INTRODUCTION.

Rome is, and was, an enormous city. Large in size, it was the largest city in the ancient world. Large with history, it has been continuously occupied from at least the Bronze Age on, through the intervening ages to the present day. Large in archaeological terms, it is the largest archaeological site in Europe, its dimensions, both in land area and depth of historical remains creating a subject of enormous scope and complexity. Beyond its physical dimensions Rome also looms large. The city's political success, its longevity, its place at the centre of the most successful, consolidated and inclusive pan-Mediterranean empire afforded Rome a sphere and position of unparalleled influence. Its place at the centre of a second empire, that of Christianity, fostered that influence, emeshing the idea and ideals of Rome into the culture and psyche of the European world. It was not by accident that Rome came to hold such sway over its world, nor was it by accident that the city came to express that power architecturally, it was designed and built that way. Designed and built to impress, to fascinate, to inspire awe and allegiance. The city was groomed and shaped to present itself as the premier city of Europe, caput mundi. Moreover, it was built to endure, both physically and conceptually. The solidity and stability of the brick-faced concrete and polychrome marbles of which much of the imperial city was constructed bespoke a confidence in the continuation of the city, whilst simultaneously
ensuring by way of the nature of the materials that the physical fabric of the city could and would survive the vicissitudes of time. Rome was built to be *Roma Aeterna*, the physical longevity of the city protecting and enshrining the ideologies of its creators.

Designed to endure, designed to impress, to attract allegiance, to promote and instil ideological concepts, those who designed and built Rome have, in their success, conquered for the city a third empire, that of academia. The ancients themselves were fascinated by Rome, its history, its mythology, its physical presence, its topography resonant with sites and structures made venerable and significant through age, usage, or sacred association. The fascination has continued throughout the history of Rome, resulting in a body of work on the subject that is staggering in its size, in its depth, its breadth, its complexity, its own historical longevity. The study of the city of Rome has become, in its own right, a subject area approaching in size and formidable the subject it addresses. Amidst such vastness of choice, topics, approaches, areas and scholarship, decisions of limitations must be made by any who would wish to enter the field and discover their own Rome.

This thesis concerns itself with the physical transformation of Rome at a time when the political landscape was itself under-going a far-reaching and profound transformation. The limitations begin to be
applied, an era is chosen, 31 B. C. to A. D. 138, from the ascendancy to sole power of Octavian/Augustus through until the demise of Hadrian. It is an aim of this thesis to demonstrate that within this time-frame the needs, the aims, the whims and the wiles of the individual principes evolved through a process of progression and regression, of an experimentation with the novel, and a reclamation of the past. That is, to move from a template of behavioural appropriateness developed by Octavian/Augustus, through a series of individual conceptions of what a princeps could or should be, until a new behavioural template comes to be developed during the principate of Hadrian. Fundamentally this thematic aim springs from a conception of the principate succinctly expressed by a quote, to wit that, '...the emperor "was" what the emperor did.'\textsuperscript{1} In his monumental work on the role and position of the principes, Fergus Millar demonstrated that the principate was by and large defined by the activities it performed. The princeps was in reality supra leges, for the most part unencumbered by legal restraint, curtailed rather by precedent, social and political necessities and expediencies. There was, therefore, and this is especially the case in the early period of the history of the principate, room for an individual approach, flexibility enough to allow for experimentation, interpretation, an evolving of the conception as to the appropriate role of the princeps. The emperor may have been what the emperor did, but what the emperor did was still dependant on who the emperor was.

The limitation of the time-span addressed, the limitation of the subject matter is next in line, the Imperial building projects. When, towards the end of a long and extraordinary life Augustus approved the final draft of the list of achievements that he had accomplished, he approved, within that concise and carefully edited document, three large passages on his building activity at Rome. In total something approaching one tenth of the Res Gestae Divi Augusti is given over to the building programme effected at Rome by Augustus. It is a substantial proportion of the work, reflecting one would presume, a substantial proportion of his own work, the creation and maintenance of his political position as princeps. Moreover, it would tend to suggest that, for the author, the building works of his regime represented a substantial element in what he perceived as being the role and justification for that position as princeps. The princeps, as patronus of the city should, in the view of Augustus, build, ornament, and shape that city.

This conception of the appropriate role of the princeps in concerning himself with the physical environment of the city of Rome did not confine itself to the times and the person of Augustus. When he came to compose his own literary monument that concerned the things done by others, Suetonius never failed to include the buildings that the principes built, or had planned to build, at Rome. The
building activities of a *princeps* was one of the criteria by which Suetonius evaluated the worthiness of an individual to occupy that position. For Suetonius, it was where the *princeps* concentrated the resources for his building projects that indicated the character of the reign. Resources lavished on public projects equate with a beneficent, therefore worthy *princeps*. Lavished on private, or better, personal aggrandisement, the character of the *princeps* is suspect, unworthy, the judgement negative\(^2\).

But none of the *principes*, including Augustus, had a clean and untouched canvas upon which to make their mark. All had to build on, with, or against the pre-existing city, both the physical city and the conceptual city. In the words of Winston Churchill, ‘we shape our buildings; thereafter they shape us.’\(^3\) This is not the end of the process however, it continues, the symbiosis between the shaper and the shaped is on-going. A further theme of this thesis is to demonstrate that whilst any individual *princeps* may have perceived his own building activity as reflecting within the urban fabric of the city his individual conception of the *princeps*’ role, over time the city evolved to in turn affect the behaviour of the individual *princeps*, standardising an acceptable behaviour to be expected from any *princeps*. To move from Augustus to Hadrian, from *princeps* to principate, from a behavioural template developed by and for an


\(^3\)Churchill, W., interview published in *Time* magazine, New York, 12th September, 1960.
individual, to a template developed on generalities, into which an individual could fit himself.

Finally, the third limitation upon the subject matter, Rome. With but less than a handful of exceptions this thesis restricts itself to those buildings built by the principes at Rome, essentially within the area later to be circumscribed by the Aurelian walls. This area has been chosen for a number of different reasons, not the least a need to keep the scope of the evidence within a manageable range.

Rome was at the centre of her empire, both physically and ideologically. The governance of the empire was centred at Rome. The empire was conquered territory, Rome was not. The empire could always be subjugated again if needs must, Rome could not be subjugated in the same fashion. If the principate was to flourish, it was the hearts, minds, and egos of the Roman populace, from the lowest to the highest orders, that needed to be won over, persuaded, allied to the presence of the principate. Simple imposition would not work, it had been tried before, and Julius Caesar had found to his loss just how violent the reaction of Rome could be when honour was at stake. Throughout the rest of the empire the relationship between the ruler and the ruled, at the levels of provinces, cities or individuals could be understood, developed and fostered as a relationship between mortals and a god. Not at Rome. Rome owned her empire,
her people owned the city. They could hardly be expected to worship one who had in effect, usurped their time-honoured power. The new political reality introduced with the victory of Octavian’s forces at Actium would need to find an acceptable expression of the changed power structure. The city itself was the stage upon which the governance of the city and the empire took place. What better media could there be to begin to construct the image and the presence of the new political reality than the stage upon which it would act out its role. ‘All the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players’, wrote Shakespeare⁴. With the advent of the *principes* one of those players had changed his role, he was now actor, producer and director. He was also something of a set-designer. The third aim of this thesis is to examine both how the stage scenery changed, and changed over time, with each *princeps* adding his own additions to the stage, or attempting to change the scenery and scenario altogether; to examine also the relationship that, whilst the emperor built the city, the city simultaneously help to construct the idea of ‘emperor’.

In any survey dealing with the emperors of Imperial Rome there is one emperor who stands head and shoulders above the rest, and that emperor is Augustus. There are of course a number of different reasons for this stature of Augustus. For a start not only was Augustus the first of the emperors of Rome, he in fact created the position. Before Augustus there had been no emperors, after him there were to be many. Being the first, he not only set but became the precedent and the exemplar to which succeeding generations of emperors had to react in order to express their own conception of what the principate was, in either a positive or a negative fashion. Not only was Augustus the first emperor and the inventor of the position, he also held that position for a greater period of time than any of his successors. This amazing longevity should not be under-estimated. It was probably this very element as much as any other of his rule that allowed for so solid a foundation for a form of government that was to survive virtually intact for such a long period of time, weathering the vicissitudes of fate and time, and though adapting to changed circumstances, remaining remarkably and identifiably the same. It was this very same longevity of tenure in the constitutional position he himself created that allowed such scope for one of the major elements in what was to be the Augustan conception of the principate, the emperor as patron of the city of Rome. It was the Augustan building

1 According to Tacitus Ann. 1:9, this was worthy of comment amongst the general populace at Rome at the time of Augustus' death.
programme that was to prove so influential in creating the mutually reinforcing relationship between the emperors and the city of Rome, and was to create the framework against which the building programmes of succeeding generations could be evaluated.

Augustan restructuring of the Forum Romanorum.

Geographically and metaphorically the Forum Romanorum lay not just in the very heart of Republican Rome, in a way it was the heart of Rome\(^2\). From time immemorial this valley between the hills had been a place of meeting and commerce, the activities undertaken there growing in complexity and volume over the centuries but at their core they retained a central theme, that of interchange. So it had evolved that it was here the public life of the city was undertaken. It was here that Rome displayed itself to itself in the behaviours thought to be most

characteristic of itself, the making of law, the implementation of justice, the practice of government, and the pursuit of competitive display. The Forum was the site of the senate house and the courts, it was here in the Forum that the business of the present took place amongst memorials to the glories of the past. The Forum was central to a citizen's life at Rome. The Forum was the site of the Umbilicus Urbis, the navel of the city, symbolically as central as it is possible to be. If one wanted to entrench oneself in the collective life and psyche of Rome, this was the place to do it. Augustus did just that.

If you are a god it is beneficial to your status to have your own temple. Likewise if you've a god in the family recognition of this fact within the wider community may be enhanced by the placement of your familial god's temple in a significant location within the urban geography. Rome was to be only too aware of the Julian deity, the newly deified adopted father of Octavian. Positioned on the shortest side of the irregular rhomboid that was the Forum with the flanking basilicas compelling one's gaze towards it, the Temple of Divus Julius was to sit, high on its podium, gleaming in its fresh cut marble in the aesthetically strongest position in the Forum. An eclectic mix of Greek and Italo-Etruscan elements, the temple was in accord with the prevalent style of religious architecture. The high podium, the frontal emphasis, the deep pronaos

---

were retained from the Etruscan tradition which was also essentially the Roman tradition, while the marble, the fluted columns, their capitals, the decorated pediment, and a roof more harmoniously proportioned to the size of the body of the building were adopted and incorporated from the styles of Classical Greece and the Hellenistic kingdoms. Incorporated into the front of the temple was a speaker’s platform, decorated with the beaks of the Egyptian ships defeated at Actium. At the other end of the Forum stood the newly re-positioned speaker’s platform of the Republican era which was itself decorated with the beaks of enemy ships⁴. The implied comparison had the effect of transforming the personal enemy of Augustus, Marc Antony, into the enemy of the state⁵. At the opposite end of the Forum from the Julian temple was the Temple of Concord. A happy coincidence of association here also, given the later development of the concept of the Augustan Peace as bringing concord. Concordia was not so much in opposition to Divus Julius, but in an alliance⁶.

Caesar’s re-aligned replacement Curia had been destroyed by fire in a riot that followed his death, providing Octavian with the opportunity to replace it (RG. 19,1)⁷. In doing so he managed to create an expression

---

⁵ Zanker, 1988, p. 81.
⁶ The Temple of Concord being restored late in the principate of Augustus, and under the auspices of Tiberius, will dealt with more fully below.
of his conception of the power relationship between himself and the Senate. By re-building the Curia, Octavian was providing the setting in which the forms, traditions and practices of the Republican government could continue to be played out. Restoration of the Curia restored the presence of the Senate in the Forum. However, aesthetically the Curia was marginalised. Out of alignment with the central and dominant axis of the Forum, its visual impact minimised due to the width of its frontal facade in relation to the newly restored basilicas, visually integrated into the overall scheme of the Forum by the Chalcidicum\(^8\), it had lost any sense of dominance or independence, and had been made instead to fit the architectural *schema* of the Augustan Forum renovations. Renamed as was the custom after its patron, it became the Curia Julia (\textit{RG} 19; Dio, 51, 22, 1). The name alone reminded the senators to whom they were beholden for their new premises. However the Augustan presence did not stop there. It was crowned by a statue of Victoria (known from coins, \textit{B. M. C. Emp.} 1. 103 nos. 631-20); inside was another Victoria, armed with Egyptian booty and placed behind the seats of the consuls (Dio, 51, 22, 1). A more conspicuous position would be hard to find. But it was not only Augustus and his efforts that re-defined the power relationship between himself and the senate. After all it was the senators who voted him such honours as the *clipeus virtutis* (\textit{RG} 34:2), which was placed in their chamber, and further amplified his presence in their midst.

The eastern and western sides of the Forum also received due attention from Augustus. The Curia, the place where the laws of Rome were formulated had already been brought under the mantle of the gens Iulia. Now it was the turn of the places where those laws moved from the theoretical to the practical face of government. The Basilica Julia with its bulk dominated one side of the Forum, and the Basilica Aemilia, re-built by Augustus in a most extravagant style, dominated the other. Each basilica housed courts of law, each basilica was itself a dominating presence in the Forum, and each basilica was imbued with the stamp of Augustus and the gens Iulia. Not only the physical space of the Forum, but also the organs of government that functioned within that space were being, if not subverted to, at least directed towards the Augustan agenda.

With the re-building of the Temple of Castor and Pollux, the erection of the Arcus Augusti (one, two, or three, the debate remains open?)\(^9\), the later erection of the Portico of Gaius and Lucius (RG 20:3)\(^10\), the


\(^11\) Nedergaard, E., 'Zur problematik der Augustusbogen auf dem Forum Romanum', in *Kaiser Augustus: Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik*, Mainz am Rhein, 1988, pp. 224-39, argues for one triple fornix arch by the Temple of the Deified Julius against Coarelli's suggestion of three arches ultimately built in close conjunction with the temple, with one, that erected for the victory over Sextus Pompey, later being demolished, whilst an arch for the Actian, and later one for the diplomatic victory over Parthia were left in situ, Coarelli, F., *Il Foro Romano II: periodo repubblicano e augusteo.*, Rome, 1985.

repaving of the Forum\textsuperscript{13} with the retention of selected items such as the Umbilicus and covering of others, for example the Comitium, very little was left on view in the Forum of the Romans, the Forum Romanorum, that had not a direct reference to the new ruling power at Rome\textsuperscript{14}. What of the past that could be used to support the new regime was retained, and even emphasised. That which could not was deleted, replaced, or paved over. The eclectic accumulation of centuries of history had been reshaped and thus transformed to a single end, a single presence wherein the political reality of the era found expression in the physical structure of the city (Plate 1).\textsuperscript{15}

Thus the heart of Republican Rome had been transformed into the core of the Rome of Emperors, and in doing so it embodied the fundamental relationship that would be maintained between the traditions of the past and the requirements of the future. Most of the outward forms and traditions of the past would be maintained, but under the patronage of the Emperor, at his pleasure, and for his purposes. Dynastic requirements interplayed with the broader public needs, but in the final analysis there could only be one ruler, one Emperor, and everything must submit itself to the maintenance of his position, or else succumb


\textsuperscript{14}Wallace-Hadrill, A., \textit{Augustan Rome}, London, 1993 p. 51

and disappear. The Forum Romanorum should now be more fittingly known as the Forum Romanum, for now it belonged to the city that was owned by Augustus, rather than the people of that city.

The Forum had always been the centre of public life at Rome, but with the expansion of the city and its responsibilities over the preceding centuries the functions of the city had outgrown the room available to them\textsuperscript{16}. This had been recognised by Caesar, who had availed himself of the opportunity to win support and public exposure and had initiated the building of the Julian Forum\textsuperscript{17}. However, his sudden and unexpected death had left this along with many other of his projects unfinished. What was good for Caesar would be good also for Caesar Augustus, and accordingly he financed the completion of the project (RG 20,3). The symbolism of the new forum could serve the purposes of the new princeps, promoting as it did the ancestral lineage of his adopted family\textsuperscript{18}. There were however unwelcome elements in the symbolic programme of this forum. The forum was a product of the late republican propaganda campaigns waged between the leading senatorial families, it was self-promoting and self-glorifying. Such blatant self promotion was less than compatible with the image of the princeps as


conceived and promoted by Augustus. The change in emphasis, the evolved needs and desires of the emperor are evident in how the message was altered and redirected in the forum he built under his own auspices, the Forum of Augustus, named after his senatorially conferred title (RG. 34:2)\textsuperscript{19}.

A temple to Mars Ultor had initially been vowed before the Battle of Philippi in 42 BC (Suet. Aug. 29) in order to secure the assistance of that god against the forces of the Caesarian assassins Brutus and Cassius. In the forty years that elapsed between the taking of the vow and the dedication of the temple and its supporting forum the needs and interests of he who had become Augustus had changed somewhat. What had been a very public expression of a \textit{pius filius} avenging the death of his father could also look like hubris directed against senatorial peers when it is remembered that Caesar’s assassins claimed their act was an effort to restore Rome to liberty from the manipulations of a tyrant. This would be a less than attractive interpretation especially in the face of the heavily promoted concepts of the Republic restored and of the Augustan Peace, the cordial relationship between the various social groups, or the pious and moral ideal of \textit{princeps}, the first among equals. So over time the reason behind the building of the temple and forum were replaced with a more acceptable idea. Rather than avenging the death of a dictator of Rome’s past, Mars Ultor, Mars the Avenger, ended by avenging Rome’s

disgrace at losing standards to the Parthians under the leadership of Crassus. Rome was avenged thanks to the god, the god was rewarded thanks to Augustus, and once more the indispensability of a figure such as Augustus is underlined and given purpose and permanence in the form of a major building complex.

Placed alongside the Forum of Caesar, much as the Caesarian forum had been positioned adjacent to the Forum Romanum, the fora complement each other from a practical perspective whilst architecturally and conceptually providing sharp contrast between the republican and imperial reality. The Forum Romanum had evolved as an architectural agglomeration. Thus it was irregular, holistically unplanned, its space ill-defined, its borders permeated with multiple points of access. The Augustan restructuring had done much to impose visual order on the area, but the continuing irregularity inherited and imposed from the past managed to resist a total capitulation to the schematisation. In the construction of the two Imperial fora there was no such past to be taken account of, and they both could be planned and executed as a single architectural entity of the new order. The singularity of conception and design is evident in their form. For a start their form and space has been regularized, the open spaces geometrically pure, the axes unmistakable and unencumbered, points of access limited and planned, and a heavy reliance on symmetry provided balance and a sense of order. In the Forum Romanum the definition of the open area of the Forum was the
result of its encirclement by a number of independent structures, these buildings being both in and helping to define the borders of the Forum. With the two Imperial fora however this is not the case, with the formula being in fact reversed wherein each complex is a single structure which contains the forum. The open space was the internal result of the form of the structure, rather than the result of the external forms of structures which was the case of the Forum Romanum. It was a change from buildings in space to space in buildings. In the former instance the space laid claim to the buildings, in the latter the building laid claim to the space. In regard to the expressed and perceived power of the individual patron of a building it was an important difference in the experience of the viewer. In one prestige was gained by claiming a presence in a space made important through previous activity and prior communal consensual acknowledgement, whilst in the other prestige was shown by creating a space which itself became a presence wherein the important functions of the community could be acknowledged under the patronage of its owner.

The change in emphasis from space delineated via externality to space created and defined internally created, along with the changed perception of the power and prestige of the builder, a changed experience on the part of the viewer. The space of the Forum Romanum was in part a result of non-building, a product of limiting the encroachment of the buildings into its area. Its space and shape and thus its borders were ill-defined, an
effect heightened by the numerous and diversely angled points of access. Its function as the nexus of a network of streets allowed it to take its place as a seamlessly incorporated element within the urban fabric. The Augustan remodelling lessened this sense of the organic wholeness it shared with the rest of the cityscape. The Augustan work created for the Forum Romanum a more sharply delineated form, with a greater sense of its being a unified whole\textsuperscript{20}, but did not entirely remove the sense of its space and buildings as being a part of the texture of the wider urban landscape\textsuperscript{21}. The imperial fora were different. Their space was entirely the result of building, their borders sharply defined. Access to their space was limited and controlled, most especially in the Augustan forum. Their shape was strictly regular and symmetrical. Their perceivable form was not derived from, in fact disallowed, any influence from the outside shape of the city. They were pockets of strictly regulated space in the heart of the cramped and tangled, the verging on strangled spaces that existed outside the barricades of their encircling walls and colonnades. The Imperial fora resisted the existing character and texture of the surrounding city, defied its muddle, yet at the same time denied a sense of their well planned spaciousness to the city outside of their walls. Thus the visitor to the Forum Romanum would still, even after the Augustan tinkering, have had a sense of being within the wider urban environment. However a short stroll into the Augustan forum would have resulted in a sense of removal from the surrounding city, into a

\textsuperscript{20}Boatwright, 1986, p. 106.

realm disowned from that city, an isolated and insulated space forced into
the fabric of that city, an environment owned by the ruler of that city but
not by the city itself.

The functions they accommodated were centralised in the one specific
area. There also would have been a cumulative effect, first with the
renovation, restoration and reassignment of the Forum Romanum,
where as we have seen the Forum of the Romans became the Forum of
Rome under the express patronage of the Imperial family. Then the
Julian Forum, provided to the city by the family that was to become the
Imperial family, was a forum which provided for the greater comfort of
the people of their city, and also of course the self promotion of that
Imperial family. Finally there was the fresh, gleaming marble presence of
the forum built under the auspices of and with the name of Augustus.
Augustus was to be the culminating achievement of the long line of the
Julian family whose statues indeed were arrayed within one of the
exhedras of his forum. Augustus became a figure who, even without
apotheosis, went beyond the bounds of normal humanity to become
ensconced as the living embodiment of a somewhat abstract ideal;
Augustus, an idea and ideal of a leader who ruled not only due to the
prestige of his family, but also on the basis of a senatorially conferred
authority.

Now the judicial component of city life was in much the same position
as the Senate, it was accommodated in a complex of forums and basilicas all of which were more or less directly the gift of the Imperial family. The machinery of government, the courts and the senate now went about their daily tasks in a context specifically designed to promote the Julian cause, and the participants could not have but been constantly reminded as to whom the processes of government were ultimately destined to favour. However the promotion of the Julian cause is not the only message implied by the building activities in the area of the fora. Splendid new accommodation had been provided for the traditional organs of government, promoting their presence in the heart of the city simultaneously with the Julian family. What is more, the restoration of their buildings and especially in the case of the courts the expansion of their presence in the governmental precinct of the city implied the continuance of their functions under the new order. The Augustan involvement thus enhanced and further entrenched the traditional form of governance, ostensibly supporting the traditional power structures of Roman government while in reality that power had been usurped and retained by Augustus. Though the reality may have been quite different, the perception is all important.

_The Temple of Apollo and the House of Augustus._

The forums as the places of government were eventually completely
imbued with the presence of the gens Iulia, with both the judicial and legislative functions of government being housed in buildings and spaces provided for by that family. Thus the family was present as the patron of government, and the government by implication became the client of the patron. A quite clear relationship was evident as to where the real power and influence within the city lay. However it was not the intention of Augustus to present himself in a way that could encourage perceptions of tyranny, dictatorship or monarchy. The lesson of Caesar’s fate had been learnt, so whereas the state may have been beholden to the gens Iulia, Augustus as an individual preferred to present himself as the first among equals, the princeps, rather than an autocrat. His house on the Palatine provided a clear example of his intentions in this regard.22

The house itself was small, plain, simple enough in fact to be worthy of comment by Suetonius in his biography of Augustus (Suet. Aug. 72). The princeps lived simply, much more so than many of his peers among the aristocracy, a model of restraint, without undue luxury or display. The house was sited on the summit of the Palatine hill, under the Republic the traditional area of senatorial domi, of those who counted in the ruling of Rome. The princeps lives amongst his peers,


he is one of them, he too is a senator. However, his house was sited on
the the summit of the Palatine. He may live among equals, but he is the
first among equals, at the top of the heap. Moreover, the Palatine
traditionally was the hill which had comprised the original centre of the
city of Rome as founded by Romulus, and it was the supposed hut of
Romulus, restored by Augustus, that was located next door to the
Augustan abode\textsuperscript{24}. So the princeps belonged at the very heart of
traditional Rome, the new founder of the city had a close association with
the original founder of the city, just as he had an association with the
founder of the Latin people, Aeneas, through the fictional genealogy of
the gens Iulia. But however ostensibly simple and unassuming the
house of the princeps may have been in and of itself, it was not a
detached and independent structure. The desire of Augustus to show
himself to be a Roman senator pure and simple had to be allied with
other concerns and desired outcomes.

Of the gods that could be thanked for lending their assistance to the cause
of the young Octavian one more than any other required public
acknowledgement and gratefully offered largesse in return for services
rendered: Apollo, the god under whose patronage the battle at Actium
had been won. The temple, the erection of which had been vowed by
Augustus during the struggle against Sextus Pompey (RG 4, 19; Dio, 53,
memoriam Otto J. Brendal. Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities, 1976, pp. 5-12; Balland, A.,
‘La casa Romuli au Palatin et au Capitole’, REL 62, 1984, pp. 57-80; Coarelli, F. LTUR1, 1993,
pp. 241-2.
1, 3), was begun almost immediately, and upon Octavian’s return to Rome from the East in 29 B.C. must have been nearing completion, it was to be dedicated the following year on the ninth of October (Dio, 53, 1, 3 for the year, for the date, Degrassi, 518-9). There was a pressing urgency behind repayment of the debt. The family of the Iulii had their own personal link to the immortals through the myth of ancestral foundations beginning with Iulus, the son of Aeneas, himself the son of Venus. Octavian though was not to be content with this. He desired his own personal patronal deity, and after the effective show of support at Actium, Apollo was to be the one.

So the new temple arose, set high on the Palatine hill, made higher still by a tall sub-structure, the second largest temple to that time in Rome. Encompassed within a surrounding colonnade, the Portico of the Danaids with its columns of imported African marble and didactic relief, with its sacred grove, libraries and gardens, all in all was conceived as a luxuriously outfitted sanctuary befitting the new found status of the god as a favourite of the Emperor. A ramp connected the forecourt of the sanctuary of the god with the house of Augustus, linking the two structures in such close association that they were virtually one (Plate 2). This association, allied to the fact that another divine intervention with lightning had allowed Augustus’ house to be declared a domus publica and thus semi-sacred (Dio, 49, 15, 5), meant in effect that Augustus was

---

25 The mythological connections of the Julian gens being most fully outlined in Virgil’s Aeneid.
26 The largest was that of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Capitoline Jove.
living in a religious sanctuary. Though the princeps lived in the precincts of the temple he had built, the house of the god was far more richly appointed than the house of the god’s benefactor. Here we have piety, modesty and the humility of a mortal in the presence of the immortal.

The house sat at the centre of an inter-relating and interlocked web of symbolism, incorporating references to Roman mythology, social/historical facts and fictions, and religious and military glories. Each a potent enough symbol within itself, the effect of the accumulated layers became undeniable, each aspect of the web of symbols and meanings further strengthening each other and the web as a whole. Yet there was also balance and restraint. Augustus was not declaring his divinity, just his close associations to it. Improper or overt self glorification could be denied, the glory was for Rome, its traditions, its myths, and its gods. There was the restraint evident in the positioning of the princeps’ house amidst those of his peers, and keeping his abode and lifestyle well within the limits acceptable to his status amongst them. The princeps, whilst maintaining his position, was to be seen to be the humble servant of the best interests of Rome.

Aspects of the Augustan Building Programme.

Ever conscious of the need to appear other than an autocrat or a tyrant,
Augustus encouraged the appearance of a diffusion in the patronage that was transforming the urban landscape of Rome. Much of what was built during the reign of Augustus was built under the names of others, even if the projects may have been financed with Augustan cash. So we have the Portico of Livia\textsuperscript{27}, the Theatre of Marcellus\textsuperscript{28}, the Portico of Octavia\textsuperscript{29}, the restoration of the Temples of Concord and the Dioscuri by Tiberius\textsuperscript{30}, and of course the many projects of Agrippa. It is interesting to note those projects Augustus considered beneficial to his political programme, those projects that were deemed to be in accord with the image not only of himself which he wished to project, but also the image of himself in the role of princeps, and had built under his own auspices, in comparison with those projects he farmed out to others or under the names of others.


\textsuperscript{28}Fidenzoni, P., Il teatro di Marcello, Rome, 1970.

\textsuperscript{29}The Portico of Octavia is an interesting case in point. The Augustan version replaced an earlier version built by Gnaeus Octavius in 168 BC but retained the name of the original builder (RG 19). The happy coincidence between the name of the original builder, the name of its rebuilder, and the sister of the rebuilder may have had something to do with the retention of the original builder’s name upon the new structure. On the Portico see Olinder, B., Porticus Octaviae in Circo Flaminino, Stockholm, 1970; La Rocca, E., ‘L’adesione senesionale al consensus: i modo della propaganda augustea e tiberiana nei monumenti in circo Flaminio’, L’Urbs, Espace Urbain et Histoire, Rome, 1987, pp. 347-72; Coarelli, F., Il Campo Marzio I. Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica., 1997, pp. 515-528.

Almost immediately upon his return from campaigning against Antony in the East in 29 BC Octavian, as he still was, announced a programme to renovate and renew the spirit of the city, a broad and complex programme that concentrated on refurbishing the spiritual life of the city, the neglect of which had long been postulated as the prime cause of Rome’s woes. Temple renovation or re-building was to be a major part of this programme:

_Duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sextum ex auctoritate senatus refeci nullo praetermisso quod eo tempore refeci debeat._

In my sixth consulship I restored eighty-two temples of the gods in the city on the authority of the senate, neglecting none that required attention at that time.

(R. G. 20, 4)

All in all one would think a fairly comprehensive and ambitious task, and all the more so when the full breadth of the temple restoration projects throughout the entire reign of Augustus is taken into account. However, everything need not be so clear as it would at first seem. The level of renovation of the temples varied greatly, some being completely remodelled in the new Augustan style, others lucky to get crumbling.

---

31 An example of the feeling of the time may be reflected by Horace, _Carmen_, 3, 6
plaster repaired and a fresh coat of paint, if that\textsuperscript{33}. Augustus in his autobiography has a selective memory, as selective it would seem as his restoration programme. In 31 BC the Temple of the Dionysiac Triad had been destroyed by fire, a situation that would supply one would think a ‘need of renewal’ for the date of its destruction by fire, (Dio, 50, 10, 3). Augustus obviously thought otherwise, this temple not being re-dedicated until A.D. 17 by Tiberius, some 47 years later (Tac. Ann., 2, 49)\textsuperscript{34}. There was money for the gods that suited the designs of the new emperor, the temples of the Lares\textsuperscript{35}, the Penates\textsuperscript{36}, Jupiter Capitolinus, Juno Regina\textsuperscript{37} and Quirinus\textsuperscript{38}, these traditional gods of the Roman Pantheon all received money and attention (RG 19:2). These were respectable cults and in the main uniquely Roman. By restoring these temples Augustus would be able to emphasise the Roman-ness of his vision for Rome's future. Other gods more closely related to the interests of the emperor, Palatine Apollo, Mars Ultor, received not only completely new temples, but large and elaborate sanctuaries, added

\textsuperscript{33}Zanker, 1988, p. 209

\textsuperscript{34}See further Coarelli, F., LTUR 1, pp. 260-1; Richardson, 1992, pp. 80-1.

\textsuperscript{35}Coarelli, LTUR 3, 1996, p. 174; Richardson, 1992, p. 232


honours such as the removal of the Sibylline prophesies to the Temple of Palatine Apollo (Suet. Aug 31), and decorations and offerings to rival the previously greatest of all Rome's deities, Capitoline Jupiter.

The same treatment was not meted out to all. Take for example the case of the Temple of the Dionysiac Triad. Fecundity as the fruits of peace was elsewhere celebrated within the Augustan programme as a welcome result of Augustan destiny. However a god such as Bacchus not only had a foreign provenance, but required certain rites as part of his worship, rites which did not fit with the Augustan ideal of public decorum and re-invigorated morality. This wilder side of religious observance was not to be encouraged; the princeps wanted piety, morality, adherence to the traditional virtues. Thus he favoured the religious cults that supported the idea of the Roman state, as the state supported those cults. Bacchanalian frenzies were hardly appropriate in this context, nor were the exotic rituals of imported gods such as Isis (Measures against: by

39 Apollo too was a god of foreign origin, but the only such foreign god to find such favour with Augustus, a favour that at times looks to be bordering on obsession. Aside from this one exception Augustus confined his interest to the traditionally Roman gods. Dionysus also had the attached odium during the early principate of Augustus of having been, in conjunction with Hercules, one of the gods with whom Marc Antony had closely identified himself with (Plutarch, Antony, 24; Dio, 49, 15, 5) so for this reason too was likely to be avoided in any Augustan scheme.

40 There were further reasons beyond the connection with Antony that made the cult of Dionysius incompatible with the Augustan agenda. The cult had been the target of savage Senatorial suppression in 186 B.C. (ILS 18; Livy, Hist. 39, 8-14). The cult, structured in cohesive groups, inclusive of all social levels, providing a primary role for women, and containing, allowing or requiring a sense of personal commitment of belief, contained all the elements to allow it to be seen as a political and social threat by the Senatorial authorities. The Augustan agenda was similarly in opposition to such practices, see Beard, M., Norton, J., Price, S., Religions of Rome., Cambridge, 1998, pp. 93 ff.
Augustus in 28 BC, (Dio, 53, 2, 4) forbidding celebration of Egyptian religious rites within the pomerium; by Agrippa in 20 BC, (Dio, 54, 6, 6) reiterating the same.) Isis had of course been the goddess that Cleopatra had wished herself to be closely identified with (Plutarch, Antony, 54, 6; Dio, 50, 5, 34; 50, 25, 40), providing perhaps a compelling reason for disfavour towards this goddess on the part of Augustus. Even the cult of Magna Mater, long resident in Rome and supportive of the Roman ideology, was not looked upon with much favour. In the case of the Temple of Magna Mater the lack of favour made it scarce worth looking at, Augustus considering tufa and stucco good enough to house the goddess when he re-built her temple in 3 AD. These may have been the original materials, and Augustus may have been able to maintain that he was only respecting the past, but the close proximity of this temple to his own lavish shrine to Palatine Apollo may have influenced the choice of material restoration.

So Augustus supported the deities that supported his concept of what Rome should be, and his support and refurbishment of the gods’ abodes supported and expressed his concept of the role of the princeps as the chief intermediary between the Roman people and their gods, a concept

---

underlined by his eventual inclusion of the position of Pontifex Maximus as an inherent component of the princeps' offices (R. G. 10).
The chief patron of the city was also the principal client of the gods, offering up goods and services for their benefit. How important this role was to the idea of what the princeps was is made all the more evident by the monopoly maintained by Augustus in his religious building programme. Few others were permitted to partake in this activity. Agrippa was given the honour of building the Pantheon, but there was a side issue here. The Pantheon had originally been conceived with the purpose of including Augustus amongst the other gods, an idea later modified to lessen the impact of such a novelty (Dio, 53, 27, 1-3).
Nevertheless it must have seemed rather more appropriate to have one's own temple, even if it was to be shared with others, built under the auspices of someone else.

Also it must be remembered that the Pantheon was not a traditional temple, it was a novelty in itself, designed as it was to have all the major gods in harmony under one roof, and built on the Campus Martius, not exactly the most traditional site for a temple, especially one promoting the concept of peace or harmony. The only other significant partner in the temple building programme was Tiberius, allowed (or ordered) to rebuild two major old temples in the Forum, those of Concordia and the

---
Dioscuri, and that only after the process of elimination by death had left Tiberius as the only possible successor to Augustus.\textsuperscript{43}

Religious renewal, resurgent piety, the refounding of Rome along traditional lines, these were considered appropriate areas for the attention of the princeps. These were not only done under his own auspices, but jealously guarded by him. Other areas of urban renewal were not so rarified, and common mortals such as Agrippa were permitted to participate in these building projects. The most extreme example would have to be the Cloaca Maxima, the main sewer of Rome, in need of repair, and assigned to Agrippa for his attention (Dio, 49, 43).\textsuperscript{44} Now it could be argued that a well made and efficient sewerage system, facilitating as it does a much enhanced and more comfortable, not to mention healthy urban environment would be one of the most well received gifts that one could make to the largest urban environment yet known to the Mediterranean world. Even on a symbolic level there could be an appeal, namely the efficient disposal of the poisonous waste of the city.\textsuperscript{45}

Augustus obviously thought not, or thought it not in keeping with his

\textsuperscript{43}Tiberian responsibility for the reconstruction of these temples; Concordia, Dio, 55, 8, 2; 56, 25, 1; Ovid, \textit{Fast.}, 1, 637-8; Suet, \textit{Tib.} 20; Dioscuri, Ovid, \textit{Ifast.}, 1, 707-8; Suet, \textit{Tib.}, 290; Dio, 55, 27, 4

\textsuperscript{44}The renewal of the Cloaca Maxima was probably part of Agrippa’s programme of works dating to his aedileship of 33 B.C. He was at that time very much a part of the supporting faction of the Octavian cause, Syme, R., \textit{The Roman Revolution}, Oxford, 1939, p. 241 f.

\textsuperscript{45}For a relatively contemporary, and glowing, account in its favour, Pliny, \textit{HN.}, 36, 104-8.
newly constructed image. Agrippa got to do the dirty work, personally touring the sewers in a boat, while Augustus received the kudos for having taken the trouble to think of his subjects' continued wellbeing, and having the power to direct his loyal assistant to undertake such an onerous task. Augustus won all round, the job was done, the sewers worked, Rome was cleansed and renewed from the top of the Palatine hill to the depths of her sewers, all under the ultimate direction of her new Emperor. Yet he could still maintain his distance from the more earthly/earthly aspects of this renewal, and remain so much more closely associated with the mythological and divine.

The Role of Agrippa

There was a balancing act that Augustus needed to maintain if he was to take the population of the city along with him. It was all very well to have achieved sole power, but to maintain that power there was a need to persuade the city that their best interests lay in supporting the creation of the role of the princeps, or at least not actively attacking the concept. Others had reached positions of sole power, Julius Caesar of course being the most obvious example, and look what had happened to him, assassinated by his peers. It was not that he had been unpopular with the vast majority of the people in Rome, in fact quite the opposite, the plebs had rioted on the occasion of his death (Suet. Caes. 1, 85). It was his overriding of the power, authority and prestige of the senate that caused
his downfall (Suet. Caes. 1, 78). Only too aware of this precedent, Augustus was at pains to appear as anything but a tyrant. He needed to keep all social levels on side, whilst still providing the benefits that he wished to show his reign could bestow on the city, from the highest to the lowest members of its inhabitants. Up until the time of his death Agrippa provided Augustus with one of the solutions to this problem.

We have already seen how the renovation of the sewers and the construction of the Pantheon had been delegated to Agrippa, for the reason that these tasks could not be made to sit comfortably with the image of the role of the princeps that Augustus wished to project. However the building programme undertaken by Agrippa went far beyond these two projects, he being responsible for most of the transformation of the Campus Martius, building or rebuilding there the thermae Agrippae, the Saepta Iulia, the stagnum Agrippae, the Pantheon, the Basilica of Neptune, and the aqua Virgo to supply the water needed for the baths. Adjoining the Campus Martius was the

---

46 After his assumption of sole power there begins to be a discernible movement away from the close association and identification between Octavian and his illustrious adopted forebear that was so apparent during the last decade of the late republic. Rose, B., *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period.*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 11-12, n. 10, 11; Ramage, E. S., 'Augustus' Treatment of Julius Caesar,' *Historia* 34, 1985, pp. 223-45; Syme, R., *Roman Papers*, 1979, Oxford, pp. 213-4; White, P., 'Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome.', *Phoenix*, 42, 1988, pp. 334-56.


campus Agrippae, a park devoted to recreation, on which was built the porticus Vipsaniae. Elsewhere in the city he repaired streets, the channels of the existing aqueducts, constructed the horrea Agrippiana, a new warehouse for the very necessary grain dole, also the aqua Iulia and the pons Agrippae. The building programme of Agrippa was vast, expensive, particularly practical in parts, and diverse. Moreover, much of it was financed from the private wealth of Agrippa himself, starting in 33 BC with his term as aedile Dio.

There was however one strong underlying thread of cohesion amongst the range and diversity, and that was the public for which these projects were undertaken. The baths were the first of the great Imperial baths in Rome, and who would benefit? One presumes the rich could afford their own private facilities, the poorer could not. Agrippa’s provision for a year’s free bathing for all in 33 BC would underline this focus on the part

---


of Agrippa to be inclusive with his largesse (Dio, 49, 43). Now all could enjoy the luxury provided. The park too provided a recreational facility that paralleled the private estates of the rich, but it was for the people, it was public. The horrea stored their food, the aqueducts quenched their thirsts and supplied their baths. They could rest by the Stagnum and indulge their artistic senses amongst the treasures displayed in the Saepta. The common element of the Agrippan building projects were the common people, the un- or under-privileged, the masses of the city.

Whereas Augustus more than happily promoted himself as the patron of the gods and the senators of Rome, did he perhaps think it would be too much for his senatorial peers, be too obvious a concentration of undivided power in his one set of hands, if he became the patron and hero of the plebs as well? Could this be one of the reasons behind the division of the tasks, not only to share the organisation and expense, not only to include others in his programme of renewal, but to head off the problem that had confronted Julius Caesar, the resentment produced by being perceived to have too much power through the control and loyalty of the plebs, and thus pose a threat to the prestige and position of the senate?

The mission of Augustus throughout his reign was a complex of multi-

---

faceted, multi-targeted programmes, ideals and ideas held together and
given a singularity of purpose by two underlying and mutually
dependent goals, the preservation, restoration and continuation of the
might and glory of Rome and of the gens Iulia. In the systematic visual
programme undertaken throughout the length of his reign the two
became interlinked to such an extent that the best interests of one became
inextricably meshed in the best interests of the other until it was all but
impossible to separate the one from the other. It was a conception of a
mutually dependant relationship that existed from the very beginning of
the Augustan hegemony. The imagery was refined as his reign
progressed. The relationship adapted itself to accommodate changed
circumstances, as has been pointed out in the case of the Temple of Mars
Ultor in the Augustan forum. It also adapted itself to changed
circumstances within the familia Iulia as well. Events such as the death
of Marcellus and later on the deaths of Gaius and Lucius provided
Augustus with further opportunities to promote his dynastic goals. The
heirs may have been dead, but the idea of dynasty was reinforced through
the furtherance of the presence of the gens Iulia via projects of
commemoration such as the Theatre of Marcellus and the Portico of
Gaius and Lucius. In the grouping of monuments at the northern end of
the Campus Martius that included the Ara Pacis one can find a distilled
expression that encapsulated this Augustan philosophy of mutual inter-
dependence.

Down on the Campus, early in his life, Augustus, (or should that rather
be Octavian) began the construction of a building that was not to have its principal purpose realised till after the end of his reign; the building in question is of course his Mausoleum. As odd as it may seem to start with a building meant for an end, there was a method to the madness on the part of Augustus/Octavian. That a mausoleum speaks of the end is undeniable, but it need not be the exclusive message. Especially when it is constructed at the beginning of an undertaking such as Octavian was engaged upon, it espoused another extremely important message: that at the completion of the undertaking the achievements of the individual will be worthy of the memorial. In this way the monument meant for the end but built at the beginning expressed something of the ambitions and goals of its instigator. However, this is not all such a building can tell us.

When Octavian/Augustus began the construction of his mausoleum he was still a relatively young man of thirty and on his rise to power still, yet to assume sole leadership of the Roman state. So why should a young man, visions of glory before his eyes, fighting for his political future be so intent on providing for his death? Part of the answer may be in what else the mausoleum provided for its young owner other than just a resting place for his corpse-to-be. According to Kraft the construction of this enormous building can be explained in relation to the illegally published

51This dating of the construction of the mausoleum is dependent on an acceptance of the argument as proposed by Kraft, K., 'Der Sinn des Mausoleums des Augustus', Historia 16, 1967, pp 189-206, and accepted by Zanker, 1988, p. 72.
will of Marc Antony, in which he desired that upon his death his body should be interred at Alexandria in Egypt alongside Cleopatra after, according to Octavian's propagandists, he had moved the capital of the empire to Alexandria and changed the governmental form of the empire to a Hellenistic style monarchy\textsuperscript{52}. Though an attractive argument it is as yet still somewhat controversial and thus uncertain. What is certain is that the mausoleum was designed to be noticed, and in being noticed was intended to convey a message about its owner, and later occupant.

The most inescapable attribute of the building was and is its sheer size, it was quite simply huge\textsuperscript{53}. Size shows wealth, size means power, size is important. Eighty seven metres in diameter, close to forty metres high, more if one adds the colossal statue of Octavian/Augustus that most probably surmounted this bulky structure, size alone would have ensured its presence was felt, but position too was used to emphasise its existence. Amongst the crowded and tangled mess that was urban Rome the mausoleum was erected in the heart of a spacious park (Suet. Aug. 100, 4), set apart in splendid isolation. More space and air was given to one of the would-be-dead than to hundreds or thousands of the living. The park would provide a welcome place of rest and recreation for the

\textsuperscript{52}Zanker, 1988, p. 72.

inhabitants of the crowded metropolis, attract them into itself, and in doing so the mausoleum would remind them of to whom they owed this pleasant place of leisure.

Heed for tradition, custom, call it what one will, was always a major consideration in the public behaviour of Octavian/Augustus, and customarily private tombs had been placed alongside the roads leading in and out of Rome, and could be of great size. None however could compete with the bulk and position of Octavian’s tomb, and that, one supposes, was the idea. None could, would or should compete with him who would be Rome’s saviour. The scale of the mausoleum is also interesting in the context of both the time and the political position of Octavian in which it was conceived. It is imperial in size, yet the competitive display with its insistence on the individual is essentially a product of late Republican thinking. This concentration on the individual was later softened or diffused by the addition of surrounding monuments, but at its conception the message was one of unrivalled egoism.

The form of the tomb was also important, incorporating as it did the *tumulus*, an archaic element meant to refer to Rome’s long gone

---

54 One immediately thinks here of the tomb of Caecilia Metella on the Via Appia Antica, though this example does have the difficulty as to the likelihood of its construction post-dating that of the tomb of Augustus. However, for the suggestion that roadside mausolea were used as devices in aristocratic competitive display see Patterson, J. R. *LTUR* 5, p. 131. On the Via Appia see Quilici, L., *Via Appia de Porta Capena ai Colli Albani*, Rome, 1989.

origins, the burial mounds of the Trojan heroes whence the Roman race was said to have sprung, or from the traditional funerary mounds of the Etruscans\textsuperscript{56}. In the Augustan scheme one would presume that the Trojan connection held more attraction than the Etruscan. But the form of the tomb had more than attractive mytho-historical associations, as pointed out by Zanker, The entire structure could be seen to act as ‘a monumental base for the statue of Augustus’\textsuperscript{57}. Also, if one looks at the shape of the tomb it is obvious that it is of a type that will resist the passage of time. Squat, solid, there is little to fall off or over. It has the effect of permanence in the same manner as a natural mound or hill, an effect that must have been heightened by the plantings of trees on the slopes of the tomb itself (Strabo, 5, 3, 9). The artificial was naturalised into its environment, thus making it seem part of the general scheme of things, part of the world as it was meant to be. Likewise the trees on the slope of the tomb would have aesthetically linked the mausoleum with the parkland, thereby making the park a part of the memorial, just as the tomb became part of the park.

With the population of the city attracted to this area of the Campus due to its salubrious atmosphere an opportunity for further promotion of the Augustan agenda was all too tempting, and was not to go unfulfilled. The entire corner of the Campus in which the mausoleum was built was eventually redeveloped as a complex and interlocking triad of mutually

\textsuperscript{56}For the two main proposed reconstructions of the form the Mausoleum took see Plate 4.

\textsuperscript{57}Zanker, 1988, pp. 75-76.
referencing monuments, incorporating the mausoleum, the Ara Pacis, and the Horologium.

Built between 13 and 9 BC (at around the mid-point of what would be the reign of Augustus, though no-one was to know that then) the Ara Pacis provided not only complement but counterpoint to the mausoleum in scale, style and context. Its construction was precipitated ex senatus consulto as a thank-offering for the return of Augustus after a campaign in Gaul and Spain (RG, 12, 2). The role and position of Augustus in relation to the Senate was underlined and reaffirmed by this action, with the show of a loyal and grateful Senate acting on its own initiative. Whether Augustus may have assisted them in their enthusiasm there is no way of telling. Though the altar was the result of military tasks successfully undertaken for Rome’s benefit there was no suggestion of a triumph, even if the occasion of its being voted recalls the voting of a triumphal arch. When Octavian had returned from the East in 29 B.C. the Senate had voted him triumphal arch(es?) to be erected in the Forum Romanum even though his victory had been over a fellow citizen. Arches were the regular means of commemorating military success, even if not normally for such an occasion. By 13 B.C. however times, ideas and needs had changed, and an altar to Peace was deemed more

appropriate than a celebration of pure militarism. Religious in its nature and effect, it piously alluded to the benefits that result from military victory rather than the victory for its own sake. It was not a celebration of war, but a celebration of the peace resulting from the deterrent effect of overwhelming military strength. This was a definite shift in emphasis.

The siting of the altar was also significant, and links in with the previous idea as to its relation to war and peace. It was built beside the via Lata, the urban portion of the via Flaminia, the road that led out of Rome to the northern provinces, and given high visibility due to a freedom from any closely surrounding structures. It was this selfsame spaciousness in its immediate vicinity which allowed the visual, and thus the symbolic, linking of the Ara Pacis, the Augustan Horologium and the Augustan Mausoleum. It was also built on the edge of the Campus Martius, and there was no place in Rome more redolent of Rome's present glories built on a foundation of past military strength and the sacrifice that that strength required. Now in the reign of Augustus much of the campus had been transformed through the projects of both the princeps and his right-hand man Agrippa into a recreational facility for the benefit of the people of Rome. The coming of peace under the auspices of the princeps allowed a transformation in both the lives of the people of his city, and in the actual functions of the city's environment from the necessary rigours.

---

of war to the delights and healthy distractions of recreation, with an emphasis on the healthiness of these distractions. A third significant aspect of its siting was that it was constructed exactly one mile outside the pomerium, the religious boundary of the city, the point at which magisterial power changed from imperium militiae to imperium domi, the point at which senatorially conferred imperium changed from military to domestic. In not being a triumphal arch but an altar, the whole tone of the monument is radically re-assigned, taking it away from the secular and the militaristic and repositioning it amongst the religious. However the link remains, with the religious sphere benefitting not so much at the expense of, but rather as a result of, the militaristic.

The change in the emphasis from military to religious is paralleled by a change in temporal perspective as well. Whilst triumphal arches commemorated a victory now past and gone, with the altar victory remained, though unspecified, victory not a victory; for the real victory is peace and the fruits of that peace in the present and on into the future. It is a shift from the specific to the general, from a victory to victory, and then a re-focusing on an abstract or transcendent idea, Pax or Peace, the result of victory. Nor is the peace due only to military strength. The opportunity for Peace has been won militarily, but its maintenance must be through religion and religious piety. There is also the simple reversal

from a sense of looking back to a looking forward, from a memory of that which is gone (the military effort) to a hope for a continuance of that which is now a reality (the peace), a move from the commemoration of a single past event to the celebration of an on-going process. As a Roman victory monument it is a complete innovation, eschewing glorification of war for its opposite, peace, and replacing glorification of individual military success with a promotion of community through religious observance.

The innovation did not stop there. The ‘historical’ reliefs that decorate the upper panels of the outside of the walls of the altar’s enclosure also seem to have been the first of their type to be incorporated into a state monument. The reliefs are an important insight into the ideological programme of Augustus of which the altar formed a significant part. The outer walls of the monument are divided horizontally in halves, the lower half decorated in an extremely fine example of “a decorative frieze of lush vegetation, curling tendrils romping with all the implausible symmetry of wall paper design”. Implausible as it may be however, the symmetry of this lush vegetation is important in its suggestion of

---

61 The reliefs are termed historical, for they are presented as such, yet indeed they are far from being truly historical. They are in fact a mixture of myth, legend, and in the case of the relief showing the family of Augustus, an idealisation. Truth in this ‘history’ would be an unwelcome intruder. For an attempt to garner historical accuracy from and for the relief sculptures, Syme, R. ‘Neglected Children on the Ara Pacis,’ AJA 88, 1984, pp. 583-89. For the rebuttal, Pollini, J., ‘Ahenobarbi, Appulei and some others on the Ara Pacis.’ AJA 90, 1986, pp. 453-60. See also Pollini, J., Studies in Augustan ‘Historical’ Reliefs., Berkeley, 1978. On the innovation of the reliefs Torelli, M., Typology and Structure, 1982 p. 29 ff.

order and regularity placed on the overwhelming fecundity of nature. Romp it may, but only to the ends of its designer's wishes. The internal decoration as we shall see stresses this same fecundity, and presents it as one of the fruits of peace, so the outer and inner walls are linked by this motif.

The frieze also effects a visual link between the various relief panels that comprise the upper portions of the outer walls. The diverse subject matter and symbols of the upper friezes are quite literally underlined by the continuity of the lower friezes. The 'implausible symmetry' also underscores the overriding stylistic theme of the monument, the restrained and elegant neo-classicism so evident in the historical reliefs, and even in the simple undecorated base, door frames and parapet, and the simplicity and symmetry of the structure as a whole.

Unfortunately this is not the place to undertake a detailed discussion and interpretation of the historical reliefs as individual pieces. However, as they are obviously such an important element of the structure, providing such a wealth of meaning to it, at least a brief discussion must be included. The two main long side reliefs depict a religious ceremony, with a procession of priests which culminates with the Imperial family, individualised though idealised against the background of un-individualised, classicized ideal types. At the procession's head Augustus, his own head draped by his toga indicating his role as priest for
the sacrifices, is surrounded by priests and companions. Here is the aristocracy of Rome co-mingled with the Imperial family, its youthful members promising a future, Augustus at its head providing leadership and example by his pious behaviour.

The style is classic, elegant, restrained, somewhat aloof, and highly dignified. The subject matter is contemporary, the style makes it timeless and lends it an air of authority and correctness. It is interesting to note who is not included in the procession, the common people. They have no place here, unless it is to view Rome’s elite on pious display. The smaller panels positioned beside the doors at either end depict non-contemporary subjects. Here are Roma and Tellus, both peaceful, fecund, promising. There are also depictions of the Lupercal and Aeneas, Aeneas who founded Latium and the family that would eventually lead it to this new age, Romulus who founded the city that would give its name to its empire and its era. Pius Aeneas sacrifices, Augustus sacrifices. Pious Augustus, second founder of Rome, another Romulus? Aeneas led his people through the trials and tribulations of their years in the wilderness to the safety of their new homeland, so has Augustus led the Roman people through turbulent times to a new era. This was pre-destined for Aeneas, son of a deity. Augustus, son of the deified Caesar, would seem to have a favoured destiny also.

Inside the altar’s walls the reliefs depict garlands and bucrania hanging
above a rendering in marble of a wooden fence. The garlands and the bucra
nia mark this out as a sacred enclosure, as the wooden fence and the outside scrollwork, possibly imitating the Temple of Janus, mark the enclosure out as a *templum minus* or a *templum in terris*, created according to very archaic augural laws\textsuperscript{63}. The mythological, political, religious, and fictional historical themes, all rooted firmly in the archaic past, are linked to the present by strong associations and comparisons, a present which incorporates the hope of the future.

The interwoven and mutually amplifying layers of symbols, signifiers and meanings, so dense as to be almost encrusted onto this one monument were further complicated by the altar’s relationship to the other monuments and structures in the vicinity.

Built to the west of the Ara Pacis was the Horologium, a huge sundial, laid out on a paving of travertine, the necessary lines of the calendar inset into the paving in bronze and an enormous obelisk was employed as the gnomon. The obelisk recalled the victory of Actium merely by its Egyptian origin, a reference underscored by the inscription at its base (*CIL* 6, 702 = *ILS* 91). It also, however, recalls more peaceful themes, the continuing wealth of the province, and the availability of that wealth to the people of Rome through the efforts of Augustus in bringing it within the fold of Roman territory.

\textsuperscript{63}Torelli, M., 1982, p. 31.
The Horologium was so positioned that at the autumnal equinox, September 23, the day of Augustus' birth, the shadow of the obelisk not only indicated this on its face, but also pointed towards the Ara Pacis. Thus the birth of Augustus was linked directly to the monument celebrating the peace brought by Augustus' actions. It implied a destiny to the life of Augustus, and moreover, he as the saving destiny of the Roman people. It was a destiny predetermined from the date of his birth, a destiny written in the stars. The destiny was indicated on the Horologium by the sun, to whom, as a god, the gnomon was dedicated. Of course Apollo too was connected with the sun, as well as being the god associated with prophecy. So the god of prophecy, civilisation and the primary tutelary god of Augustus indicated to the people of the Roman Empire, via the shadow cast by the gnomon dedicated to one aspect of him, the destiny of Augustus and the benefits that flowed from his position of power. The destiny of Augustus was thus shown to be cosmically ordered and divinely ordained.64

The view from this angle from the Horologium would have included on the left the tomb of Augustus surrounded by its park, including the

64 There seems to be some sort of a problem here. The birth of Augustus is unequivocally given as just before sunrise on the 23rd of September in Suetonius Aug. 5. However the propaganda of Octavian also shows that he presented himself as having been born under the sign of Capricorn (see Zanker) and this too is mentioned by Suetonius Aug. 94. September and Capricorn are incompatible, there is no possibility of them coinciding. The adoption of Capricorn as the zodiacal symbol of Augustus is understandable as the sign under which he would have been conceived, however, there is also the fact that the shadow cast by the gnomon would only have pointed towards the Ara Pacis late in the afternoon, which would seem to minimise its connection with the time of Augustus' birth.
**Ustrinum**, the enclosure in which the body of Augustus would be cremated when the time came. The one view therefore incorporated the birth, destined life, death and place of apotheosis as well as the continuing presence and memory of Augustus, with a parallel interconnection between all the imagery, themes and symbolism that these three monuments contained. Past, present, future; gods, legends and ‘reality’; birth, life and death all combined with the result that an almost impenetrable web of meanings was created. Thus the entire complex and its subject matter became not only self justifying, but through its divine sanction indisputable and inevitable.

**Rome Resplendent: The Material Transformation**

Urbem neque pro maiestate imperii ornatum et inundationibus incendiisque obnoxiam excoluit adeo, ut iure sit gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, quam latericiam accepisset.

Since the city was not adorned as the dignity of the empire demanded, and was exposed to flood and fire, he so beautified it that he could justly boast that he found it built in brick and left it marble.

(Suet. Aug 28)

So could write Suetonius, indicating what would have been to contemporary Romans one of the most visible and unavoidable
elements in the city as a result of the Augustan building programme. Marble was the stone of choice when it came to the public works of Augustus, and though this may seem rather a minor facet within the complexity of symbolism ever present throughout the Augustan works, it would have had a far greater impact than may at first appear. It was a detail of great enough significance to be mentioned by Suetonius before he actually detailed the buildings that were the product of the Augustan age. Whether or not the emperor ever boasted of any such thing, it was a fact that he could have done. Furthermore, it was an obvious enough fact to contemporary residents of the city that it was thought worthy of comment (Ovid, AA, 3, 125), an Ovidian acknowledgement of the city transformed around him. Perhaps we should look a little deeper at this aspect of the Augustan building programme.

It was probably rather convenient, especially to the Imperial finances, that good quality marble of exploitable quantities was discovered at Luna in time for Augustus to make good use of it. Prior to the opening of the Luna quarries the main source of architectural marble had been the Greek east. Importation from this source was technically feasible though

---

65 Sear, F., Roman Architecture, London, 1982 p. 84 “By 48 BC the marble quarries at Carrara in northern Italy were being exploited...”. The earliest archaeologically known example of Luna marble used architecturally is from the restoration of 36 B.C. of the Regia in the Forum Romanum, Borghini, G., (ed.), Marmi Antichi, Rome, 1989, p. 248 n. 95. However Fant, J. C., ’A distribution model for the Roman imperial marbles’ in The Inscribed Economy, JRA Supp. 6, Ann Arbor, 1993, p. 147 n. 15, claims its use must have been incorporated in the Julian Forum from its inception. The Julian Forum was conceived as early as 54 B.C. (Cic. Att. 4, 16, 8), Richardson, 1992, p. 165, and dedicated on the 26th of September 46 B.C. (Dio, 43, 22, 2), which suggests a start to quarrying at Luna at least by the late 50’s B.C.
incredibly costly undertaking. This was one of the major reasons that Rome had remained relatively un-marbled; sheer expense denied its use except for the most extravagant and luxurious of buildings. Furthermore the troubled times during the period of the late republic had not been conducive to the organisation of resources needed to transport such materials from diverse parts of the Mediterranean world. However reasons such as these that had led to the sparing use of marble added to the prestige of the stone. That which is rare and expensive is always highly likely to become that which is desirable, particularly within such a competitive milieu as aristocratic Rome.\(^{66}\)

There were also other factors that marked out marble as the desirable construction material in the Rome of the late Republic and early Empire. One was its extensive use throughout the Greek world, the great cities of the eastern Mediterranean. Those influential centres of culture, taste and learning chose to adorn themselves in marble. Rome had relied on brick, wood, tufa and travertine for its building materials, practical enough materials to be sure, but hardly glamorous\(^ {67}\). A few buildings had been endowed with marble features, such as the Temple of Capitoline Jupiter, its reconstruction begun by Sulla (Val. Max. 9, 3, 8; Tac. Hist. 3. 72), who brought columns from Greece to grace its façade (Pliny, HN. 36, 45)\(^ {68}\).

\(^{66}\) Fant, 1993, p. 146

\(^{67}\) Sear, 1982, pp. 69-85

But these buildings were a rarity. Indeed the fact that only columns were imported by Sulla to ornament the most prestigious and visible temple at Rome was an indication of both the status this stone was thought to be able to impart, and the expense and logistical difficulty the importation of such stone required. If the most luxuriously appointed temple in Rome could only manage to have its colonnade in marble, what chance had the rest of the city of adorning itself in such material? By the time of the late Republic however the increasing wealth of the top ranking citizens of Rome had increased the presence of architectural marble in the city, mainly to provide domestic improvement in displays of extravagant competitiveness (Vitruvius, 6, 5, 2; Pliny, HN, 36, 48)69. It was a practice that provided an easy target for condemnation in the moralizing rhetoric of the time70. The discovery of marble reserves in Italy made marble available for the first time at an affordable price and with an ease of access that made its extensive use feasible.

However the old connotations remained. Marble retained the glamour ascribed to it, was still seen as expensive and luxurious. For the educated and/or travelled elite it was a material infused with the glamour of Greece, with the glories of the Greek classical past, that which was

---

70 Later records of this, Pliny, HN. 36, 7; 36, 48; 36, 49-50; Plutarch, Lucullius, 38.4; 39, 2; 39, 3; 40, 2; 40, 3.
considered the height of civilisation, culture, and sophisticated taste. Greece and its culture enjoyed an extremely high status amongst the people of fashion at Rome. Not only the cities of Greece, but those throughout the Hellenistic world were renowned for their beauty, which was in part the result of the extensive use of marble in their public buildings. For a city to compete in the beauty stakes at this time it had to be made of marble. Rome, ruler of its known world, mighty mistress of the many weak Greek cities of the Eastern Mediterranean, was clothed in tufa and travertine, built of brick and wood. The anomaly was all too clear, and an unconscionable situation for Augustus, the ruler of Rome, the city that ruled the world (Suet. Aug. 28).

Marble also has a practical advantage over materials such as tufa, wood, and brick. It is hard, and though not impervious to fire, is more resilient to time and its travails. Rome would benefit from its use, as would the creator of the new city. His legacy would stand the test of time, his efforts would not so easily go up in smoke. The continuing existence of parts of some of these structures built of marble is testimony to its outstanding qualities. Moreover, the fineness of its crystalline structure enables it to be worked to a much higher degree of detail than either tufa or travertine, so a richness of decorative detail was now possible, a richness which declared the power and prosperity of the new age, and of course, the new ruler, he that made it possible. The quarrying, transportation, shaping and finishing of marble is more difficult due to its very nature, it
is harder and heavier, therefore more difficult to move and work. Its extensive use therefore reflects favourably on the wealth and power of an individual who can mobilise the necessary resources to use this material. Rome could now be as resplendent, if not more so, than its subject cities, and all thanks to its new patron and refounder.

Marble also had other advantages over the limestones, tufas and terracotta that to this time had been the standard materials of which the city had been composed. In particular marble has two aesthetic qualities that these other materials could never rival. One is the ability of marble to be worked and polished to a very high degree, giving it a bright reflectivity, a quality that would set it apart from the predominately matte surfaces of the Republican city. The other is the range of colours and patterned effects that were available in the marbles found throughout the Mediterranean world: reds, yellows, greens, black and purple, from the greyish white of the stone from Luni or the brilliant white severity of the stone of Thasos, to the richly mottled surface of africano or cipollino.

Through the extensive importation of stone from throughout the Roman world the buildings of Augustan Rome were supplied with a whole new palate of colours and patterns and surface texture with which to clothe themselves. The resources of Rome's empire were available to be used in the beautification of the city, a tangible presence of her wide
ranging hegemony and influence infused into the fabric of the urban landscape. Moreover the exploitation and application of these resources were made possible through the beneficence of the princeps, pater patriae and patronus urbi. A result of the adoption and thereafter extensive use of marble by Augustus is that it became a signifier of his involvement in a building project. Therefore the longer he remained in power, and the more projects were undertaken by him and completed in marble, the more his presence was diffused through the city of Rome. The progressive encrustation of Rome in its marble cladding would have kept the presence of the princeps constantly before the minds of the populace, and given a sure indication as to just how extensive the building programme of their leader was. When Augustus found Rome a city of brick he found a city that belonged to the Roman people. When he left it a city of marble, he left it a city that belonged to himself and his successors.

In A.D. 14 Augustus finally died at the age of 76 leaving what seemed to be his reluctant choice of Tiberius well established as his successor. The dynastic dreams of Augustus had finally died with Gaius in A.D. 4 and it had been to Tiberius that he had had to resort in an effort to provide some form of smooth transition of governance in the event of his own death. The death of Augustus would bring with it the one last 'first' in the principate of Augustus, and a first in the governance of Rome since the time of the kings, the transfer of autocratic power through inheritance. It was an event that would only happen on the death of Augustus, and as such was in fact beyond his direct control. This minor detail would not prevent him from attempting to control events from beyond the grave. In doing so he was to reveal the true nature of the principate as he had created it and as he thought of it, as an inheritable position of power, conferred autocratically rather than constitutionally or senatorially.

Already the step-son and son-in-law, Tiberius was nevertheless adopted as the son, and also required to adopt his nephew Germanicus as his son. By this last action the obsession of Augustus to have a blood member of his family eventually succeeding to the position of princeps was revealed. Tiberius, without a drop of Julian blood, would never be

the ultimate choice of heir while there remained a trace of the genes of
the gens Iulia in existence. However, in A.D. 4 Tiberius was really the
only choice available. By adopting Tiberius as his son Augustus provided
the state with an heir who was legally part of the gens Iulia, thus
allowing the continuation of the Julian name, with all its associated
auctoritas including - and this may be the an important element that led
to the decision - all of the accumulated links to the world of the divine
and claims of favoured destiny\(^2\). Besides the adoption Augustus had
also moved to provide Tiberius with the necessary legal basis to take over
the position of princeps on the event of his death. Tiberius had a ten
year term of the tribunicia potestas bestowed upon him, along with a
grant of proconsular imperium for his command on the vital, yet never
fully settled, northern frontier of the empire. In A.D. 13, following his
triumph of A.D. 12, the tribunicia potestas was prolonged, and the
imperium proconsularis was upgraded so as to be on an equal footing
with that held by Augustus(Tac. Ann. 1, 3, 3; Dio, 55, 13, 20; Vell. Pat. 2,
99, 1)\(^3\). To all intents and purposes Tiberius was at the level of co-ruler,
in as much as the position of princeps was able to be shared.

Constitutionally and legally Tiberius was positioned as the successor, a

\(^2\)The obsession of Augustus to provide an Imperial Julian family for Tiberius is accentuated by his
posthumous adoption of Livia into the gens (Suet. Aug. 101; Dio, 56, 46, 1). This was an
extraordinary act flying in the face of Augustus’ own legislation on marriage and adoption. Never
before had a wife been posthumously adopted into the gens of her late husband, and one can
understand why. Legally the adoption must have made Livia the daughter of Augustus, yet she retained
her position as mother of Tiberius, the son of Augustus, a strange familial juxtaposition indeed.

433.
state of affairs that was re-affirmed in the physical fabric of the city of Rome, by the incorporation of Tiberius into the building programme of Augustus, and in a highly significant way.

As we have seen Augustus had maintained a sharp delineation between different areas of his building programme. In the main he retained for himself responsibility for the construction or reconstruction of the religious buildings of Rome, particularly the major temples of the city, and especially those that had a long and venerable history in the city. There were, however, a few exceptions. There was the Pantheon, built under the auspices of Agrippa, and the Temple of Concord and the Temple of the Dioscuri both built under the patronage of Tiberius. The motivation behind the inclusion of Agrippa in this role had probably been due to the initial intention of having the Pantheon contain a statue of Augustus amidst the other gods. As has been previously mentioned, this aspect of the temple would have made it a far too politically sensitive a project for Augustus himself to undertake. The political sensitivity, aligned with the non-traditional nature of the structure, required one other than the princeps to be associated with its construction.
**Tiberian Temple Building.**

The reason for Tiberius' inclusion in the building of temples was most probably due to his nomination as successor. The temples he was permitted to re-build were important in the context of the Augustan ideology for a number of reasons. They were traditional temples of ancient foundation and as such figured in Augustus' aim of spiritually regenerating the city through its old gods and practices. Also, both temples were part of the Roman Forum, and we have seen just how complete was Augustan control in this most important part of the city. To give over responsibility for construction in this area would denote especially high favour.

The history of the Temple of Castor ranged back to its vowing by the dictator Postumius at the time of the Battle of Lake Regillus in 493 B.C. and its final dedication in 484 B.C. (Livy 2.20.12; 2.42.5)\(^4\). This lent the building a venerable and archaic past, and important symbolism as regards the Augustan programme of symbolic associations. Not only had

the battle of Lake Regillus marked the final end to monarchy or tyranny at Rome, and an important step in Rome's eventual hegemony over theItalic states, but the legend of the battle also included the participation of the Dioscuri (Dio. Hal. Rom. Ant. 6. 13 ff). Thus the cause of both theRepublican form of government and Roman empire building wereassisted via the intervention of these gods and could be seen to be divinely sanctioned. One can see why these aspects of the battle could sit comfortably with the Augustan agenda. Being the Temple of Castor, and therefore of Pollux also, the temple also had welcome associations with intra-familial piety and loyalty, an aspect emphasised by the dedicatory inscription that included both the name of Tiberius and his deceased brother Drusus (Suet. Tib. 20; Dio, 55. 27. 4; Ovid, Fasti, 1. 707-8). This aspect would have been further strengthened by the renaming in A. D. 12 of the Basilica Julia which lay alongside the temple as the Basilica of Gaius and Lucius and the Portico of Gaius and Lucius that stood fronting the Basilica Aemilia on the opposing side of the Forum (R. G. 20; Suet., Aug., 29, 4; Dio, 56, 27, 5).

The sibling loyalty present in the inscription on the Temple of Castor is evident also in the inscription on the other Forum temple re-built by Tiberius, the Temple of Concord. This temple also had a venerable and useful past, being first vowed by the dictator Camillus in 367 B.C. on

---

the occasion of an outbreak of civil disturbance. The task of building the
temple was taken over by the Plebeians the following day after the
successful resolution of their problems (Plut. Cam. 42. 3-4). The temple
could thus be seen as a symbol of political concord between the people,
the Senate, and a ruling power in the senate. The Temple of Concord
was also a location for meetings of the Senate, especially at times of civic
disturbance, (Cic. Cat. 3. 21; Sest. 26; Dom. 11; Phil. 2. 19; Dio, 58. 11.
4), so the temple was linked in the minds of contemporary Romans with
the idea of state authority being used as the agent of civic harmony. This
could have been programmatically opportune for Augustus. By having
members of the imperial family as patrons to the shrines of Concordia
the idea of a cohesive and beneficent family with a concern for the
welfare of the state could be promoted6.

In A.D 12 Tiberius had returned to Rome and a triumph following his
military successes in Pannonia, Illyricum and Germany. The following
year his tribunicia potestas was re-affirmed and prolonged, and his
proconsular imperium was expanded to equal that held by
Augustus (Vell. Par., 2, 121, 3; Suet, Tib., 21, 1)7. Tiberius was now
essentially co-regent in readiness for the impending demise of Augustus.
The ten years between Tiberius’ adoption and the death of Augustus, and
the efforts undertaken to secure and promote his position as successor,

6 The Portico of Livia housed a temple dedicated by Livia to Concordia and for an example of how
the intra-familial connections with Concordia were clear note the way Ovid is able to link the two in
Fasti 1:649-50.
7 Levick, 1976, pp. 35, 49; Seager, 1972, p. 37. f; Syne, 1939, p. 433.
would seem to negate the need for the deviousness and fear of revolt attributed to Tiberius by Tacitus\textsuperscript{8}. The succession had been set up to be smooth and uneventful. However, to go so far as to maintain that:

Tiberius was emperor between 14 and 37, and these years were marked by Tiberius’ complete loyalty to Augustus’ s domestic and foreign policies,\textsuperscript{9}

is to misrepresent the reign of Tiberius as simply a continuation of that of Augustus from the smooth transition of power in A.D. 14 to his death in A.D. 37. It was not. Tiberius was to stamp his own mark on the Principate, re-assess what he saw as its role, and assert his own ideas as to how his position should be presented to the people.

One of the most outstanding features of Tiberius’ incumbency, in contrast to that of Augustus, is the lack of building activity. Not that none took place, rather that the almost frenzied activity under Augustus was strictly curtailed. On his death Augustus had been deified, and every god needs a temple. Accordingly, and on the initiative of the Senate (Dio, 56. 46; Tac. Ann. 1. 10), one was ordered to be built at Rome in the valley between the Capitoline and Palatine hills. However, it may look a little misleading if we were to therefore believe that Tiberius would enthusiastically follow the example of Augustus in providing a temple

---

\textsuperscript{8}The first Book of Tacitus’ Annals is infused with this conception of the Tiberian character. See Goodyear, F. R. D., \textit{The Annals of Tacitus.}, Cambridge, 1972, p. 121 ff.

for his deified adoptive father. The Temple of Divus Augustus may have been vowed in the year of Augustus' death, but it was not to be completed until 25 years later, in A.D. 39, and then by Caligula\(^\text{10}\). It would seem that Tiberius was in no hurry to further glorify Augustus, nor did he feel the same need to secure his own position through promotion of his illustrious forebears as Augustus himself had when he had set about the promotion of his own ties with Julius Caesar.

The Temple of the Deified Augustus no longer remains. It is possible, however, to have some idea as to its style due to its depiction on a *sestertius* issued under Caligula at Rome in celebration of his dedication of the temple (BMC Roman Empire I, Calig., nos. 41-3, 58, 69). The coins depict Caligula officiating at a sacrifice in front of a hexastyle Ionic temple façade, raised high on a podium in the typically Roman manner. Its pediment was decorated with a statuary group, no doubt of a highly symbolic nature. It may be reasonable to suspect that the temple would have been a fairly conservatively conceived affair, and it is interesting that the classically sober Ionic order should have been chosen over the more opulently detailed, and more expected, Corinthian.

The positioning of the Temple of the Deified Augustus in the valley between the Capitoline and Palatine hills may also be of some

\(^{10}\) As an indication as to just how extended the period of construction was, one could use the example of the Temple of the Deified Julius, built between 42 and 29 B.C., a period of 12-13 years, half the time taken for the Augustan temple and under much different political circumstances.
importance. While this position allowed easy access to it from the Forum Romanum, it was not actually placed in the midst of the Forum buildings, but tucked away behind the Basilica Julia. Though it may look at first sight to be a somewhat strange diminution in prestige to be denied one's temple in the Forum proper, there may be a perfectly good reason for this siting of the temple.

The temple and its area would have been planned to be of significant size. Perhaps it was simply the availability of land that determined the site of the temple. The Forum may not have been full to capacity, but available space was restricted. When, years later, Titus chose to insert a temple for his deified father into a site overlooking the Forum, the restrictions of the site were to force an unusual compression of that temple. The siting of the Temple of the Deified Augustus in the Velabrum may have permitted a more expansive complex. The temple would still be in close relation to the Forum, happily passed by the route of Rome's premier public ritual, the triumph, and providing a visual, and perhaps symbolic link between the imperial accommodation complexes on the Palatine and the most prestigious religious site in Rome, the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The presence of Augustus could continue to provide a connection between the gods of Rome, the newly developed terrestrial power centre of the city present on the Palatine, and the traditional centre of government at Rome represented in the Forum.
Whatever the reasons behind the choice the site was chosen and work begun. It did not progress swiftly. Perhaps it was enough for the purposes of Tiberius that the temple had been vowed and construction begun, and it was not so important to have the temple completed. His behaviour demonstrated all the required virtues such as loyalty to his forebear's memory. None could complain he was completely neglecting his duties to the past. In any event, it had been the Senate that had decreed the deification of Augustus and the building of a temple. Perhaps Tiberius had no interest in furthering his either of his predecessors' honours. According to Rose there is a noticeable dearth of evidence of honours given to both Caesar and Augustus after A.D 14, both it would seem at an imperial and at a municipal level. In fact Rose calls it 'somewhat surprising'. However, it is a lack of enthusiasm that also finds evidence in the building behaviour of the Tiberian principate, where a general lack of enthusiasm in increasing the Augustan legacy is discernible. Just as the imperial propaganda under Tiberius moved away from simply linking Tiberius with Augustus to a broader identification of Tiberius as a member of the gens Iulia, to a promotion of the family rather than Augustus as an individual, so too the building behaviour of Tiberius moved away from the Augustan model.

In part the lack of building activity initiated under Tiberius, though in

12Ibid.
marked contrast to Augustus, may also be seen as less of a reaction against the Augustan standard and merely the result of common sense. As in the case of the Temple of the Deified Augustus, buildings were not completed overnight, Rome was not built in a day, and it is quite possibly the case that many projects begun under Augustus, and thus attributed to him, needed to be finished off under Tiberius. One example should suffice, the completion of the Augustan restoration of the Temple of Janus in the Forum Boarium, only dedicated in A.D. 17 (Tac. Ann. 2, 42). There was also a noticeable decline in new projects begun by Augustus in the second half of his principate. The broad reach of the Augustan building programme in its initial phase left little unattended to, and it may have simply been the case that there was not much more that was considered necessary in regard to public amenities in the city. This may well have been the case to the mind of Tiberius. It may also have been that the continuation of projects begun under Augustus, and the ongoing maintenance and repair of existing buildings, would have taken up resources and may have also provided sufficient employment to the urban populace.

There are however projects which suggest that Tiberius did react against the ideological legacy of Augustus. Included amongst these are the Arch of Tiberius, and also the castra Praetoria. As has been mentioned above, after 19 B.C. Augustus never again erected or allowed to be erected in his

---

13 RG 20.3 shows that Augustus was well aware of the possibility of this eventuality.
honour another triumphal arch in his own honour, instead preferring to
have the city endowed with such monuments as the Ara Pacis. Arches
were erected, but never to Augustus. Tiberius did not follow this lead,
and in A.D. 16 erected an arch in his own name in the Forum Romanum
(Tac. Ann. 2, 41, 1). It was certainly not unprecedented that the
princeps should cause to have built triumphal arches in his own
honour, one need only remember the arch(es?) of Augustus in the
Forum Romanum, and Tiberius' military success gave at least as much
justification to this honour as did the military exploits of Augustus.
However, the evolved model of appropriate behaviour for a princeps
was less personal military glorification than communal benefit from state
military strength under the patronage of the princeps. However, the
erection of a triumphal arch was understandable within the imperial
context, so though this may be a small aberration from the example of
later Augustan practice, it may not be of very great significance. More
significant may be the construction of the Castra Praetoria,
accommodation for the Praetorian Guard at Rome, and the Domus
Tiberiana, the private residence of Tiberius in Rome.

Throughout his tenure of the position of princeps Tiberius seemed
reluctant to finance large public works, or even public works of any size.
Money was not poured into a speedy construction of the Temple of the

---

Deified Augustus, and triumphal arches were of no great expense. The remainder of his building projects in Rome were minor in the extreme. There was a restoration or dedication of a few temples, those of Fors Fortuna, A. D. 17 (Tac. Ann. 2, 41, 1)\textsuperscript{16}, Flora, A. D. 17 (Tac, Ann, 2, 49)\textsuperscript{17}, Spes, A. D. 17 (Tac. Ann. 2, 49)\textsuperscript{18}, and Ceres, Liber and Libera, the Dionysiac Triad, A. D. 17 (Tac. Ann. 2, 49)\textsuperscript{19}. Perhaps significantly, these were all gods left relatively unfavoured under the Augustan restoration programme, yet they have seemed to have found some favour under the principate of Tiberius. Only the restoration of the Theatre of Pompey, the Temple of the Deified Augustus, and the construction of the Castra Praetoria were of any real size or required major financial outlay.

The Theatre of Pompey had been extensively restored by Augustus in 32 B.C., just prior to his assumption of sole power at Actium, but the theatre had burnt in a fire in A.D. 21 (Hieron. a. Abr. 2037) and restorations were begun by Tiberius (Vell. Pat. 2.130.1; Tac., Ann. 3. 72). Tiberius did not complete the restoration (Suet, Tib. 47). Restoration continued under Caligula, who actually completed the restoration (Suet. Cal. 21). There is a parallel here with the Temple of the Deified Augustus. Once more the slowness of work under Tiberius is remarkable. A period of somewhere

\textsuperscript{16}Tac. Ann., 2, 41, 1; Richardson, 1992, pp. 154-55.
\textsuperscript{19}See preceding chapter.
over 15 years had not seen the theatre's restoration completed under Tiberius, but the less than four years reign of Caligula proved ample for its completion, though not its dedication. The dedication was to provide Claudius that easy glory during his own principate (Suet. Claud. 21.1), and in the names of both Tiberius and himself (Dio, 60. 6. 8).

So two important buildings in Rome, the Temple of the Deified Augustus and the Theatre of Pompey, both languished from the lack of interest under Tiberius. Their construction, or reconstruction, was remarkably sluggish, if it did not at some point cease altogether. One may very well wonder why. Both buildings were, or could have been, beneficial to the public image of Tiberius and the positioning of that image within the city of Rome. It may be understandable that he did not wish to emphasise the divine adopted inheritance that came via the Augustan connection, but the temple of Pompey provided a useful and popular public amenity, had strong associations with the Republican past, and furthermore included a shrine to Venus Victrix (Tertullian, De Spect. 10). As demonstrated by Rose, it was the connection with the gens Iulia that was emphasised throughout the principate of Tiberius. One would think in this regard that a temple honouring a variant aspect the divine source of the family, Venus, would find favour with the princeps and draw his enthusiastic attention, but it would appear not to have done so.

---

The *castra Praetoria*.

The one major public, or semi-public, (for want of a better word) building project that was completed during the principate of Tiberius was the *castra Praetoria*, the barracks of the Praetorian Guard. This may have been no accident. Under the principate of Augustus the presence of the Praetorian Guard in the city of Rome had been minimized in a number of different ways, including their dispersal in lodgings throughout the city, and even outside of the city of Rome itself, possibly even in towns as distant as Aquileia. The construction of a centralised accommodation for this significant military force indicates a shift away from the Augustan example. Probably the most significant change was that by concentrating the forces of the Praetorian Guard they became a more coherent, more easily controlled, and thus more useable political tool. The result of this concentration of the forces was lost on neither Tacitus nor Dio in their relating of their histories (Tac. *Ann.* 4. 2; Dio, 57. 19. 6). Interestingly, Suetonius does not seem to wish to emphasise the more sinister aspects of this changed circumstance of the accommodation of the Praetorian Guard (Suet. *Tib.* 37. 1).

The concentration of the Guard in the *castra* would also have in some ways raised the visible presence of this sizable force in the city, providing

---

21For a detailed discussion on this point see Keppie, L., 'The Praetorian Guard before Sejanus.', *Athenaeum* 84, 1996, pp. 101-24.
a tangible and quantifiable physical indication as to the size and militaristic nature of the Guard. Though the presence of the Guard became more noticeable in the city, yet this heightening of their visibility was in part due to separating of them out from the city.

Essentially the *castra* was designed and built along the lines of a typical fortified Roman camp, being in form a broad oblong 440m long and 380m wide and with rounded corners (See Plate 5). There was a change from the regularity of the usual layout in that the shorter main street of the camp did not bisect the camp equally, but was situated up to 30m closer towards the northern end of the camp. There may be no real significance to this aberration from the normally regimented regularity of Roman military camps, but as so little else is known as to the interior layout of the camp, it may yet be an indication of an important variation\(^22\). What does remain are the walls of the *castra*, sturdy brick faced concrete walls, 4.75m high when first built during the principate of Tiberius, topped by battlements and the gates of the camp surmounted by towers. The *castra* left no doubt in its outward form as to its true military nature or function. It was built to withstand attack or siege. This must raise the question, from whence the expected threat? It was the Praetorians who were being protected from attack, not the city of Rome itself.

---

\(^{22}\) The lack of knowledge as to the interior layout of the camp is due, interestingly enough, to its present day utilisation as the Italian army's headquarters in Rome. For such a large remaining ancient structure little in the way of modern scholarship is available. Lissi Carona, E., *LTUR* 1, 1993, pp. 251-54 lists but seven works.
The military nature of the castra was also heightened by its position in relation to the city. It was built at the extreme of the north-eastern area of the city, beyond the built-up residential area (Pliny, HN. 3. 67), and on one of the highest points in Rome. This position gave the camp advantages in its role as a military installation: a clear view over the entire city, and command of the roads that approached the city from the north and the north-east.

It was only to be expected that the form of the castra would be military in nature; it was of course a military installation. However, to erect such a building at Rome itself, to concentrate the resident military force in such an obvious way was a significant departure in style from both the long standing Republican tradition of Rome as a civically governed entity, or the Augustan model of the Principate, wherein the princeps role was presented as a constitutional position, with the armies as the protectors of the internal peace from external threat, and the urban military presence in Rome diffused and thereby minimised. Roman societal values may have been largely wrought from a militaristic foundation, but as a society Rome had traditionally wished to believe itself the governor of military power, rather than subject to its governance. The elevation in the presence of the military at Rome began the revelation of the true nature of the Principate’s power base, the armies.

At 16.72 hectares the castra was indeed a formidable presence to impose
on the city, yet it was not as large as it might have been. The barrack buildings were double storeyed, unique in forts of the Roman world, and imply a doubling of the forces housed within the castra. This, as suggested by Richmond, may be what he terms one of the "arcana imperii", a concealing of the fact as to the true size of the force within from the city outside. However, a less cynical view might be that, having to construct the castra in an urban context, the availability of free land may have had an impact on the chosen size. After all, this was not a frontier fort, it had a different context if not an essentially different purpose, and elements of the design of the castra, such as the omission of the normal surrounding trench and the alignment of the main entrance gate towards the city rather than towards the open country, reinforce the sense of a contextual difference.

The question as to the availability of free land is also suggested by the positioning of the fort outside of the already built up areas of the city, though there might also have been other considerations as to this siting of the castra. Tacitus in his Annales states that increased control over the behaviour of the Guard, by removing it from the insidious delights of the city, was one of the reasons for the positioning of the castra at the edge of the city. However both the language and the context in which this is related should give pause for thought:

Praetendebat lascivire militem diductum; si quid subitem ingruit,

maiore auxilio pariter subveniri; et severius acturos, si vallum statuat procul urbis inlecebris. Ut perfecta sunt castra, inreperere paulatim militaris animos adeundo, appellando; simul centuriones ac tribunos ipse deligere.

His pretext was that the scattered troops became unruly; that, when a sudden emergency called, help was more effective if the helpers were compact; and that there would be less laxity of conduct, if an encampment was created at a distance from the attractions of the city. Their quarters finished, he began little by little to insinuate himself into the affections of the private soldiers, approaching them and addressing them by name, while at the same time he selected personally their centurions and tribunes.

(Tac. Ann. 4. 2)²⁴

Behavioural improvement of the Guard is presented as one of the pretexts by which Sejanus hopes to hide the true reason for this concentration of the military power of the Praetorian Guard; his true intention is implied as being the increase in his own power. Tacitus gives strength to the idea that the true intention of the both the positioning of the castra and the concentration of the forces of the Praetorian Guard were concerned with the concentration and elevation of military might in the heart of empire, on the threshold of Rome, and

that that military might was to protect the position and interests of the 
princeps (whoever that may be) rather than the protection of the 
populace. Furthermore, the barracks may have been at a remove from 
the heart of the city but they were not so distant that the seductive 
delights of the city were beyond the easy reach of the members of the 
Guard. They could easily get to the city, or the city could get to them.

The influence of L. Aelius Seianus may therefore have been one of the 
major factors behind the uncharacteristically speedy construction of the 
castra Praetoria. The building stands out amidst the official building 
projects of Tiberius for its size, its function, and its completion. The 
requirements for the later development of the designs of Sejanus may go 
a long way in explaining, or at least shedding some light on, this anomaly 
in the civic construction of the Tiberian regime. The part played by 
Tiberius in its inception may in reality have been very minor. In general 
in his role as the patron of the city, both in the area of his building 
programme and more widely, Tiberius seems to have been reluctant, 
maybe just uninterested, at any rate certainly frugal. However, neither 
the same financial restraint nor the same reluctance in regard to the 
imposition of his presence within the city was evident in a major project 
undertaken by Tiberius as a private individual.
Private Accommodations.

During his life Tiberius constructed at least twelve villas of his own, the most important of which for our purposes was the Domus Tiberiana constructed on the Palatine hill at Rome. The present state of our knowledge as to the original building constructed by Tiberius is poor to say the least. Excavation of the site carried out under the direction of C. Krause, though systematic and thorough, has brought to light no evidence for which a Tiberian date can be applied. Though the final archaeological reports have yet to be published, a concise summary of the work to date is available. It would appear that the earliest phase for which there is archaeological evidence is from the time of Claudius. However, the nomenclature of the edifice would suggest that the domus was indeed the property of Tiberius at some point. The name of the domus is first found in the works of Tacitus and Plutarch (Tac. Hist. 1. 27; Plutarch, Galba, 24. 7), though neither writer specifically connects the house with Tiberius except to name the building. However, that the building was so named would speak in favour of Tiberian ownership.

The name of the owner denoted the name of the house, and once known

---


by that name usage was slow to change. An example of this close to hand would be the *domus* of Germanicus. In the time of Caligula the House of Germanicus was still denoted by his name (Jos. *AJ*. 19. 117).

The frugal behaviour of Tiberius in other areas of his building programme has suggested to some that the Domus Tiberiana may not have been built by Tiberius at all. This is perhaps a little misleading. If the original Domus Tiberiana was built for Tiberius, there is no evidence to the date of its construction, it may well have been completed long before his accession to the position of *princeps*. In any event, as mentioned above, Tiberius would appear to have felt no restraint in providing himself with luxury accommodation. Twelve villas is no small number. Nor were they necessarily modest, in the Augustan mode. Tiberius' most famous residence, the Villa of Jove on Capri, is certainly no simple sea-side shack! In fact the frugality of the Tiberian public building programme in contrast to the magnificence evident in the private buildings of Tiberius may perhaps be used as evidence for the Tiberian interpretation of his role as *princeps*. Tiberius was only too ready to indulge himself with accommodations as befitted an extremely wealthy citizen of Rome. Tiberius in this regard was acting true to his background, status and heritage. He behaved as did his social

---

28 A fundamental question to be resolved is whether or not the palace that stood originally on the platform was built by Tiberius, as the name implies. Tiberius' aversion to extravagant architectural projects makes it unlikely that he would have undertaken a luxury project of this kind. Barratt, A. A., *Caligula. The Corruption of Power.*, London, 1989 p. 204
contemporaries and peers. The idea so carefully promulgated by Augustus of the *princeps*, the first among equals as the autocratic patron of the city of Rome providing public magnificence whilst living in ostentatious simplicity is effectively deflated by the honesty of the approach taken by Tiberius. If the first among equals is to be just that, should he not act in accord with their behavioural mores? Tiberius did. His concern for the status of his family, the memorials to them\(^{30}\), and his own opulent accommodation and private display mark him as a man of his times and social position. His reluctance to faithfully follow the example set by Augustus in the promotion of the role of *princeps* as a carefully constructed misnomer for a monarchical reality is all too evident in the the building programme he undertook, the personal and private, as well as the one he did not, the public building programme.

All this was in stark contrast to Augustus who had made such a show of personal simplicity in his daily life as a private citizen. There seems to be a complete reversal in the manner of personal/private presentation between the originator of the office of *princeps*, and the inheritor of that position. Whilst Augustus contrived to display himself in his capacity as a private citizen in an ostentatiously simplified manner, Tiberius retreated into a private splendour. The private life of Augustus was engineered and exploited towards public ends, whilst even the public capacities of Tiberius, his day to day administration of the state, were eventually withdrawn from the public gaze to be carried out in opulent

\(^{30}\)See Rose, 1997, pp. 22 ff.
seclusion. The public life of the príncipe becomes private. This reversal in the behavioural patterns of the princípes can be seen to extend to an even greater degree. With the Augustan building programme it and its attendant propaganda programme infiltrated the city of Rome at every level, was woven as a complex web into the fabric of the city, and became an unavoidable experiential fact in the day to day operation of the city.

This is in contrast to the reign of Tiberius where there is something of a retreat in progress. First a retreat from the concept of the príncipes’ role as evolved by Augustus in regard to his position as patron of the city, and then a physical retreat from the city itself. Just how loyal was Tiberius to the domestic policies of Augustus? The evidence of his building policy would seem to suggest he had his own ideas, and followed them. That Tiberius had concerns different than those of Augustus in his conception of the role of the príncipes should now be evident. However, if one needed more evidence there is one final non-action on the part of Tiberius that truly shows his independence from the Augustan example. Tiberius did nothing to provide for a political successor to his position as príncipe. His will divided his estate between two heirs, Gaius Caligula and Tiberius Gemellus (Suet, Tib. 76; Dio, 59, 1 ff.). It was an inheritance of property, not of political position. The obsession of Augustus to have a political successor of his own choosing was not the obsession of Tiberius. Upon the death of Tiberius it would be the people and the Senate that elevated Caligula to the Principate. That was their choice and their choice alone. Tiberius had made no effort to secure the political or

31 Wiedemann, CAH 10, 1996, p. 221.
legal position of his great-nephew. Caligula would have to remedy that situation himself.
CALIGULA

Signs of the impact that the individual could have on the principate had become evident during the tenure of that position by Tiberius. There had been evidence initially of a certain reluctance to continue, or at least to retreat from the behavioural form of the principate as it had evolved under Augustus. This became evident in the Tiberian attitude to Imperial building projects in Rome. A radically different divergence from the Augustan ideal was to become the hallmark of Caligula's reign. Augustus had evolved a complex, sophisticated and carefully balanced programme of Imperial building, infiltrating the presence of himself, his gens, and the Imperial reality into the fabric of the city. Caligula it seems had a different view as to what the principate was or could be, and his short reign is remarkable for the scale and the ambitious nature of his building programme.

Much would remain incomplete due to his sudden demise 3 years 10 months and 8 days after his acclamation as emperor by the Senate in March 37 A. D. (Suet. Cal. 59). The word 'reign' is used cautiously, though perhaps appropriately in connection with Caligula, for it is under the influence of Caligula that the principate first begins to show publicly signs of its true nature, and the potential of that nature to be a monarchy open to tyrannical practices. However, though these
drawbacks were to become evident throughout Caligula's reign, initially there seems to have been widespread rejoicing at the promises heralded by the accession of the new princeps (Suet. Cal. 13-14). It was a promise that seemed to bear fruit in the re-energising of the Imperial building programme.

\[\text{Opera sub Tiberio semiperfecta, templum Augusti theatrumque Pompei, absolvi. Inchoavit autem aquae ductum regione Tiburti et amphitheatrum iuxta Saepta...} \]

He completed works which had been left half finished in the reign of Tiberius - the Temple of Augustus and the Theatre of Pompey. He also began an aqueduct in the area of Tibur, and an amphitheatre next to the Saepta....

(Suet. Cal. 21).

This is Suetonius on Caligula the Emperor, as distinct from what he calls Caligula the Monster (Suet. Cal. 22. 1). It is not hard to see how the distinction is made. A temple to a deified ancestor, restoration of a theatre, an aqueduct, these are all good practical things, things that a city can use, even if in the case of the temple it may not need them.

The temple is well within the limits of the Augustan example,

showing not only a respect for Rome's past and the men who made her great, but also inter- and intra-familial piety. It may indicate a marked change from Tiberius' distinct lack of enthusiasm in this area. A similar continuation of Augustan policy may be seen in the Theatre of Pompey, damaged by fire in A.D. 21, our sources tell of Tiberius' inception of the restoration work on this edifice (Vell. Pat. 2. 130. 1; Tac. Ann. 3. 72). It was not, it would appear, enthusiastically pursued (Suet. Tib. 47). It seems work remained to be done under Caligula, who may have completed the project and given his name to it (Suet. Cal. 21). Its dedication under Claudius would indicate that ceremonies and celebrations to mark the completion of the work of Caligula had not yet been undertaken. It need not indicate that work remained to be completed by Claudius, in fact, Dio explicitly excludes Claudian building activity, though not intervention (Suet. Cal. 21; Claud. 21. 1; Dio, 60. 6. 8). Given the relative enthusiasms of Tiberius and Caligula for expending resources on buildings for public use, it would not be surprising if the restoration work had languished, if not ceased altogether, under Tiberius only to have been re-invigorated under Caligula. That Claudius had occasion to remove the name of Caligula and restore that of Pompey, including both his own name and that of Tiberius as the restorers of the theatre, would indicate that Caligula's intervention had seen the restoration through to a point at least very near to completion (Dio, 60. 6. 8).
For Caligula, having been 7 years resident on Capri isolated from the world of Rome and its realities, and the adulation he received during his return to the capital after the death of Tiberius, may go some way to explaining his behaviour during his time as princeps. Suetonius (Cal. 13-14) records the outpouring of emotion that marked Caligula's entry into the city, a phenomenon made all the more momentous due to the occasion. Dressed in mourning and accompanying the corpse of his predecessor, the new young ruler must have been impressed by the joyful reaction of the crowds. Moreover, unlike Tiberius or Augustus, Caligula had had no exposure to a world without an emperor, and had, through close association with his grandmother Antonia and his childhood friends such as Herod Agrippa, experience and education in the forms and processes, and maybe most importantly, the expectations of Hellenistic monarchy. Also, the years spent on Capri may have entrenched in the mind of Caligula a conceptualisation of the principate that was far removed from the day to day reality of the position as it had been experienced by Augustus. Autocratic, populist, extravagant, fickle, even sometimes whimsical in his behaviour, Caligula reigned without the caution and restraint, and the sensitivity to political necessities, shown by both Tiberius and Augustus in hiding the true nature of the principate. Caligula's reign revealed this true nature, but it was a truth unpalatable to at least certain elements of society, and

2 Though Wiedemann, CAH 10, p. 223 cautions against placing too much weight on this association between Caligula and the future Eastern monarchs.
unfortunately for Caligula it was those elements of society that had
the power to do something about their displeasure.

Popularity tends to be an uncertain and ephemeral beast. Augustus
had assured his through peace, prosperity, bread and circuses for the
masses, and honour and dignity for the higher social orders; in short
by making both himself and his role appear necessary to the smooth
functioning of society. The people were in general to regard him as a
benefactor. Tiberius, apparently not wishing to play the game,
withdrew himself from the need to court the good-will of his subjects.
If Caligula wished to enjoy a continuation of the popularity expressed
at his accession he needed to buy it, in much the same way Augustus
had. So buy it he did, but not with the self and state serving piety of
Augustus' games and spectacles, nor with monuments that celebrated
the glory of the Roman people and its traditions, but with races and
shows and games and conspicuous and extravagant display of
personal promotion.

The restoration of the Theatre of Pompey, so slowly advanced during
the reign of Tiberius, was re-energised. Further provision for
entertainment was also to be forth-coming. At a site not precisely
known Caligula had work started on an amphitheatre. The
amphitheatre was in the Campus Martius, \textit{iuxta Saepta}, according to
Suetonius \textit{(Cal. 21)}, probably to the north or east, or north-east of that
structure. Provision for its site required the destruction of a section of
the arcing of the *aqua Virgo* (*CIL* 6. 1252 = *ILS* 205). The amphitheatre was never completed, and that which had been erected was to be demolished under Claudius (Suet. *Cal.* 21)\(^3\). Need for a purpose-built structure in which to accommodate games and spectacles may have suggested itself to Caligula when, in order to house such events away from environmental annoyances, he had the Diribitorium furnished with tiers of seats and transformed it into a theatre (*Dio*, 59. 7. 8). The erection of an amphitheatre in close proximity with the Diribitorium, the Baths of Agrippa, and the Saepta would further augment what was already a recreational complex. The transformation of the area into a recreational complex also recycled buildings whose original governmental purposes had become increasingly redundant in the face of the political reality of the principate. It may have been honest assessment of the future utility of the buildings, though perhaps not a wise one. Augustus and Tiberius had been careful to obscure the new political reality, and Claudius in his caution would retreat from the example of Caligula. All three maintained their positions with much greater success than Caligula was to manage to achieve.

That Caligula thought to provide for the entertainment of the population of Rome may be largely due to his own predilections. He appears in the sources to be obsessed with entertainments, particularly

racing. A new circus, the Circus of Gaius and Nero, was laid out in the Ager Vaticanus, on a private estate inherited from Caligula’s parents. Evidence from the excavated remains of this circus tend to suggest that the structure was largely completed during the time of Nero. However, a substantial element was most definitely a product of the time of Caligula. The Vatican obelisk that stands today as the centre-piece of the Piazza S. Pietro was brought from Egypt on the orders of Caligula in a specially constructed ship in order to provide the centre-piece for Caligula’s circus (Pliny, *HN*, 16. 201-2, 36. 74; Suet. *Claud*. 20. 3). The ship itself was an engineering marvel, with its cargo, the obelisk, being up to 45 m tall. Its monumental presence in the circus would have been a breath-taking marvel as well.

The monumentality of size, the courting of the masses’ adulation, recalled Augustus’ behaviour prior to his assumption of sole power. Though the Octavian of that time and Caligula had a common denominator in their youthful enthusiasms, their situations were different. Octavian had been operating within the norms of the late

---

7 Pliny *HN*, 36. 74, reports its height as 100 cubits.
Republican system, and had the sensitivity to adapt his behaviour to a more suitable style after he had achieved sole power. Caligula had that sole power, given to him by senatorial acclamation (Suet. Cal. 14. 1; Dio, 59, 1. 1-3), yet appears not to have understood the need for delicacy and obfuscation, the need to use that sole power in a way that amplified the city’s importance beyond that of his own. It is a lack of restraint that finds greater evidence in his additions to the Imperial residences on the Palatine.

Nearer My Gods to Thee.

Mad Caligula may have been, and the sources would have it that he was (Pliny, HN, 36. 113; Suet. Cal. 51.); however there may also be detected something of method in this madness. Augustus had evolved the symbolism of his domestic accommodation in order that, whilst it may have been physically part of a temple complex, the aristocratic domi that lined the approach to it along the clivus Palatinus suggested that the house of the princeps was but the ultimate accommodation of one of the senatorial order. Caligula’s extension to the Palatine complex held no such subtlety of message, it cut straight to the chase. Suetonius and Dio both mention the Caligulan extension of the Domus Tiberiana (Suet. Cal. 22. 2; Dio, 59.

---

28. 5), and it is from these sources that the location of the extension can be determined, placing the work between the north-east corner of the Palatine and the Temple of Castor in the Forum below.

Archaeological evidence uncovered during excavations of the site between 1983 and 1989, though fragmentary, would support the evidence from the literary sources. As presented by Hurst, the *domus Gai* comprised a suite of rooms, raised on a barrel-vaulted under-storey, that covered the area between the *horrea Agrippiana* and the *vicus Tuscus*, incorporated the Temple of Castor as a vestibule, and was connected by way of a ramp with the Domus Tiberiana above on the Palatine hill. Quite a sizeable presence!

Moreover, following the example of Augustus, Caligula appears to have wished to associate his abode with temples and divinities. But whereas the Augustan model associated the house with a temple, the design of Caligula incorporates a temple into the house. The status of the temple is in effect diminished in proportion to the increase in status to the house. The temple becomes merely the vestibule through which access to the greater presence resident in the buildings behind is gained. The gods were now serving to bolster the image of the *princeps*, not as before through close association, but through subservience to the terrestrial power.

---


10 *op. cit.*
The symbolism of the incorporation of the Temple of Castor into the domus Gai as a vestibule, whilst overt, was in a sense only a development of the Augustan example. It was a less subtle, less sophisticated rendering of a related idea. It does not, however, have appeared to have satisfied Caligula's concept of what his role as princeps could or should be. Suetonius reports a further extension of the Palatine complex effected under Caligula, the bridge that spanned the Velabrum, supported by the Temple of the Deified Augustus, which created a direct physical link between the Palatine and Capitoline hills. It was a joining of the two sacred citadels in a much more extreme and obvious way than had been undertaken by Augustus. Furthermore, it is reported that Caligula had a house begun within the precincts of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (Suet. Cal. 22. 4). A god should live with gods, and Caligula encouraged the idea that that was indeed what he was, a god, establishing a shrine to his own god-head with the full accompaniment of a priesthood and extravagant sacrificial victims (Suet. Cal. 22. 3).

If the company of the greatest gods appealed, so too did the achievement of heroic feats, and comparison with heroes of history. Though not directly concerned with the city of Rome, his behaviour

---

Augustus had paved the clivus Capitolinus and the clivus Palatinus, both streets beginning at opposite ends of the Forum Romanum, and connected in between by the Sacra Via. With the Sacra Via itself being newly paved, a uniformly paved route then linked the temples of Palatine Apollo and Capitoline Jupiter, see Platner-Ashby, 1929, pp. 122, 124.
and the grandiose plans for projects throughout the empire may shed light on some of the more perverse excesses of Caligula's building projects in Rome. The intention to cut a canal through the isthmus at Corinth recalls the reported plan of Caesar to do the same (Suet. Caes. 44. 3; Cal. 21). The bridge at Baiae on which he bestrode the sea may have as one of its explanations a re-enactment of the Hellespont crossing of Xerxes (Suet. Cal. 19. 1-3). The battle on the coast of Gaul where he triumphed over Neptune (Suet. Cal. 46- 47) would seem to have no precedent unless the whole Gaulish sojourn was an attempt to re-visit the ground covered by Julius Caesar, and the battle against the sea a last minute substitute for the invasion of Britain. The building of moles far out into the sea recalls the campaign of Alexander the Great against Tyre. The Alexander connection was already evident in Caligula's appropriation of the Macedonian's breast-plate. These, and other feats of geographic re-modelling that were said to be impossible (Suet. Cal. 37. 2-3) could all just be symptoms or symbols of his madness, a megalomaniac modelling his behaviour on legendary figures of the past, on leaders of almost super-human reputation. But can there have been a method to this madness?

Wiedemann suggests that Caligula saw the role of the princeps as symbolizing 'the struggle of man against nature'. This

---

12Wiedemann, CAH 10, 1996, p. 225.
interpretation of the role of the *princeps* fits nicely with the concept of the role of the *princeps* as approved of by Suetonius, and outlined by Wallace-Hadrill, as the *princeps* being ideally the guarantor of social conservation. The city is both the symbol of order imposed on nature, and the venue in which this order is best displayed. Moreover, the city can only exist if it can impose order upon the wider environment in order that the provision of life’s necessities may be forthcoming. Therefore, the *princeps*, as *patronus* to the entire city, was responsible for imposing the necessary order on the natural world in order that the city may continue to thrive. If the city’s continuation was assured, civilisation was assured, and the social order should be guaranteed. It is interesting to note that Suetonius placed his reports of the bridge at Baiae and the Corinthian canal in the section that he claims describes ‘Caligula the *princeps*’ as opposed to ‘Caligula the monster’. Nor is ‘Caligula the monster’ necessarily any more the product of madness, in the assessment of Suetonius, than is ‘Caligula the *princeps*’. The expressions of madness have their own discreet section (Suet. *Cal.* 50-55). The projects and behaviour of Caligula, when viewed in the light of the conception of the role of the *princeps* as the champion of humanity against the forces of nature, become rationally comprehensible. If an individual could demonstrate power over the forces of nature when humanity itself is at the mercy of nature, then it followed that the individual was of mightier stuff than the merely human. Being greater than human logically led to

---

identification as divine.

Within the city of Rome Caligula seems to have wished to demonstrate this conception of the role of the *princeps*. The entrance to his extension to the Palatine residences was a temple to divinised heroes, two of those who existed on the threshold between the worlds of mortals and the gods. Moreover, they were two who had power to protect against the winds and waves, power over the forces of nature. The further extension of the Palatine residences to the Capitoline hill was in itself a demonstration of the power of the resources of the *princeps* to defy the natural lay of the land by means of engineering excellence. The ingenuity of humanity allowed the impossible to be possible under the sponsorship of the *princeps*.

What may appear to have been the grandiose schemes of a madman or acts of sacrilegious hubris (one and the same thing, perhaps, to the pious), can, with this interpretation, appear to be the honest expression of Caligula’s conception as to the true role of the *princeps*. All in all Caligula’s reign seems to show a more honest presentation of the reality of the position of unfettered power of the principate as it really was, without the fudging of the truth as happened under Augustus. Should we be surprised if his building projects in Rome project the same reality? However, done without a clarity of vision and a sensitivity as to the temper of the senatorial times and types, as
had been the case under Augustus, offence was sure to be given, and taken. It would appear that it was. Rome wasn’t ready for the honesty of a Caligula.
CLAUDIUS

The deed had been done, the tyrant had been dispatched. The wounds inflicted on the corpse bore stark testimony to the frenzy, the hatred born of the fear arising from uncertainty or from the wounded pride that had fuelled the attack. More chilling yet to remaining relatives would have been the fate that had met Caligula’s immediate family: Caesonia assassinated, and the infant Drusilla dashed and broken in the mêlée (Jos. AJ. 19. 190-200). Claudius, as uncle to the dead princeps, may have been wise to fear for his own survival. Suetonius paints for us a poignant and pathetic scene of the behaviour of Claudius at the time of Caligula’s assassination: the physically unfortunate, bumbling man of middle years in his fear ineffectually flees to seek safety behind a curtain. There he is found by a member of the Guard, whose footsteps Fate has chanced to guide in his meanderings through the palace (Suet. Claud. 10). Whereas Claudius chose poorly, the cloth had failed to obscure his presence, Suetonius chose well, the incident a metaphor that reveals much about his subject.

Claudius had spent his entire life amidst the privileges and predations of

1Wiedemann, CAH 10, 1996, pp. 228-9 cautions against the wholesale acceptance of later justifications for the murder of Caligula as being an act of tyrannicide.
the imperial household. Born on the 1st of August, 10 B.C., he had, at
the death of Caligula, served a fifty year apprenticeship in the arts of
imperial domestic political survival. Less thoroughgoing had been his
training in the wider political sphere of the Roman aristocrat, only
entering upon a senatorial career of sorts with his holding of the
consulship in tandem with his nephew Caligula from the 1st of July to
the 12th of September A.D. 37. This lack of a public political profile was
underscored by a lack of exposure to matters military. There had been no
opportunity offered.

Claudius entered upon his principate to all intents and purposes as a
private individual, with no official public profile of which to speak, even
his senatorial rank only by default (Suet. Cal. 15. 2, Claud. 7; Dio, 59, 6,
5-6). It was, as stressed by Wiedemann inter alia, a particularly weak
position from which to inherit (some may consider the word 'usurp',
others the word 'accept' more appropriately descriptive) the role and the
position of princeps. Like his nephew Gaius before him, Claudius
became princeps free of any of the customary prerequisites for the
holding and wielding of power at Rome. In one area, and in one area
alone, did Claudius possess an advantage that Caligula had had not.
Claudius had the advantage of years of survival in the political jungle
that was the imperial household.
Whatever had ensured his survival to this point, be it caution, bumbling ineffectualness, or intelligent dissembling of his own abilities, could be now marshalled to assist his survival in a broader political environment. Moreover, fifty years of observation at the very centre of the Roman political world had provided ample opportunity to observe those behaviours that had proved effective in the maintenance of power, and those that had not. Claudius, it would appear, had not squandered that opportunity.

**Family Honour and the Ara Pietatis Augustae.**

To honour one's predecessors was to display piety whilst amplifying one's own associated glory; to deify an ancestor that much better. There was little room for manoeuvre when it came Claudius' turn to effect a public display of familial piety. To honour his immediate predecessor was simply out of the question, it would never do. The worthy, or perhaps better, the unsullied members of the imperial family had by and large been promoted to the limits conscionable. One major lacuna remained to the new princeps. Accordingly Claudius caused his paternal grandmother to be deified by decree of the Senate. Thus Claudius could claim to have gods on his side, on both sides of his family
tree in fact, with Livia as his deified grandmother, and Augustus as his deified grandfather and grand-uncle. The blood of both the Julian and the Claudian branches of the imperial family flowed in the veins of Claudius; now both bloodlines could boast divinized members.

Though the connections were a little tenuous, a little removed in time, they were better than nothing. Furthermore, memories could be assisted by promotion of the new goddess. To this end a statue of the Deified Augusta joined the cult statue of her husband in his temple; the match was now to be made in heaven as it had been on earth (Suet. Claud. 11, 2; Dio, 60, 5, 2; Acta Arv docs. 13. 43. 8; ILS 4995; RIC 1(2), 128, no. 101). At the same time and in connection with these events it may well be the case that Claudius had erected an altar initially voted by the Senate in A. D. 22, at a time when Livia had been extremely ill (ILS 202). Controversy surrounds this so-called Altar to Augustan Piety, even its position so doubtful that it has been placed both on the Capitoline and in the Campus Martius2. In A. D. 43 an inscription, recorded though now lost, declared a dedication (perhaps an altar) to Augustan Piety on the Capitoline hill (CIL 6. 562 = ILS 202)3. At further remove, relief

---

2Even the Latin title, ara pietatis augustae leads to uncertainty, most properly it should read as the Altar to the Piety of the Augusta's, but there is also the possible translation as the Altar of the Augustan Piety. For a full account of the various theories and propositions that this altar has generated see La Rocca, E., LTUR 4, 1999, pp. 87-9 and the bibliography there cited.

3The inscription reads:- Pietati Augustae / ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) quod factum est D(ecimo) Haterio / Agrippa C(aio) Sulpicio Calba co(n)s(ulibus)/Ti(berius) Claudius Caesar Aug(ustus) Germanicus /
sculptures, some now in the Villa Medici, others in the Capitoline collection, have been attributed to an altar of Claudian date erected in the Campus Martius beside the via Lata\textsuperscript{4}. These have also been at times identified as belonging to an Altar of Augustan Piety\textsuperscript{5}. The two sources of evidence seem to have been unreasonably associated with each other, leading to theories of one altar, similar in design and form to the Ara Pacis. Koeppel has demonstrated the unfeasability of this theory\textsuperscript{6}. However, in its wake, no wholly convincing alternatives having arisen, the controversy remains\textsuperscript{7}.

The Arches of Claudius.

Family honour and glory addressed, Claudius turned his attention to his dearth of military cachet. Military operations in Mauretania and along the Rhine frontier, inherited from Caligula’s reign, were brought to conclusion. The military operations were successfully enough brought to

\textit{pontif(ex) max(imus) trib(unicia) pot(estate) III co(n)s(ul) III imp(erator) III p(ater) p(atriae) / dedicavit.}

There is no actual mention of an altar.


\textsuperscript{5}Bloch, R., ‘L’Ara Pietatis Augustae’, MEFRA 56, 1939, pp. 81-120.


a conclusion in Mauretania that *ornamenta triumphalia* were awarded both the *princeps* and the General responsible, M. Crassus Frugi (Suet. *Claud*. 17. 2; Dio, 60. 8. 6; Pliny, *HN*, 5. 2)\(^8\). The success of German campaigns resulted in a coin issue in A. D. 41/2, its reverse stamped with an arch *De Germanis* (*BMC*, *Rom. Emp*. 1, Claudius nos. 2, 36, 95-103, 121-23, 187-91), though the arch may never have been realised\(^9\).

Following in the footsteps of Julius Caesar the military might of Rome was then turned against the kingdoms of the Britons (Suet. *Claud*. 17. 2; Dio, 60. 19 ff.)\(^10\) Victories there would shine all the brighter if they were perceived as extending Roman hegemony beyond the natural limits of the world\(^11\). Victories remaining shining in the memory of the Romans held an even greater importance. Victories do however take time, and their commemorative arches take more time to build. The senate had voted the arch in honour of the Claudian victories in Britain in A. D. 43 (Dio, 60. 22. 1). It would not be until A. D. 51/2 that the arch commemorating Claudius' triumph against the Britons was dedicated (*CIL* 6. 920-923 = *ILS* 216, 222). In the meantime coins could carry forth the message of military glory (*RIC* 1(2), 123 Nn. 30, 33 ff., 44ff.). It is from

---

\(^8\)Levick, 1990, p. 149.


the coins that we can reconstruct to a degree the form that this arch took (See Plate 6)\textsuperscript{12}.

The coins show a single fornix, flanked to either side by a single Corinthian column. Above this an abstracted entablature area, any decoration that may have been present on the original arch omitted in favour of the bold legend naming the defeated enemy. On the attic the customary statuary group, an equestrian statue in the centre (of Claudius?), to either side of which are figures, or trophies\textsuperscript{13}. The coin cannot show everything though. The arch was not purely ornamental and monumental. It was, rather, a monumentalised barrel vault of the \textit{aqua Virgo}. The aqueduct was in need of reconstruction following Caligula’s demolition of a part of it in order to provide space for his planned, though not completed, amphitheatre. Now under Claudius its reconstruction was undertaken, the monumental and utilitarian being fused into the one project, an efficient use of resources that, whilst providing for the desire for personal glory on the part of the \textit{princeps}, provided also for the recreational needs of the populace at Rome. It would seem to have been thought a happy mix, to have worked to a desirable outcome.


\textsuperscript{13}Rodríguez-Almeida, \textit{LTUR} 1, 1993, p. 85.
A second monumental arch, inserted similarly into the structure of the *aqua Virgo*, and of Claudian date, remains intact to this day, integrated into later buildings at the junction of the *Via del Nazareno* and *Via del Bufalo*. This arch, of heavily rusticated Travertine masonry, carries the inscription which both dates the work (A. D. 46), and provides testimony as to the motivation behind the re-building of the aqueduct. The retention of the memory of Caligula and his behaviour could be used by Claudius to his own ends.

There were other more positive elements of Caligula’s legacy that could also be safely incorporated into the Claudian programme. Rather than simple restoration of damage inflicted on pre-existing structures by Caligula’s projects, there could also be a continuation of some of the public works that Caligula had begun, and perhaps even a continuation and development of the idea as to the self presentation of the *princeps*.

As mentioned above there seems to have been a desire on Caligula’s part to identify or parallel himself with the great heroes of history, most noticeably Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar. It is a modelling of himself on Julius Caesar that Claudius seemed to adopt and develop both in his building programme and in his broader policies.

---


Claudian Utilitarianism.

In A. D. 38 Caligula had begun construction on two new aqueducts to supply the city of Rome, the Anio Novus and that which upon its completion would be known as the *aqua Claudia*. Aqueducts were no small undertaking; they consumed enormous amounts of time, planning, labour, materials, and of course financial resources in their construction (Pliny, *HN*. 36. 122). Therefore it stands to reason that no sane emperor, on inheriting two only recently started aqueducts, would have ordered their continued construction if there had been no good reason for them to be built. This may not only provide us with some indication as to the sanity, at least in some instances, of the decisions of Caligula, but it also indicates that Claudius recognised that he had something to gain by the continued construction of these aqueducts.

Augustus had left such tasks as the building and repair of aqueducts to his right hand man Agrippa. It has been suggested above that this may have been partly due to a desire on the part of Augustus not to be seen to be courting too strongly the popularity of the masses, the plebs, the majority of the free population at Rome. For this reason projects which
could be seen to be for the greater benefit of the masses, such as public baths, gardens, aqueducts and grain storehouses, were left to the capable hands of Agrippa.

Neither Caligula nor Claudius seems to have had, wanted, or perhaps thought they needed, a lieutenant to fulfil the same role as Agrippa filled for Augustus. Could this be due to neither of them seeing the advantages of a deputy, or the disadvantages of not having one? Alternatively, they may have preferred not to share any possibility of increased popularity. We have seen how Caligula seemed to have wished to court directly the popularity of the masses in order to counter the influence of the Senate. Claudius, though he had no reason to thank the Senate for his elevation to the principate (Suet. Claud. 5. 10), was more cautious in his approach. The Senate was not to be put off-side, but popularity and support from all the orders of society was desirable. Utilitarian projects such as aqueducts could bestow such benefits on the princeps. After all, there would be a broad-based appeal to such schemes, from the highest to the lowest. All in the city benefit: everyone needs water. Beyond the obvious utility of the aqueducts another aspect: they reveal also the extreme wealth and power of the princeps. Even the rich had not these in such abundance as to enable them to supply their own water needs, to build their own aqueducts. Only the enormous resources of the empire, marshalled by the princeps, and directed towards such practical and beneficial ends,
could hope to provide such largesse of public infrastructure. By serving the needs of the populace the princeps also serves himself, underlining the importance of his position in being able to provide such a service to his fellow Romans, bringing them further into the debt of the imperial institution.

To further this end, the aqueducts, utilitarian as they may have been, were designed to attract attention, to proclaim their builder's presence. Hence, the Porta Maggiore. Provision needed to be made for the aqueduct's channels to be carried over the junction of the via Labicana and the via Praenestina of course, but the Porta Maggiore goes well beyond the immediate practical needs of the water channels. The vaults of the aqua Virgo had provided the opportunity for triumphal monumentalisation within a utilitarian structure. The Porta Maggiore is likewise a monumentalised utilitarian structure, triumphal in its form, perhaps also in its intent, but with no traditionally military triumph to trumpet. If there is a victory here it is a victory of human ingenuity, engineering and planning in the service of humanity. It is a victory achieved under the auspices of Claudius, his involvement doubly attested, by the inscription inscribed on the attic and by the rusticated masonry so favoured during his regime. As to why Claudius seems to have been partial to this effect can only be guessed at, but one explanation
may be that just as marble and neo-classicism came to be the signature of the Augustan buildings, so did Claudius hope to develop a style that would mark out his own presence in the city of Rome.

Even though it is outside Rome proper, the harbour at Ostia (Suet. *Claud.* 5. 20; Dio. 60. 11. 2-3) must be included in the building programme of Claudius, due mainly to the inseparable nature of its relationship with the city of Rome. Without Rome there would have been no need of a harbour. Here again the practicality of the building programme of Claudius is in evidence, even if the harbour proved in time to be practically useless. Useless or not the intentions of Claudius are discernible in his actions. At great expense the delivery of the grain supply for the city is being secured. It had been given water, or at any rate provided with a substantially increased supply, now the nutritional needs of the citizenry are addressed. Once more everyone benefits, the poor get fed, the rich are made more secure from the danger of rioting mobs. Once more the importance of the existence of one such as the *princeps* is underlined; he shall benefit too. For only due to the power and position of the *princeps*, and through the resources that he is able to deploy, are such immense public works, works beyond the means or capacity of private individuals, able to be accomplished.

There is an underlying symbolism in the Ostian Harbour as well. When
Caligula had imported the giant obelisk from Egypt for his new circus, a specially designed boat had needed to be built to transport its giant bulk. This boat still remained an imperial possession when Claudius began the construction of the harbour. In order to provide the foundations for the breakwater on the seaward side of the harbour the boat was filled with concrete and sunk (Suet. Claud. 5. 20). It was not only a dramatic demonstration of the efficient and practical use of available resources, but also, symbolically, the sinking of the grandiose excesses of Caligula, a recycling of the by-products of imperial flamboyance and aggrandisement for the benefit of the populace at Rome.

With the delivery of grain to the city secured, there was still need of its storage, and of its distribution. Immediately to the west of the via Lata, and from just south of the aqua Virgo to a point c. 400m to the south lie the still largely unexcavated remains of a large complex. This complex has been attributed to the time of Claudius on stylistic grounds, the masonry being of the heavily rusticated Travertine so favoured by that princeps. The building has been identified as the Porticus Minucia Frumentaria. It has been proposed, largely on the basis of three inscriptions (CIL 6. 10223, 10224 (b), 10225), that the Claudian Porticus

\[16\] For the initial proposal, Castagnoli, F., 'Il Campo Marzio nell'Antichità', MemLinc 1, 1948, pp. 175-180. However, see further the reservations of Blake, 1959, p. 28. For more recent publications concerning this building and its identification see in the first instance, Manacorda, D., LTUR 4, 1999, pp. 132-7 and the bibliography there cited.
Minucia was devised as a distribution centre for the grain dole. Another grain storage and distribution centre, arguably of Claudian date, has been proposed as the function for the remains of the building excavated beneath the *chiesa San Clemente*.

Though well beyond the outskirts of Rome, but once again of importance to the life of the city, was another of the projects undertaken by Claudius that must be mentioned here. The draining of the Fucine lake (Pliny. *HN.* 36. 122-125; Suet. *Claud.* 5. 20) reveals once more the character of the Claudian concerns in his conception of the appropriate role of the *princeps*. It was again of a similar nature, impressive in its scale, daring in conception, hugely labour intensive, and providing for the greater comfort and well being of the population of Rome by providing a substantial increase in fertile land available to grow the food that Rome needed. Being only about 80 kms from Rome, and directly connected to the city by way of the *via Valeria*, transportation of the produce from the newly acquired agricultural land to the capital would not have posed a problem.

Rome now had its bread, and water too of course. Nor was the other half of the equation to be despised, there would be circuses as well. It was

---

under Claudius that a major renovation of the carceres of the Circus Maximus was undertaken. This was no utilitarian gift to the city, though it was perhaps a pragmatic one, as the cliché above would suggest. So the carceres were re-built, the existing tufa walls replaced by walls of marble. Further ornamentation was effected as well, with the old metae replaced by new, now of gilded bronze (Suet. Claud. 21. 3)\textsuperscript{18}. There was little of dangerous precedent in Claudius' attentions to the circus. Though it is possible that Caligula had had to repair the damage to the circus that had resulted from the fire of A. D. 36, Augustus had ornamented the circus with the pulvinar and the obelisk of Ramses II that he had had removed from Heliopolis. Moreover, Julius Caesar had commissioned work on the structure (Pliny, HN. 36. 24. 102; Suet. Caes. 39. 2). It had been Caesar's interventions that had given the definitive form and dimensions to the complex\textsuperscript{19}. These precedents may have been enough even for cautious Claudius to change his approach for once and spend money on luxury, lavishing ornament on a recreational, not a utilitarian, project. But it was an anomaly. It may have been the Caesarian example that gave Claudius the incentive to ostensibly change his behaviour.

The harbour, the aqueducts, the draining of the lake, the invasion of Britain had all been stated aims of Caesar\textsuperscript{20}. Caligula may have taken

\textsuperscript{18}Ciancio Rossetto, P., LTUR 1, 1993, p. 274.

\textsuperscript{19}Ciancio Rossetto, P., LTUR 1, 1993, p. 27; Richardson, 1992, p. 85.

\textsuperscript{20}Levick, 1978 provides a fairly convincing argument for the modelling by Claudius of his reign on
the Caesarian example as a model, or at least an exemplar, but that was no reason for Claudius not to do so as well, in fact it may have been the wisest course to take. Both Claudius and Caligula relied on the goodwill of the armies and the people rather than the senators to support their rule. Both of them attempted in some way to emulate the feats of their famous ancestor. Both undertook building or engineering projects that were planned by Caesar but never achieved. If an emulation of the behaviour of Caesar was a conscious choice on the part of these two principes, it was a radical re-definition of the principate that was in evidence here, with an emulation of one who was assassinated because he too obviously lorded his own powerful position over his fellow senators. It would appear to be a distinct move away from the Augustan ideology of princeps, first among equals, to a more autocratic model. What is also interesting is Claudius' continuation of this same modelling of the role of the princeps from the example of Caesar as begun by Caligula. Though the two later rulers use the same model, they adopt different aspects. For Caligula it was the self-promoting behaviours, the super-human achievements that would have appeared to have attracted his attention. The Claudian model was in opposition to this. His building programme was breath-taking in its engineering prowess, formidable in its achievements, but magnanimous in its aims: it was the actions and plans of Caesar. The similarity between the building plans of Claudius and Caligula is not mentioned.
antithesis of Caligula’s behaviour. Nor was the model followed by
Claudius indebted to the Augustan exemplar. There was no emphasis on
the divine, no largesse to the gods, the honours to Livia being
dynastically and politically opportune. The traditional pantheon was left
un-addressed. Indeed the Augustan example was recalled mainly
through Claudius’ rejection of the Augustan ideal of the gleaming
marble city, the style favoured by Claudius evoking a Rome of pre­
hellenistic cultural adoption.

From an uncertain and timid start, the principate of Claudius evolved to
become rather more successful than many may have foreseen. His
approach, cautious, conservative, intelligently aware of historical
precedent, would appear to have served both himself and his city well. It
could not, however, protect him from the aspirations of those who owed
their positions of power to him.
The princeps was dead, long live the princeps. Marked out for years previously as the most likely successor to Claudius, fate for once did not intervene and remove the heir designate (Tac. Ann. 12, 41). Mushrooms and a poisoned feather forestalled any such occurrence, if Tacitus is to be believed (Tac. Ann. 12. 67). Mushrooms, an enema, or a cruel gruel if one prefers the rumours faithfully catalogued by Suetonius (Suet. Claud. 44). Divergence in the sources, an occurrence not so rare. However, in both accounts the hand of Agrippina is to the fore, jealous lest time or the vicissitudes of an old man’s mind should rob her of her goal. Dio’s account concurs (Dio, 61, 34 ff.) Having been wife, sister, niece, great-grandniece, step-granddaughter, great-granddaughter even step-great-granddaughter of emperors, now there was the chance to have a son as emperor. Almost the full set; and a formidable curriculum vitae, if not an enviable one.

It would be tempting to dismiss these accounts of the role of Agrippina in

---

1 In A. D. 50 Nero had been designated consul-elect, to take up the position in his twentieth year. He also received pro-consular imperium outside the limits of Rome (Tac., Ann. 12, 41, 2), and was hailed as princeps iuventutis (RIC 1, p. 125, nos. 75, 78 f; 129, 107 f). For the chronology of the reign of Nero see Gallivan, P. A., 'Suetonius and Chronology in the "de vita Neronis"', Historia 23, pp. 297-318, still, I am assured by the author, of value.

2 For the life and career of Agrippina see Barrett, A. A., Agrippina, Mother of Nero., London, 1996.
the transition of power from Claudius to Nero as the product of male and senatorial prejudice if it were not for evidence sourced elsewhere that lends support to their veracity. The role and the eventual fate of Agrippina in the early reign of her son is, as Sutherland notes, 'reflected with a cold and clear precision in the coinage...'\(^3\), with representations of her at first sharing equality of status with her son on the obverse of the coins, her image later being banished to the reverse, before disappearing entirely, as she herself was eventually to do thanks to the efforts of her son and his advisors (Tac. Ann. 14, 1-13; Suet. Nero, 6, 36). But that was yet to come. At the accession of her son to the principate Agrippina would have been something of an expert in the ways of Imperial politics, both domestic and public. She had survived, indeed thrived, within their midst her entire life. Her political instincts would have been refined, masterful. It may in large part be the skill and understanding of Agrippina that accounts for the style of the early years of Nero's principate. In conjunction of course with the guiding hands of Nero's tutors and advisors, the Stoic senator Seneca and the Praetorian Prefect Burrus (Tac. Ann. 13, 2). It is this stability of personnel at the centre of power that would account for the continuation of the conservatism that had been so evident under Claudius.

Thus the tried and true forms were to be followed. Claudius was deified, following the example of both Tiberius and Augustus, who had both had

deified their respective adoptive fathers.

Templum Divi Claudii.

A temple for the new divus was begun, on the instigation of Agrippina according to Suetonius; divique Claudi in Caelio monte coeptum quidem ab Agrippina (Suet. Ves. 9; Aur. Vict. Caes. 9, 7; Pseudo Aur. Vict. Epit. 9, 8). The site chosen on the Caelian hill was prepared. To accommodate the temple a platform was constructed, 205m wide, 175m deep, and raising the level of the site to one in accord with the adjacent Palatine⁴. It was intended to be a massive, impressive, dominating structure, the largest religious precinct in Rome⁵.

Little is recoverable of how the temple that this platform was to support was to have appeared. Whatever may have been built in the five years between the accession of Nero and the demise of Agrippina was to be destroyed on the orders of Nero, (sed a Nerone prope funditus destructum, Suet. Ves. 9). Though the site of the temple has never been excavated, from fragments of the Severan Marble Plan it is possible

⁵Rose, B., Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period., Cambridge, 1997, p. 46.
to reconstruct something of what the temple and its area was at its completion, but this is the completed version carried out under orders from Vespasian as princeps. It may therefore have no bearing whatsoever on the Neronian era structure. That building is at present irrecoverable, irrecoverable due to lack of excavation, and irrecoverable due to the actions of Nero at a later point in his principate.

Darwall-Smith makes a case for the survival of the temple of the Deified Claudius until its destruction by fire in A. D. 64, pointing out that not only was the presence of a deified father extremely useful for Nero, but that Martial mentions a Claudia...porticus (Martial, Sp. 2, 9-10), which he suggests may have been connected to the temple. However, it may have been that this porticus is that of which traces remain in front of the east facade of the platform. Though the porticoes may well have been retained during the later changes effected under Nero, it would appear that the temple proper did not. After all, Suetonius wished to leave us in no doubt, it is Nero who destroyed the temple, not fire (Suet. Ves. 9). If the temple was still in existence in A. D. 64 it may have been damaged in the fire. However, whenever its demise, it was Nero's decision to have it demolished, burnt or not.

6 FLR, pl. 16, Rodriguez - Almeida, pl. 2. For concise reconstructions of its appearance see further Buzzetti, C., LTUR 1,1993, pp. 277-8; Richardson, 1992, pp. 87-8. Also below in following chapter.
8 Richardson, 1992, p. 87.
In part then the conservative, traditional approach to the Imperial building programme at Rome during the early years of Nero was very much a product of Agrippina's influence or agenda, not Nero's. Similar, though springing from a different source, is another example of conservative building activity in the early years of Nero's reign.

The Macellum Magnum.

If it was Agrippina's influence that accounts for the traditional nature of dynastic display or commemoration during the first years of the principate of Nero, it was probably due to the presence of Seneca and Burrus and their role in the administration of the government of empire that accounts for the conservative nature of the early years of Nero's reign in that area of the princeps' role.10

Cassius Dio records the dedication in A. D. 59 of a macellum by Nero (Dio, 61 [62] 18, 3). It is listed in the regionary catalogues after the Temple of the Deified Claudius, in regio II, on the Caelian hill. From coin issues of Nero's era and its representation on a fragment of the Severan Marble Plan some idea as to what this macellum looked like can be retrieved (see Plates 7, 8).11 The coins show an open columnar tholus of two

11The identification of this fragment of the Marble Plan as representing the Neronian macellum is not completely certain, its has also been identified as representing the macellum Liviae constructed during the principate of Augustus on the Esquiline hill, see
storeys, roofed by (perhaps) a dome, on a high podium, a flight of stairs admitting access to a statue, perhaps Neptune, that stands in the tholus\textsuperscript{12}. To the left and the right are colonnades, the order Corinthian, that on the left being of an elevation greater than that on the right. Some examples of the type include in their legend the letters S. C., some do not. The fragment of the Marble Plan that has been identified with the \textit{macellum} represents the building as a series of blocks of \textit{tabernae} laid out within a rectangular area, the whole surrounded by a colonnade\textsuperscript{13}. At the centre of the courtyard around which the \textit{tabernae} are arranged is the representation of a circle of columns and a flight of stairs. At one of the shorter ends of the complex there was what appears to be a double exhedra. According to Pisani Sartorio, this \textit{macellum} corresponds in every way with \textit{macella} known from others parts of the Roman world\textsuperscript{14}. It is a standard type, though its name would suggest that its was the largest to be built in Rome, at least until that time. A standard type, though of imperial dimensions, a useful, utilitarian building, conservative, traditional, almost Augustan. It, and the nearby Temple of the Deified Claudius both reveal tendencies in their public relations aspirations that sit ill with those buildings commissioned by Nero personally. It is not unlikely that with the Macellum Magnum we have

\begin{itemize}
  \item Pisano Sartorio, G., \textit{LTUR} 3, 1996, p. 204. However, the coin representation would, with its inclusion of a tholus element, allow the Marble Plan fragment to be identified as this Neronian \textit{macellum}.
  \item \textsuperscript{12}The coin types are listed by Richardson, 1992, p. 242, and more fully by Pisani Sartorio, G., \textit{LTUR} 3, 1996, p. 204.
  \item \textsuperscript{13}Rodríguez - Almeida, 1981, 157, 169 n. 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{14}Pisani Sartorio, G., \textit{LTUR} 3, 1996, pp. 204-5.
\end{itemize}
again a building built under the auspices of the princeps, even dedicated
by him, but having little to do with his personal conception of what he
intended the principate to be.

Buildings of a Variant Inspiration.

Meanwhile, elsewhere at Rome, buildings of a variant inspiration were
taking shape. The circus laid out under Caligula in the horti
Agrippinae bears evidence of Neronian activity\textsuperscript{15}. Probably Neronian
too was the bridge that spanned the Tiber giving access to this region, the
pons Neronianus\textsuperscript{16}. The circus was essentially of a private nature,
being an element of an imperial hortus. The bridge as well would
appear to have been similarly a private affair\textsuperscript{17}. Indulgence in
recreational facilities was not to be limited to the private sphere.

On the Campus Martius, adjoining to the north the thermae Agrippae
and the Stagnum, a second complex of imperial thermae were laid out
(Suet. Nero, 12, 3; Philostratus, Vit. Apoll., 4, 42; Aur. Vict, Epit., 5, 3;
Eutrop., 7, 15, 2). Later extensively restored under Alexander Severus,
little of the Neronian version is recoverable (S. H. A., Alex. Sev., 25, 3-4)\textsuperscript{18}. Though said to have been enlarged at the time of the rebuilding

\textsuperscript{15}Richardson, 1992, pp. 83-4.
\textsuperscript{16}Liverani, P., LTUR 4, 1999, p. 111; Richardson, 1992, p. 298.
\textsuperscript{17}Grimal, P., Les Jardins romains., 2nd ed., Paris, 1969, p. 140, although contra,
under Alexander Severus (S.H.A, Alex. Sev., 25, 3-4)\textsuperscript{19}, one might question in what way this enlargement was effected. Bordered to the south by the Stagnum, to the west by the Stadium of Domitian, to the east by the Pantheon and to the north by the so-called \textit{via Recta}, the site would have allowed little room for enlargement of the land area under Alexander Severus. We may conclude, therefore, that the actual land area occupied by Nero’s version of the \textit{thermae} would have been of a very similar size. It may also be safe to assume that Nero’s \textit{thermae} took their alignment from the Agrippan structures which bordered his new building. In this way Nero could show himself to be expanding upon the example provided from the era of Augustus. However, his complex may also have included divergence from this example. It would appear that the \textit{gymnasium Neronis} may have been part of, or at least closely positioned with, the \textit{thermae}. The sources are not completely clear on this point. Suetonius most closely links the two, \textit{dedicatisque thermis atque gymnasio}, (Suet. Nero., 12)\textsuperscript{20}. It has also been suggested that the wooden amphitheatre erected by Nero within the year A. D. 57 (Tac. Ann., 13, 31, 1; Suet. Nero, 12) may have adjoined the complex, being built where the sphendome of the Stadium of Domitian would later

\textsuperscript{18}Brick-stamp evidence where found is datable to the reigns of Hadrian and Alexander Severus; \textit{CIL} 15.481, 15.164, 15.364, 15.371, 15.404. Neronian era finds are restricted to a length of inscribed lead pipe, \textit{CIL} 15.7271.

\textsuperscript{19}Richardson, 1992, p. 394.

\textsuperscript{20}Tac. \textit{Ann.}, 14, 47 mentions also the distribution of oil at the time of the gymnasium’s dedication as does Dio, 61 [62] 21. Neither however mention the \textit{thermae} in context with the gymnasium. Richardson, 1992, pp. 183, 394 links the two. Chini, G., \textit{LTUR} 2, 1995, p. 374 is a little more circumspect, though not significantly so.
rise. It would have made for an interesting conjunction or juxtapositioning between the exclusively Roman tradition of the amphitheatre, the Roman ritual of the baths, and the Greekness of the gymnasium. The juxtapositioning of amphitheatre and baths foreshadows the accumulation of recreational facilities that would later centre on the Flavian Amphitheatre. Also, the inter-meshing of the Roman and Greek traditions pre-empts Hadrian’s similar inspiration.

The Greekness of the gymnasium accords well with what is known of the philhellenism of Nero generally. The shows staged in the newly erected amphitheatre included Pyrrhic dances performed by Greek youths. These youths were presented on completion of the dance with Roman citizenship (Suet. *Nero.*, 12), an indication perhaps of a conception of Roman supremacy rather than a capitulation to Greek cultural supremacy. It is Tacitus who links the *ludi iuvenales* with Greek degeneracy (*Tac. Ann.*, 14. 14, 1), but he may have had his own agenda to consider. Then followed in A. D. 60 the establishment of Nero’s Greek-style quinquennial games, the Neronia. These are linked to the dedication of the Baths and Gymnasium by Suetonius (Suet. *Nero.*, 12). Tacitus (*Ann.*, 14, 47) has the establishment of the Gymnasium two years later in A. D. 62. Both, however, mention the free distribution of oil to senators and knights, Tacitus dismissing this largesse as being in

the Greek fashion.

Throughout the rest of his life Nero continued to show signs of fascination with Greek cultural manifestations, particularly those that contained an opportunity for public display and participation; horse-racing, singing to the lyre, or the composition of poetry. Much has been made of the Neronian pre-occupation with Greek cultural activities. However, it should be kept in mind that the culture of Greece had long been an integral part of elite culture at Rome. Augustan cultural nationalism was politically motivated, an aberration of sorts, and not compelling enough to prevail completely. Likewise, Tacitean vitriol and scorn poured forth against the philhellenism of Nero was the result of his own agenda, and may not reflect prevailing social attitudes. In keeping with the fact that Greek culture was by this time an accepted part of elite Roman culture is the the fact that most of the building programme of Nero at Rome is Roman in character. Nero’s philhellenism, though evident, is perhaps over-drawn, too readily made a prime focus of his behaviour. It may be better to understand Nero’s pre-occupations as pre-occupations with culture and aesthetics. In the pursuit of these, Greek traits were inescapable. They need not imply an unhealthy obsession with foreign cultural phenomena, especially when these phenomena were in truth no longer foreign.

26Syme, 1958, pp. 504 ff.
In accord with the over-riding Roman character of Nero’s building programme is the evidence of his interest in military glory and honours. Griffin, in a chapter devoted to the subject, demonstrates the importance of military honour to Nero, placing it firmly within the context of Republican and Imperial traditions. Nero, it would appear, consistently adhered to traditional notions of virtus and auctoritas derived from military supremacy for the majority of his principate, diverging from the model only in the closing years of his reign. It is within this context that his triumphal arch should be understood.

The Arch of Nero.

Nothing is known to remain of the arch Nero built at Rome. That he had an arch or arches built is certain, *At Romae tropaea de Parthis arcusque medio Capitolini montis sistebantur* (Tac. Ann., 15, 18). Tacitus’ account would have them erected in or by A.D. 62. These tokens of military honour had been voted, amongst others, by the Senate in A.D. 58 on the occasion of the capture and sack of Artaxata by Nero’s legions commanded by Corbulo (Tac. Ann., 13, 41).

The account of Tacitus reveals the approximate site of the arch, *in medio Capitolini montis*. As pointed out by Kleiner, the position of

---

27 Griffin, 1984, ch. 15, p. 221 ff.
Nero's arch on the Capitoline would place it within the tradition of siting of triumphal arches, these being built over or beside the triumphal route, and in particular towards the end of that route, across or beside the *clivus Capitolinus*\(^{28}\). A series of *sestertii* minted at Rome, Lugdunum, and perhaps by another provincial mint, carry a depiction of an arch that has been identified as this arch of Nero (see Plate 9)\(^{29}\).

Kleiner reconstructs the appearance of the arch from its representation on these coins. The arch shown has but a single fornix, to either side of which are columns, the order Corinthian. The columns are effectively free-standing, bracketed out *en ressaut*. This inclusion of free-standing columns is, according to Kleiner, the first time such a feature had appeared on a triumphal arch\(^{30}\). Also innovations were the niches and colossal statues that decorated the external side facades of the arch. Statues in niches had appeared on arches before, but never before had the sides of a Roman honourary arch been ornamented in this way\(^{31}\). The arch was surmounted with a statuary group, Nero as *triumphator* standing in a *quadriga*, flanked to the left by a figure of Victory, wreath at the ready to crown the *princeps*, to the right by a figure of Pax. The symbolism is familiar from the time of Augustus, Peace in alliance with Victory, the two reliant on the *princeps* triumphant. There is also the


\(^{29}\)Kleiner, *LTUR* 1, 1993, p. 101 lists the coin references. For those from the mint at Rome RIC 1(2), 161 n. 143 ff; from Lugdunum RIC 1(2), 175 ff. n. 392 f., 432 f., 498 ff., 573 ff.)

\(^{30}\)Kleiner, F. S., 1985, p. 89.

\(^{31}\)Kleiner, F. S., 1985, p. 91.
connection with Parthia. However, there is innovation here also. Here is the first recorded instance of Victory standing beside a mortal on an arch at Rome\textsuperscript{32}. Furthermore, the presence of Pax is the first known instance when a representation of a personification other than Victory appeared with a triumphing general\textsuperscript{33}. In another divergence from tradition, the arch of Nero was sheathed in an unprecedented amount of relief sculpture, including depictions of river gods in the spandrels to either side of the keystone. Though this placement of river gods was to become a standard feature on honourary arches, at the time of Nero it was without precedent\textsuperscript{34}.

Nero’s version of a triumphal arch is highly informative as to how he may have viewed his principate. The arch is a traditional monument, erected \textit{ex senatus consulto}, for success within the traditionally most admired activity of Roman aristocrats, military success. Moreover, this military success had been against the traditional enemy of Rome, the empire of the Parthians. Traditional also was the siting of the arch. Nor is there anything particularly revolutionary in the decorative scheme of the arch, there is innovation, lack of precedence, but no individual element, except perhaps the free-standing columns, was in itself an innovation. The divergence from tradition is either in the inclusion of the element on a triumphal arch, its position of the arch, or the quantity

\textsuperscript{32}Kleiner, F. S.,1985, p.78.
\textsuperscript{33}Kleiner, F. S.,1985, p.79.
\textsuperscript{34}Kleiner, F. S.,1985, p.81 ff.
of elements included on an arch. Nero's Parthian arch was entirely within the traditions of such structures, it is differentiated from its predecessors by excess. Even then, excess was not a quality unknown in the highly competitive field of Roman aristocratic display.

For all his much maligned philhellenism, Nero's buildings would tend to reveal him as very much a Roman. The Circus of Gaius and Nero is a circus, not a stadium. He had built an amphitheatre, not a theatre. His baths may have included a gymnasium, regardless, they were Roman style baths. Nero's need or desire to express, or his subconscious attachment to, his Roman cultural heritage finds expression in all his buildings at Rome, and particularly in the erection of his triumphal arch. It is a characteristic of this princeps which is heightened, not lessened, in his domestic accommodations.

The Domus Aurea and Domus Transitoria.

At some stage between his accession in A. D. 54 and the fire of A. D. 64 Nero set in motion a project to link the imperial properties on the Palatine with the horti Maecenatiani on the Esquiline hill35. Both

---

Tacitus and Suetonius record its existence, for once Tacitean opprobrium being out-done by that of Suetonius (Tac. Ann., 15, 39, 1; Suet. Nero, 31). The aim of the project to link the imperial properties is expressly stated by Suetonius, who also supplies us with Nero's term for his new house, the Domus Transitoria. Its destruction in the fire of A. D. 64 (Tac. Ann., 15, 39) has resulted in few traces of this domus remaining to this day.

Three significant portions attributed to it survive, two on the Palatine, the other incorporated into the platform of the Temple of Venus and Rome\(^36\). Ball also claims that parts of the Domus Aurea consist of sections previously included in the Domus Transitoria\(^37\).

These are but fragments, merely fragments, and widely scattered at that. Nor is it completely certain that these fragments can be indisputably identified as parts of the Domus Transitoria. Those on the Palatine are Neronian but are they part of that structure which was known as the Domus Transitoria? The accounts of both Tacitus and Suetonius concur on one important descriptive point, the Domus Transitoria was constructed to join the horti Maecenatini with the palaces of the Palatine. The Domus Transitoria should therefore be between these two

---


areas, not necessarily within the *horti*, nor on the Palatine.

Tacitus' mild tone in his mention of the Domus Transitoria is unexpected. This may suggest that this phase of Neronian palace building was of a scale and type that were not so far removed from acceptable standards. However, the tone of Suetonius would mitigate this interpretation somewhat. In all events, it was not the Domus Transitoria that offended the sensibilities of the Roman aristocracy to an unprecedented degree, that task was reserved for its successor, the Domus Aurea.

It had been Caligula's regret that major disaster had not befallen the empire during his principate. Suetonius reports his bemoaning the fact that the peace and prosperity of his incumbency would render his rule forgettable (Suet. *Cal.*, 31). Though history was to prove him mistaken in one respect, it remembered him, the fire of A.D. 64 would suggest the his instincts were correct. Disaster could prove to be good fortune in disguise, and the history of the principate has no more resonant image than that of Nero playing his lyre as below him the city of Rome burned. Whether the image is true to fact or not (Tac, *Ann.*, 15, 39), Nero would be remembered as an arch-villain, but remembered nevertheless.

Tacitus, Suetonius and Cassius Dio all include the fire in their accounts of Nero's principate, how could they not? The fire and its purported
author even find a place in the works of Pliny the Elder (*HN.*, 17, 1, 5)
Suetonius, Dio and Pliny all lay the blame for the fire at the feet of Nero.
Tacitus is more circumspect, though ultimately no less damaging. His
account begins;

_Sequitur clades, forte an dolo principis incertum (nam utrumque
auctores prodidere), sed omnibus, quae huic urbi per violentiam
ignium acciderunt, gravior atque atrocior._

There followed a disaster, whether due to chance or to the malice of the
sovereign is uncertain - for each version has its sponsors - but graver
and more terrible than any other which has befallen this city by the
ravages of fire.

(Tac. *Ann.*, 15, 38).

Tacitus then goes on throughout the course of four chapters to give the
most detailed account that we have of the fire and the destruction it
wrought. The city was gutted, bereft, but opportunity beckoned. From its
ashes could arise a city made anew, made better. Tacitus begrudgingly
acknowledges the Neronian intention of turning disaster to the common
good, outlining the regulations that were to control the re-building of the
city, making for a better planned, safer, more commodious urban
environment (Tac, *Ann.*, 15, 43). Apartment blocks, _insulae_, were to be
subject to building codes with their height restricted, no party walls, with internal courtyards and the materials to be used in their construction to be of Alban and Gabine stone, these being thought to be impervious to fire. Moreover the streets they lined were to be laid out as broad and straight thoroughfares, lined by porticos from which conflagrations could be the more easily addressed. All are sensible, practical measures to improve life within the city that burned so often. Even so, in true Tacitean fashion he cannot fail to undercut his praise with complaint; the new Rome is less healthy for all its light and air, people complain, the sun now burns too brightly in the open spaces.

Whilst the general populace at Rome may have received a more salubrious urban environment in which to live, work and move, it could in no way compete with the environment that Nero was to create for his own enjoyment.

The entrance to the Domus Aurea rose upon the ridge of the Velia. The Sacra Via was re-aligned from its original path to allow a direct line of sight and approach from the Forum to the Atrium. To flank and monumentalise the newly diverted Sacra Via there were probably erected porticoes. These, with the re-building of the Atrium Vestae, would have provided definition to the approach to the new imperial residence. A

---

38 For a site plan of the Domus Aurea the reader is referred to Plate 25.
sacred way leads to Nero’s home. But so as not to let subtlety deny the message, further visual focus was provided by the colossal bronze statue of Nero, 120 RF in height, that found lodging within the triple winged portico that delimited the area of the Atrium of the Domus Aurea\(^{40}\). The colossal scale of the statue may have found reply in the scale of the portico that delimited the Atrium\(^{41}\). The Atrium had need of such a scale, it was the principle point of entrance to a residence the size of which had never before been attempted at Rome.

Little now remains of that which was Nero’s pride and joy, systematic dismantling and transformation under succeeding *principes* saw to that.

However, from the remnants and the literary sources some conception of

---

\(^{40}\) Pliny, *HN.*, 35:51 is worth comparing here for his description of a painting of Nero on linen also claimed to be 120 RF high. 120 roman feet is equivalent to about 35.5m, putting this statue in much the same size range as the Statue of Liberty, which is approx.46 m in height, from the top of the base to the top of the torch’s flame. This statue of Nero was indeed a colossal colossus. For studies on the Colossos see further Lega, C., *LTUR* 1, 1993, pp. 295-8; Lega, ‘Il colosso di Nerone.’, *BCAR* 93, 1989-90, pp. 339-378.

\(^{41}\) There is on-going uncertainty in regard to the portico of the Atrium and its identification with the so-called *porticus triplices miliariae*. Van Deman, E. B., ‘The Neronian *Sacra Via*’ *AJA* 27, 1923, pp. 383-424, proposed that this portico should be identified with those that lined the Sacra Via and included those that formed the delimitation of the Atrium. Others, including Platner and Ashby, 1929, pp. 168, 271-2, 424, 429, and Castagnoli, F., ‘Note sulla topografia del Palatino e del Foro Romano’, *ArchCI* 16, 1964, pp. 195-99, identify the triple portico as a private affair, included somewhere else (unidentified location) within the grounds of the Domus Aurea. Further on these structures and the controversy of the identification see in the first instance Papi, E., *LTUR* 2, 1995, pp. 55-6; Cassatella, A., Panella, S., *LTUR* 2, 1995, pp. 50-1; Boethius, A., ‘Nero’s Golden House.’, *Eranos* 44, 1946, pp. 442-459.
the form of the Domus Aurea can be recovered.

Across the summit of the Palatine traces of Neronian building have come to light. Buried beneath the Farnese Gardens and the additions, improvements and modifications of later principes the Neronian era platform of the Domus Tiberiana remains\(^\text{42}\). Under the floor of the Aula Regia of the Domus Augustana lie the remains of a Neronian hall of similar plan to the later Domitianic version, but of a much reduced scale. To the south-west of this, beneath the cenatio of the Domus Augustana two versions of Neronian centiones have come to light, one pre-A. D. 64, one post-. To their south lie further traceable remains of Nero's Palatine palace\(^\text{43}\). Between these remains and the site of the atrium of the Domus Aurea no remains identifiable to the time of Nero have come to light, Domitianic activity here removed not preserved traces of that which had stood there before.

The platform of the atrium would have provided a belvedere from which the true nature of the Domus Aurea would have been discernible. To the south-east the platform initially erected for the Temple of the Deified Claudius was recycled, its eastern facade transformed into what

\(^{42}\) For the Neronian phase of the Domus Tiberiana see Krause, C., *LTUR* 2, 1995, pp. 189-97, in particular pp. 192-3.

appears to have been a gigantic nymphaeum. The Neronian branch of the Aqua Claudia supplied its liquid needs\textsuperscript{44}. A distance of c. 300m separated the northernmost corner of this platform from the south-western corner of the so-called Esquiline wing of the domus.

This Esquiline wing of the Domus Aurea, impressive as its remaining structure still is, would have been even more impressive in its entirety\textsuperscript{45}. It is probable that western section that still remains was mirrored by another wing to the east. The section that contains the octagonal room would then have stood as the central element of a tripartite structure c. 400m in length\textsuperscript{46}. Built into the natural slope of its site, the remains were in fact only the lower storey. Traces of another level have been found above the level that remains. The lower storey in effect provided a terrace upon which the upper storey was arranged.


Between the the Esquiline wing and the platform of the Temple of the Deified Claudius and the atrium on the Velia, in the position now occupied by the Flavian Amphitheatre was a lake. According to Suetonius the lake, as large as a sea (exaggeration perhaps?) was the focal point of the Domus Aurea, its shores ornamented with buildings that seemed as cities (Suet. *Nero*, 31). One would presume that these buildings that seemed as cities were those mentioned above, though it is possible that others were also present.

The Domus Aurea as described included the summit of the Palatine hill, and perhaps most if not all of that summit. Surely Domitian's later palace which did indeed use the entire top of that hill would have drawn more criticism than it did if he had had to evict senatorial residents in order to build as he did. The boundaries of Nero's Domus Aurea stretched from here to incorporate a majority of the north-western end of the Caelian hill, the ridge of the Velia, a sizable swathe of the Oppian hill up to the boundaries of, and possibly even including, the *horti Maecenatis*. The boundary to the south is not known, but one would doubt that it closely abutted the southern reaches of the known buildings.

Though named the Domus Aurea the term *domus* is a little misleading. Nero's new palatial residence had more in common with a villa estate than a traditional *domus*, consisting as it did of buildings arranged and

---

47 For the area surrounding the lake of Nero see Panella, C., *LTUR* 2, 1995, pp. 51-55.
dispersed throughout a landscape setting. Gilded and bejewelled, their architectural form innovative, their decorative detail elaborate, lavish, designed to impress and delight, the buildings of the Domus Aurea sat as jewels in themselves, set into the play-ground park of the princeps. Interestingly, it is this aspect of the Domus Aurea that Tacitus singles out for especial criticism. Could it have been the luxury of space that most offended the sensibilities of the aristocracy at Rome?

*Ceterum Nero usus est patriae ruinis extruxitque domum, in qua haud perinde gemmae et aurum miraculo essent, solita pridem et luxu vulgata, quam arva et stagna et in modum solitudinum hinc silvae, inde aperta spatio et prospectus,...*

However, Nero turned to account the ruins of his fatherland by building a palace the marvels of which were to consist not so much in gems and gold, materials long familiar and vulgarized by luxury, as in fields and lakes and the air of solitude given by wooded ground alternating with clear tracts and open landscapes.

*(Tac. Ann. 15, 42)*

In the words of Alessandro Cassatella, "*La concezione della domus giunge con Nerone a creare un mondo separato da ciò che resta della città ...*"\(^{48}\). A world separated from the rest of the city, buildings designed as cities set around a lake that that aspired to the size of a sea

\(^{48}\)Cassatella, A. *LTUR* 2, 1995, p. 49.
(Suet. Nero 31), set within an idealised rural landscape that cushioned its principle resident from the life of the city. This was Roman aristocratic display on a scale without precedent, though of a type long familiar. It bespoke power, resources, and social position far and away beyond the means of the next ranked order of society, that of the senatorial class. To add insult to injury Suetonius maintains that senatorial and commercial properties were targeted and destroyed by Nero’s agents during the confusion of the fire of A. D. 64 in order that space be available for his intended residential pièce de résistance(Suet. Nero, 38). Indeed, archaeological evidence would go some way in support of Suetonius’ report, with the identification of parts of the fabric of the Esquiline wing of the Domus Aurea as pre-existing commercial buildings49.

The Domus Aurea of Nero blatantly proclaimed Nero’s conception of the principate, the princeps was not to be the Augustan conception of the first among equals, hedged about and fudged with over-worked modesty and dissembling appearances. Nero’s conception as demonstrated by his residence was other. Others could be equal; he was to be simply, unqualifiedly, the first. Now with the Domus Aurea habitable he could begin to live as a man, but not amongst men (Suet. Nero., 31). Nero used a traditional means of status enhancement amongst the Roman aristocracy, conspicuous display within the domestic sphere, to separate

himself from that very order of society. Perhaps it was this use of their own methods to resoundingly diminish their own importance that so stung the senatorial order's level of society, spurring them into action. Pride, so they say, cometh before a fall. In the case of Nero the pride was with both sides of the social and political equation. It was only the one side of the equation that was to fail, however, to quite literally stumble and fall. No matter what sort of artist Nero may have been, it died with him. With him died also a dynasty, the first of Imperial Rome. Rome's succeeding dynastic founder would learn from the example of the first and the last of the Julio-Claudians, fashioning a public image that drew on the example of the Augustan principate, and drew strength from its opposition to that of Nero.