.
[64] Cass. Dio 44.7.1.
[65] *RRC* nos. 480/6-16; Cic. *Phil*. 2.87; Livy, *Per*. 116; *Inscr*. *Ital*. 13.1.170-171; Josephus, *AJ* 14.10.7 (211); Plut. *Caes*. 57.1; Suet. *Iul*. 76.1; App. *B Civ*. 2.106; Cass. Dio 44.8.4.
[66] Suet. *Iul*. 76.1.
[67] Cic. *Phil*. 2.110.

- celebration of the anniversaries of Caesar's victories[68] (this is perhaps to be connected with the measure, passed after Munda, that supplications in Caesar's name should be held whenever a Roman victory were to occur)

[68] App. *B Civ*. 2.106.