



Speakers and Abstracts by Panel

Contents (please click the panel title to go straight there)

1) End of an era: the final days and death of Augustus	2
2a) Becoming a god.....	3
2b) Historiography and scholarship	5
3a) The Tiberian response.....	7
3b) Text and Persuasion.....	9
4a) Neronians to Flavians	10
4b) Monuments and architecture	12
5a) Late antiquity	14
5b) Tacitus, Suetonius and Augustus	17
6a) Byzantine politics and literature	19
6b) The power of images	21
7a) Augustus in the novel	22
7b) Bridging the gap: towards the Middle Ages	24
8a) Augustus between the wars	26
8b) Virgil, Ovid and their successors	28
9a) Augustus on screen.....	30
9b) The 21 st -century Augustus.....	32
10) Karl Galinsky (University of Texas at Austin): Augustus in 2014	33

1) End of an era: the final days and death of Augustus

Mary Harlow (Leicester) and Ray Laurence (University of Kent) – Augustus and Old Age

The final 10 years of Augustus' long principate allow us to analyse the nature of old age in the Roman Empire. At the age of 66, it is clear that Augustus was definitely a *senex* and was also the ruler of the empire. The man with only a few rotting teeth could still make speeches, for example on marriage in AD 9. He might dream of retirement (Sen. Brev. Vit. 3.5), and be rarely seen in the senate after his 75th birthday, but there is no question even at this late stage in life that he was, with Tiberius, deciding the future of the empire (for example what was to be done about an adult Claudius in AD 12). Our paper will set out the actions of Augustus in his final stage of life and map these onto the characteristics of old age (for discussion of these see e.g. Cokayne, K. 2003. *Experiencing Old Age*). In so doing, we will analyse both the literary record found in Suetonius' *Life of Augustus*, Tacitus' *Annals* and Cassius Dio and also examine the *Res Gestae*. The latter will be evaluated as the action of an old man focussing on the past and to identify within this text elements or characteristics that were seen as characteristic of the elderly in antiquity. The paper as a whole will provide an overview of the social world of an old emperor that is written in juxtaposition to another elderly emperor – Tiberius, whose old age in contrast to his youth was spent in ignominy.

Alison Cooley (Warwick, UK) – The last days of Augustus

This paper will explore the Campanian setting for the last days of Augustus, and how different locations contributed to the staging of his death. Suetonius' account of Augustus' death (*Life of Augustus* 98-100) suggests that the locations in which he spent his last days - Capri, Naples, Puteoli, and Nola – all added different shades of meaning to his death. Suetonius describes Augustus' reaction to his encounter with Alexandrian sailors offering incense in the Gulf of Puteoli as they celebrated the safety of the seas which he had created, whilst the non-Roman cultural contexts of the island of Capri and city of Naples perhaps allowed for a more explicit exploration of his divine qualities than if he had remained at Rome. The second part of the paper will examine epigraphic evidence from Campania and Latium to see how communities and individuals subsequently responded to his death and deification. Individuals might draw prestige for themselves from being associated with *divus Augustus*, whether as members of his *familia*, as his appointees in different offices, as *Augustales*, or as his *flamines*, whilst civic communities might embed religious ceremonials for the deified emperor within their local calendars. We can trace how even after his death Augustus was a force to be reckoned with and was invoked in a wide variety of contexts. His *auctoritas* lived on.

Valerie Hope (Open University, UK) – Grieving for Augustus: emotion and control in Roman imperial mourning ritual

'Real grief was not in the hearts of many at the time, but later was felt by all', (56.43). This was the view of Cassius Dio following the death of the first emperor Augustus. Dio placed the death in the context of the continuum of Roman Imperial power. Grief was experienced less for the dead emperor, and more for what his demise symbolised: the continuation of rule by one man, namely Tiberius, who ultimately would cause more suffering than his predecessor. Augustus's death, funeral and deification (and the stage management of these)

were integral to the safe transfer of power, and demonstrations of grief, and public mourning, were aspects of this process. This paper will explore the extent to which public mourning for Augustus was related to Republican precedents or invented for Imperial times. How were different social groups expected to behave? How were the chief mourners (Livia and Tiberius) characterised? And, for comparison, how did members of the Julio-Claudian household mourn other deaths and in turn how were they mourned for? Reading of the surviving sources suggests that grief and mourning, emotional melt downs and stoical self control, were bound up with changing traditions and expectations, but also literary creations and evaluations of good and bad rule.

2a) Becoming a god

Lya Serignolli (University of Sao Paulo) – Liber, Augustus, and Tiberius

In what ways was the image of Augustus associated with Bacchus/Liber, and how do these associations reverberate in the portrait of Tiberius? For this discussion we will be focusing on some passages of Horace, Virgil, Tacitus and Suetonius that touch on some aspects of these relations.

When Octavian won the battle of Actium, the association between Mark Antony and Bacchus was already part of the dialogue of poetry and politics. Although the most evident divine affiliation of Octavian by this time was with Apollo, poets like Virgil and Horace started working on some aspects of Bacchus/Liber to build the political image of Augustus. While authors like Cicero attributed to Mark Antony Dionysus' darkest aspects, like excessive drinking and bacchanal, Horace and Virgil, taking advantage of the ambivalence of this god, reserved his brightest traits to Augustus, especially his characteristics as *divi filius*, young leader, and a hero victorious over death, as well as an agent of transformation, and a symbol of civility, fecundity and life. Liber was assimilated into Augustus' imagery not only in texts, but also in objects, like coins (RIC1 283), as a reminder of the return of a Golden Age with the end of the civil war, the conquest of the East, and the promise of restoration of some old Republican values with Augustus' new regime. After Augustus' death and divinization, Tiberius assumed the role of *divi filius*. As Gowing (2005:64) says, Tiberius, like his adopted father, as *princeps*, "continued to play the Republican card", refusing to be divinized and officially worshipped as a god in his lifetime in Rome. In Tacitus' *Annals* (4.38), Tiberius' efforts to be remembered by posterity as a mortal who managed to earn the respect of people for his deeds in life resonate with Liber as model of divinized hero.

Kelly Shannon (University of Alabama) – Temples and Memory: Augustus' Deification and Tiberius' Reputation in Tacitus' *Annals*

In this paper, I will examine Tacitus' depiction in the *Annals* of the worship of *divus Augustus* during the reign of Tiberius. This investigation will shed important light on the political implications of the imperial cult for Augustus' first successor: in Tacitus' text, worship of the *divus* raises questions of Tiberius' own divine status, and of how deification relates to emperors' posthumous reputations – divinity has become an intrinsic part of memory.

I shall focus my analysis on Tiberius' involvement in temple dedications. Tiberius piously dedicates temples to *divus Augustus*, especially at critical moments in Tacitus' narrative of

his principate. Such dedications provide a pretext for his withdrawal from Rome (*Ann.* 4.57 and 67). This sits uneasily against the devastation that Sejanus wreaks in Tiberius' absence, and the temple dedications begin to look not like pious acts of worship of *divus Augustus*, but like attempts to misdirect his subjects' attention. Furthermore, Tacitus describes Tiberius' role in the construction of Augustus' temple in Rome only toward the end of Tiberius' life and in the context of a destructive fire (*Ann.* 6.45). This allows criticism of Tiberius to be joined with the cultic worship of *divus Augustus*: Tacitus notes that the temple was never actually dedicated, possibly because Tiberius was insufficiently concerned with what this would do to his reputation (6.45.1 *contemptu ambitionis*). In attempting to worship and commemorate Augustus, Tiberius is characterized by inaction and inadequacy.

The precedent of Augustus' deification becomes even more overtly relevant to Tiberius' own posthumous reputation when he rejects a temple, proposed by Spanish emissaries, that was to be dedicated to himself and his mother (*Ann.* 4.37-8). By basing his argument for rejecting the temple on Augustan precedent (4.37.3), Tiberius shows that he subscribes to the notion that the memory of a *princeps* is inextricably bound up with deification. Tiberius claims he would rather have a good reputation based on his deeds during his lifetime (4.38.1-2), but Tacitus' description of his actual actions within the *Annals* seem to make that impossible. Furthermore, voices critical of Tiberius imply that being remembered for exceptional deeds or conduct (4.38.5 *optimos ... mortalium*) is closely linked with being worshipped as a god, as had been the case for Augustus. In their eyes, Tiberius' rejection of the temple shows a culpable lack of concern for his own reputation (4.38.5 *nam contemptu famae contemni virtutes*), a criticism similar to Tacitus' own assessment of Tiberius' somewhat lackadaisical attitude to Augustus' temple in Rome. This battle over the Augustan precedent of deification is one that Tiberius seems destined to lose; his attempts to honour *divus Augustus* only serve to highlight the ways in which he will fall short of his predecessor in the eyes of both his contemporaries (Julio-Claudian critics) and posterity (Tacitus himself).

Dario Calomino (British Museum) – Emperor or god? The commemoration of Augustus in the coinage of the Provinces

When Augustus died in AD 14, over 400 mints across the Empire were striking civic coins for local circulation; the coins subsequently produced in the provinces during the first three centuries of the Empire continued to honour the reigning Roman emperor on the obverse with the name and symbols of the issuing communities on the reverse, thus reflecting how the imperial policy and ideology were seen from and interpreted by the civic administrations and elites. As on the state coinage produced in Rome and in other imperial mints, so also on the coinages of the provincial cities Augustus was commemorated posthumously, chiefly as *Divus Augustus*, under his successors of the Julio-Claudian family. But the celebration of the first emperor also assumed other forms, varying from place to place and over time, and perpetuating his memory until the 3rd century. He was worshipped as a deified figure but also as a model-ruler, in some cases even as a sort of local “founder hero”, in commemoration of his iconic role as founder of cities and of the Empire itself. This paper discusses various aspects of the process of consecration of Augustus on coinage as seen from the provinces, analysing data from various cities in the West and in the East of the Empire (with case-studies from north Africa and Spain to Greece, Asia Minor and the Levant), and compares them with the posthumous celebration of Augustus on the imperial coinage.

2b) Historiography and scholarship

Maggie L. Popkin (Case Western Reserve University, Ohio) – The Parthian Arch of Augustus and its Legacy: Memory Manipulation in Imperial Rome and Modern Scholarship

Augustus's Parthian Arch in the Roman Forum cast the emperor's recovery of the Parthian standards as a towering victory. It also created an influential model for manipulating memories of military victories through public art and architecture. This paper explores this critical but underappreciated aspect of Augustus's posthumous legacy: his Parthian Arch's impact—both visual and memorial—on later imperial arches. Through an analysis of material evidence, ancient sources, and modern historiography, I argue that a number of emperors enthusiastically adopted Augustus's model, using "triumphal" arches to distort memories of military victories and triumphal processions that were tenuous or even fictional—with varying degrees of success. Titus, in his arch in the Circus Maximus, presented himself falsely as the first Roman general to sack Jerusalem. Septimius Severus and Constantine, in their eponymous arches in Rome, generated false memories of triumphal processions that they might never have celebrated. Not coincidentally, these emperors, like Augustus, had achieved power as a result of civil wars; their monuments sought, at least in part, to aggrandize perceptions of foreign victory in the wake of these brutal wars against fellow Romans.

The significance of Augustus's model of memory distortion extends well beyond its appropriation by later emperors, however. I argue that Augustus not only influenced how ancient Romans remembered his own military exploits and those of the abovementioned emperors, but also how we continue to remember them. Rome's first emperor is the progenitor of a trend in imperial arches that colors to this day how scholars (mis)remember the victories and triumphal processions of Roman emperors. Two thousand years may have passed since his death, but Augustus and his Parthian Arch continue to manipulate our memories of imperial Rome.

Pawel Madejski (Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, Lublin) – *Pax* in Augustan policy: between myths of historiography and the evidence

Pax – either *Romana* or *Augusta* - is inseparably connected with the reign of Augustus. This connection is considered as obvious, but reasonable is to ask a question: what will be left if the modern presumptions are to be set aside? The aim of the contribution is to examine the extant evidence and determine the place of *pax* within the Augustan discourse.

The great career of *pax* started during the Sullan period. Civil wars of the 40-ties of the 1st century B.C. made more vivid use of this value. When young Caesar's heir entered the scene the notion had settled connotations. This quick ideological triumphal march of *pax* was marked by an important change – a word *pax* lost its plural. This was symbolic. Augustus benefited from the process. Within the discourse on the Roman community encouraged by him *pax* played a significant role, however, very shortly. It was marked by some religious steps, with the altar of Augustan Peace as the most important of them. In fact the cult of *pax* quickly diminished. Another point is what *pax* meant - just peace or something else (or more)?

The modern translation of *pax* mars its correct meaning. It was a value coined in the exclusively Roman context. For them it signified above all the end of the state of inner,

mutual state of hostility and had a close connection to the Roman revenge ritual. In religious meaning it pointed to purification.

Modern historiography, motivated by the 19th century European ideologies, established and promoted quite different understanding of *pax*. As Rome became a model for the imperialism, *pax* started to serve as a justification of imperial ambitions. Such political meaning of the notion deeply rooted into historiography and contemporary popular culture.

The reassessment of the original meaning of *pax* sheds new light on Augustan ideological discourse.

Marco Romani Mistretta (Harvard University) – National Marxism: Gramsci's Augustan Rome and its Legacy in Italian Historiography

Antonio Gramsci is one of the most widely known and cited Italian authors of the modern and contemporary age: his works, and the *Prison Notebooks* in particular, are said to provide a flexible and subtle interpretation of Marxism (Mack Smith 1997³:426). Although the *Notebooks* do not include a systematic historical analysis, Gramsci's views on Augustan Rome and the phenomenon of Caesarism can be studied as a Marxist investigation of the ancient origins of socio-political problems that he sees as deeply affecting post-unitarian Italy.

According to Gramsci, the role of Caesar and Augustus in modifying the territorial structure of Roman dominions and their power dynamics is not fully understood unless it is considered in a dichotomic perspective, opposing 'national' and 'cosmopolitan' forces (cf. Fontana 2011:230). Italy failed to build a modern nation-state because its culture was always dominated by a 'cosmopolitan' vocation, whose origins Gramsci detects in the anti-Italian politics of Caesar and Augustus. As a result, the country is doomed to fall prey of another Caesarist revolution, embodied by Fascism (see Canfora 2012): as this paper argues, the Fascist use of the Augustan myth is crucial to the understanding of Gramsci's development of his theory of Caesarism.

In post-1945 Italy, the study of Roman History remained at the center of the academic curriculum in the humanities (Giardina 2009:64). At the same time, the influence of Marxism on a number of Italian classicists was catalyzed by the Istituto Gramsci in Rome since the early 1970s. How can Gramsci's legacy be measured in 20th-century Italian historiography on Augustus?

Following Gramsci, several 20th-century Italian historians (from De Martino to Canfora) have questioned the possibility of explaining the Roman revolution in terms of the rise of a capitalist economy. Whereas a number of Marxist historians (e.g. Barbagallo 1927) focus on socio-economic aspects of Roman society and its slave-based mode of production, the Gramscian tradition, as this paper shows, downplays the importance of the debate on 'ancient capitalism' and emphasizes the cultural and political factors that mark the transition from the Republic to the Empire, with special regard to the opposition of 'Italian' and 'imperial' forces.

Peter Wiseman (University of Exeter) – Missing the essentials: How we get Augustus wrong

My paper is a short historical commentary on three key texts:

Res gestae 1.1: *annos undeiginti natus exercitum priuato consilio et priuata impensa comparauit, per quem rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam in libertatem uindicauit.*

Suet. *Aug.* 7.2: *Augusti cognomen assumpsit ... Munati Planci sententia ... quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur augusta dicantur, ab auctu uel ab auium gestu gustuue, sicut etiam Ennius docet scribens 'Augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est'.*

Suet. *Aug.* 58.2: *'senatus te consentiens cum populo R. consalutat patriae patrem.' ... 'compos factus uotorum meorum, p. c., quid habeo aliud deos immortales precari quam ut hunc consensum uestrum ad ultimum finem uitae mihi perferre liceat?'*

The purpose is to show how preconceptions about Augustus and the nature of his rule lead even the best historians to misread the evidence: for instance, both Alison Cooley (2009) and Barbara Levick (2010) interpret *factionis* in the first passage as referring to Antony, even though the Greek version renders it τῶν συνομοσασμένων. Naturally, literary scholars and archaeologists depend on historians for the interpretation of their own Augustan material, and misconceptions are fed back as if they were confirmatory evidence. Only by taking the primary evidence seriously can we hope to escape from the phantom of 'the first emperor', whose house was a 'Hellenistic palace' and whose 'regime' was ingeniously undermined by 'subversive' poets.

3a) The Tiberian response

Penelope J. E. Davies (University of Texas at Austin) – Tiberius, *Primus Supra Pares*: Augustus Legacy And The Built City

“In Capri, they still show the place at the cliff top where Tiberius used to watch his victims being thrown into the sea after prolonged and exquisite tortures. A party of marines were stationed below, and when the bodies came hurtling down, they whacked at them with oars and boat-hooks, to make sure that they were completely dead.” For Suetonius, the beauty of the Villa Jovis makes a bitterly ironic setting for the misdeeds of its owner. Marion Blake, in turn, waxes quietly lyrical about Tiberian brickwork in the Praetorian Camp. This paper does not dispute the caliber of architecture in the Tiberian period, but focuses instead on the fact that, despite the length of his reign, Tiberius commissioned extraordinarily few public buildings in Rome, particularly in comparison with Augustus. Suetonius' characterization of the second emperor as twisted tyrant, along with other accounts of his parsimony, make it easy to explain Tiberius' relative inactivity and his building priorities as the quirks of a difficult man, while modern scholars propose alternative theories such as a poor economy.

This paper examines existing explanations for the so-called Tiberian building trough and argues that, for the most part, they suffer from a teleological bias, assuming that Romans and Augustus alike were fully conscious of an irrevocable change to the political system. A different picture emerges when Augustus' commissions are set against the backdrop of the Republic, when patronage of public buildings brought prestige and promotion, and particularly the late Republic, when Sulla, Pompey and Caesar used architecture to justify

and maintain supreme authority. Augustus' political legacy would radically alter the purpose and significance of architecture for his successor.

Lovisa Brännstedt (Lund) – *Femina Princeps?* The response to Livia's adoption into the Julian family

The aim of my paper is to explore Livia's exceptional position the decade after death of Augustus, and the response to Augustus' decision of adopting her into the Julian gens.

When Augustus died in AD 14, his will may at first glance appeared to have followed the Roman tradition where children were preferred heirs in law and custom, and wives could receive a share of one-half or less. But Augustus' will reinforced the unusual status of his family, and above all that of his heirs Tiberius and Livia. One of the most remarkable features was the posthumous adoption of the latter as his daughter, an act that transformed Livia Drusilla into Julia Augusta.

Scholars have often interpreted the adoption as a way of stressing a physical connection between Augustus and Tiberius, promoting Livia as the one who could link the line of succession between her husband and son. But adoption was a valid way of creating familial connection between men, and Livia does not seem to have played a crucial role when Augustus' adopted Tiberius in AD 4. I would thus like to argue that this radical change of Livia's status could not have been made only in order to secure Tiberius' Julian identity; that the adoption was not a necessity, but a choice. Tiberius may have denied her honours, but the response to Livia's new position as Augusta was nevertheless massive: her portrait was featured in statue groups of the Imperial family, cult forms developed to include her in hitherto unseen ways, and new provincial coin types honoured her.

In my paper I will discuss how the combining of familial and civic traditions during the age of Augustus had offered Livia space to create an authority for herself that now enlarged when she became Augusta and how her new position was recognized and reinforced in ceremonies and images around the Roman Empire.

Marius Gerhardt (Staatliche Museen zu Berlin) – Augustus in the age of Tiberius: the case of Velleius Paterculus

If we believe the representations of Augustus and Tiberius in later historiographical accounts, the relationship between Augustus and his stepson and successor cannot have been free of tensions. Too often Tiberius was deferred until he was made the designated successor of the first *princeps* very late in his life. It thus seems to be very interesting and promising to investigate how a historian has depicted Augustus after his death under the *princeps* Tiberius. Velleius Paterculus who wrote 16 years after the death of Augustus made a career under the first *princeps* who brought him to the praetorship. According to the impression of his own work he could be regarded as a very loyal supporter of the second princeps Tiberius and, therefore, might have wanted to belittle his predecessor Augustus. In my presentation I will analyse the presentation of Augustus by the historian Velleius Paterculus. I will focus on two aspects: first, Velleius' picture of Augustus' role in the period of the Civil Wars, which is a very good test area for recognising falsifications etc. when analysing for instance his picture of Augustus' role in the proscriptions. Second and more importantly, Velleius' depiction of Augustus as *princeps*, which I will compare with his picture of the reigning second emperor Tiberius in order to discover signs of vilification etc.

3b) Text and Persausion

Greg Rowe (University of Victoria, Canada) – From Greece to Rome and Back Again: the *Res Gestae* in Provincial Context

This talk is about the relationship between the surviving copies of Augustus' *Res Gestae* from Galatia and Sardis and the lost original from Augustus' Mausoleum in Rome. It has always been easy to contrast two images of Augustus, one for Romans ('*civilis princeps*'), and one for provincials ('*theos*'), and to see the *Res Gestae* as an instance of the former, curiously mismatched with the monuments of the imperial cult on which the text was inscribed in the Greek world.

This talk will take the opposite perspective, and argue that there was much that would have been familiar to Greeks about both the content and the form of the *Res Gestae*. 1) In public honours to Augustus such as the *clupeus virtutis* and *Augustalia* (*Res Gestae* 34.2, 11), Greeks would have recognized the Roman adoption of Greek honorific vocabulary (cf. the relief on the Temple of Zoilos at Aphrodisias, ca. 30 BC, showing Zoilos receiving a shield from personified *Andreia*). 2) In the Mausoleum—so called in Augustus' time in both Greek (Strabo) and Latin (*F.Cupr.*)—Greeks might have seen a Roman approximation of the Greek category of temple-tomb, part of the Augustan rebuilding of Rome using Greek monumental forms. 3) In the inscriptions of the *Res Gestae* on monuments of the imperial cult, on the other hand, Greeks might have seen instances of the reproduction of Roman inscriptions and monuments in the provinces (cf. the Aphrodisias Sebasteion, ca. AD 20, inspired by the Forum Iulium and the Forum Augustum).

The larger argument is that both the Roman original and the provincial copies of the *Res Gestae* should be seen in the context of a single, shared Graeco-Roman epigraphy, characterized by cultural exchange and synthesis.

Daniel Sarefield (Fitchburg State University) – Book Burning After Augustus

How did an ancient and exceptional ceremony of the Senate come to be a familiar expression of power on the part of Roman emperors throughout the early empire and beyond? As I shall make clear, the revival of the practice of book burning was a consequence of the example of Augustus, for it was especially characteristic of the religious program undertaken by the Augustan regime. For the then moribund practice of book burning, however, this renewal breathed new life and meaning into an old ritual, and represented it to an entirely new and much wider audience than the book burnings of the earlier era. Thereafter, the frequency and visibility of the practice as a state-sponsored ceremony increased markedly, so much so that book burning became a recognizable activity and was depicted in the art of the early empire. At the same time, however, the book burning of Augustus also set a precedent whereby succeeding emperors followed suit. Moreover, other leaders began to undertake this action for their own reasons, not necessarily connected to the interests of the Roman state. Consequently, the meaning and purpose of book burning came to be far more nuanced and polysemous during this second and ever-expanding era, and the circumstances in which it occurred increasingly varied. In this way, Augustus's use of the practice transformed it from an *ad hoc* ceremony devised by the Senate for a specific situation long ago, a "one-time" rite, into a familiar one widely implemented during the era that followed and beyond, earning the Augustan revival of book burning special notice as one of the most enduring of that emperor's endeavors in the realms of ritual, religion, and culture.

Kathleen Lamp (Arizona State University) – Augustus in the Rhetorical Tradition

Theodore Mommsen once referred to the principate as “the end to the entire discipline of rhetoric” (*History of Rome*, 125). Mommsen’s claim generally falls into what scholars of rhetoric term the “decline narrative,” that is, the narrative that rhetoric waned in the first centuries, retreating into declamation, encomia, and style. This narrative originates in primary sources including Seneca, Tacitus, Quintilian, ‘Longinus,’ and Petronius and stands in contrast to Dionysius of Halicarnassus’s claim that under Augustus rhetoric enjoyed a renaissance. Despite the wide dismissal of the “decline narrative” by scholars of rhetoric such as Laurent Pernot, George Kennedy, and Jeffrey Walker, Augustus is still not considered a significant figure in the history of rhetoric (Pernot, *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, 131; Kennedy, *A New History*, 186-91; Walker, *Rhetoric and Poetics*, 88).

The decline narrative is only one obstacle in considering Augustus’s role in the history of rhetoric. Despite a broadening in the definition of what counts as a rhetorical artifact, scholarship outside the field of rhetorical studies has had little impact within the field. For example, work by Paul Zanker, who argues Augustus began a “new visual language...a whole new method of visual communication,” or Tonio Holscher and Diane Favro, who consider the relationship between rhetorical theory and the production of Augustan Rome is rarely cited in rhetorical studies (Zanker, *Power of Image*, 3; See Favro, *Urban Image*; Holscher, *Language of Images*).

This paper traces the reception of Augustus in the field of rhetorical studies, arguing that both the “decline narrative” and narrow definitions of rhetoric have limited considerations of Augustan rhetoric even as other areas of scholarship (classics, architectural history, art history) have done so.

4a) Neronians to Flavians

Steven Green (UCL/Yale NUS College) – Seneca's Augustus: Fashioning a Protean Model for a Young Prince

This paper centres on the first few years of the reign of Nero (AD 54-56), and the creative attempts of his mentor and master of communications, the Younger Seneca, to mould the legacy of Augustus around the young prince. Shifting depictions of Augustus between two contemporary works of Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis* and *De Clementia*, reveal the ingenious (if ultimately unsuccessful) ways in which Seneca strives to fashion Nero as an emperor who operates in the spirit of his initial pledge to rule ‘according to the precepts of Augustus’.

Liz Gloyn (Royal Holloway, University of London) – Fathers, be good to your daughters: Seneca, Augustus and familial ethics

One of Augustus’ most enduring legacies arose from his moral legislative program, in particular the *Lex Iulia de adulteriis* of 18 B.C. and *Lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* of 19 B.C. Through his legal reforms, he sought to establish clear expectations about the family lives of elite citizens, and created penalties for those who did not conform to them. However, both before and after the settlement of 27 B.C., his own private life failed to live up to the high bar he set for others. Seneca’s treatment of Augustus’ relationship with his daughter

Julia highlights the ambiguity surrounding his ethical legacy only a few decades after his death.

De Brevitate 4.5-6 lists Julia as one of the obstructions that faced Augustus as he sought leisure in his old age. Her sexual misbehaviour is explicitly paralleled to plots against Augustus' life in a way that foregrounds the familial relationship between the two. Seneca highlights the clash between the expectation of harmony in the father-daughter relationship and the problems caused by political circumstances in a way that raises difficult questions for both Augustus' role as a father to Julia and as a father to the state.

This problematisation underpins *De Clementia* 1.15, where Augustus appears as a member of the *consilium* which decided on the fate of the son of Tarius, who had been caught plotting parricide; the son is exiled rather than executed. While Augustus' modest behaviour and praise of clemency are superficially to his credit, they sit uneasily alongside the reader's knowledge that he treated his own daughter more harshly in less extreme circumstances. Seneca thus implicitly and explicitly juxtaposes Augustus' complicated and imperfect family life with the idealised political image presented by the *princeps*, demonstrating the fluidity and complexity of Augustus' domestic image in this period.

Lauren Ginsberg (University of Cincinnati) – Remembering Nero's Augustan model in the *Octavia*

Upon Nero's accession, he famously claimed that he would rule on an Augustan model. While many have studied how the cultural memory of *pax Augusta* became a touchstone for Nero's principate, this paper examines the earliest post-Neronian reception of Nero's Augustan model: the *Octavia*.

The *Octavia*'s second scene stages a debate between Seneca and Nero over Augustus' memory that focuses not on the "Augustan age" as expected, but rather on the exemplary significance of the Triumviral period (*Oct.*437-532). Seneca suggests that even here "Augustan" virtue can be found as long as one focuses on the ends rather than the means; Nero, in contrast, finds in his ancestor's civil wars a blueprint for imperial power. This agon over the didactic value of Augustus' civil wars becomes simultaneously a debate over earlier literary models through which they might be read. Seneca grounds his ideologically-charged reading of the past in the visions of Augustus suggested by the *Res Gestae* and *Aeneid* (*Oct.*479-480 cf. *A.*1.2-3; *Oct.*481 cf. *RG* 3). Nero, on the other hand, finds in the opening of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and in the conclusion of Vergil's *Aeneid* an ideology of empire that better matches his ancestor's rise to power (*Oct.*518 cf. *Luc.*1.5; *Oct.*524-5 cf. *A.*12.950).

As the earliest extant work from the post-Julio-Claudian period, the *Octavia* is a nexus of reception – literary and historical – for the dynasty's rise to power and its tragic fall. My paper examines not only how the play reinterprets Nero's Augustan model, but also how it asks us to reread the literature of the Julio-Claudian era that variously confronted Augustus' rise to power. In doing so I offer an important contribution to studies of how the post-Julio-Claudian era responded to the memory of Augustus after the violent reawakening of civil war in 69CE. As the *Octavia* restages the sudden fall of Augustus' dynasty, so too it reinterprets that dynasty's founder, suggesting uncomfortable continuity between Octavian's *bella civilia* and the era of *pax et princeps* he would inaugurate.

Victoria Györi (KCL) – Flavian responses to Octavianic/Augustan coinage

This paper examines the influences of Octavian/Augustus on Flavian coinage. Scholars agree that the Flavians imitated earlier coin types in order to associate the Flavian dynasty with the successes of the Republic and Augustus. However, which phases of Republican and Octavianic/Augustan coinage are most prominently featured on Flavian coins? A closer study of the development of the changes in Octavianic/Augustan coinage may provide an answer. While new entries were added to the inventory of Roman numismatic typology during the Octavianic/Augustan age, such as the introduction of members of the imperial family, Octavianic/Augustan coins are primarily based on “Republican” elements. In particular, Octavianic coins minted from c.32 BC to 27 BC and Augustan coins minted from c. 19 BC to 16 BC adopted Late Republican motifs: the CAESAR DIVI F and IMP CAESAR series of c. 32 BC to 27 BC should be characterized as in a “Hellenistic monarchic” tradition evocative of Hellenistic monarchs and Late Republican promagistrates and generals while the Augustan coins of c. 19 BC to 16 BC that depict honours granted to Augustus recall Senatorial honorific decrees of the Late Republic. In much the same way, Flavian coins reflect Late Republican motifs from Sulla onwards, specifically from the Octavianic period of c. 32 BC to 27 BC. For instance, Vespasian appropriates many of these Octavianic CAESAR DIVI F and IMP CAESAR types as well as the Augustan epigraphic, “honorific” types of c. 19 BC to 16 BC. I argue, then, that the choice for the majority of Flavian coin types was deliberate and followed the Octavianic/Augustan model of employing Late Republican visual media on coinage.

4b) Monuments and architecture

Margaret L. Woodhull (Denver, Colorado) – Architecture and Female Agency in Post-Augustan Rome: Agrippina the Younger’s Temple for Deified Claudius and the Demise of Imperial Women Building Rome

Shortly after the death of the emperor Claudius, the dowager empress Agrippina the Younger began construction on an enormous temple complex on the Caelian hill dedicated to her late husband, the newly deified Claudius. As the temple’s patron, Agrippina followed a tradition of imperial women building in Rome that originated during the reign of her great-grandfather, Augustus. Agrippina, likewise, followed in the footsteps of her predecessor, Augustus’ wife, Livia, whose benefaction of the deified Augustus’ temple some three decades earlier set precedent. Agrippina’s death halted the completion of Claudius’ *divus* temple. Her sordid murder on her son Nero’s orders and her political ambitions in life often overshadow critical assessment of Agrippina’s architectural patronage to the detriment of recognizing that her ill-fated complex was, strikingly, the last monumental public building an empress would erect in Rome for nearly a century and a half. Agrippina’s failed effort, thus, marks the end of an Augustan initiative that opened the space of the city to an imperial woman’s hand.

This paper takes a fresh look at Agrippina’s Temple for Deified Claudius in order to examine the political forces that led to the demise of this Augustan legacy. By shifting the focus away from the personality of the empress to her benefaction’s place in the history of imperial women’s architectural patronage, new understandings of fundamental tensions between female agency and its expression in the built environment of imperial Rome emerge. Scholars typically view imperial women’s building patronage as a function of an evolving dynastic politics dependent on the reproductive female body – the woman who engenders the

dynasty's heirs likewise engenders the city. Yet, what seemed to be a strong dynastic strategy in the highly experimental climate of Augustan Rome dissolved at the end of the Julio-Claudian era into a failed venture. In a Rome whose public monuments symbolized their imperial patron's authority, I argue that women's monuments materialized their growing political agency. Seen from the perspective of female agency, Agrippina's spectacularly failed effort to commemorate her late husband symbolized less the extinguishing of the audacious Agrippina, so much, I argue, as a reflection of a growing anxiety in dynastic politics that sought to suppress the increasingly monumental reminders of imperial women's agency in the emperor's city.

Thea Ravasi (Newcastle) – Imperial residences from Augustus to Hadrian: architectural planning and sculptural display

Romae instauravit Pantheum, Saepia, Basilicam Neptuni, sacras aedes plurimas, Forum Augusti, Lavacrum Agrippae; eaque omnia propriis auctorum nominibus consecravit (H.A., Hadr. 19): Hadrian famously promoted the restoration and the reconstruction of a number of public buildings of the Augustan era with the intention of adding himself to the list of lawful and legitimate successors of the *princeps*. If Hadrian's policy towards public architecture of the Augustan era has been broadly investigated, Hadrian's reception of ideas expressed on the Palatine by Augustus into the relatively more private setting of Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli has never been fully explored.

Stemming from the recent re-assessment of the architectural layout of the House of Augustus on the Palatine (Iacopi and Tedone 2006) and subsequent debate (Carandini and Bruno 2008, Wiseman 2009), this paper will look at how ideas about the architectural planning, the decoration, and the sculptural display of the House of Augustus on the Palatine were translated into the architectural language of Hadrian's Villa. In particular, the paper will explore the complex relationship between architectural planning, sculptural display and the social world of the Roman court, with particular reference to the nature of the relationship between the emperor and his subjects. Moreover, the paper will look at how subjects employed in the Augustan era for the decoration of public buildings (e.g. the Caryatids) were re-interpreted in the relatively more private setting of Hadrian's Villa.

Susan Sorek (Open University) – He Who the Sun has Chosen: Augustus and the obelisks in Rome

In 10 BC, to mark the twentieth anniversary of his conquest of Egypt, Augustus transported at least two obelisks to Rome. On first sight it would appear that they were removed as victory trophies, but on closer scrutiny it would seem Augustus employed them as a means of subtle propaganda to emphasize his divine right to rule. The powerful symbolism of political and social power embedded in these monuments captured the attention of the people and thereby instilled this ideology in their unconscious minds.

Augustus was the first emperor to realize the potential of the monuments, which represented one of the most powerful kingdoms of the ancient world. Later emperors would add to their number: today thirteen obelisks adorn Rome, more than remain in Egypt. However, Augustus' legacy and ideology continued to be implemented by the Popes of Rome in the 16th/17th centuries to justify another 'divine' connection, the power of the Church. Later Empires (19th/20th centuries) with different agendas perhaps unknowingly, also followed Augustus' example by removing the last of the giant monoliths in order to adorn their capital cities.

This paper will focus upon the most significant of the original obelisks brought to Rome by Augustus tracing their development in later centuries and will evaluate Augustus' role in their preservation.

Rubén García Rubio (Valladolid / Rome Tre) – The Forum of Augustus vs Yale University Art Gallery of Louis I. Kahn

“Marmoream relinquo, quam latericiam accepi” (I found a city of brick and I left it a city of marble). With these pronounced words, according to the legend, the Roman Emperor Augustus just before he died, summarized the huge change that he promoted in the Architecture of the city of Rome. Maybe these words are a bit excessive in the physical sense, but in the metaphorical sense, they prove his great architectural legacy. These traces could be found in the most important works of the Roman Architecture like the Pantheon, the Ara Pacis and its surroundings, the Forum of Augustus, the Theatre of Marcellus or the Mausoleum of Augustus.

Almost two thousand years after, the Contemporary Architecture followed a different way from Augustus's Architecture. Names like Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier or Mies van der Rohe had led the Architecture of the 21st century through a style known as Modern Movement, characterized by functionality, free space and lightness. At the beginning that style was in fashion all over the world but soon after it revealed shortages. A bit of the blame of that falls on the American Architect Louis I. Kahn (1901-1974). He made a stage at the American Academy in Rome (AAR) in 1951. During this time he was in touch with the Roman Architecture that made him think along different lines that changed his architectural thought. From this time Louis Kahn began to transmit the essence of Roman Architecture to his architectural work and from there, a new architectural thought was created in the second half of the 20th century influenced by Kahn's work.

The present abstract will try to link the work of these great builders: Augustus and Louis I. Kahn. Firstly, I will analyze the stage of Louis Kahn at the AAR; secondly, I will go into detail about the lessons were given to Kahn about Augustus Architecture specially his Forum of Augustus; and finally, I will explain how Louis Kahn used the previous lessons on his own architectural work specially on the Yale University Art Gallery.

5a) Late antiquity

Shaun Tougher (Cardiff, UK) – Julian Augustus on Augustus: a view from late antiquity

This paper will analyse the depiction of Augustus in the *Caesars* of the last pagan Roman emperor Julian (Augustus 361-363). The *Caesars* is one of Julian's most famous works. Written in Antioch for the Saturnalia in December 362 for his fellow Neoplatonist and Praetorian Prefect of the East Salutius, the text (more properly titled *Symposium* or *Kronia*) reviews the characters and achievements of the Roman emperors from Julius Caesar up to the sons of Constantine. The setting in the text is a banquet being hosted by Romulus for the gods and the deceased emperors on Olympus, and the occasion turns into a competition to decide who the best emperor was. A selection of leading competitors is made, and Octavian is chosen alongside Julius Caesar, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius and Constantine, as well as Alexander the Great (he was added at the request of Heracles, on the grounds that he deserved to be considered because of his merits). The treatment of most of these competitors

has been well studied: Marcus and Alexander because of Julian's own particular interest in these rulers and their supposed influence upon his ideas of rulership and ambitions, Constantine as the hated Christian uncle whose revolution Julian was seeking to abort, and Julius Caesar as part of especial concern with the reception of that Roman. As for Trajan, the depiction of him has received consideration in relation to the Alexander aspect of the text, given Trajan's own apparent interest in the Macedonian king and his own Persian expedition, so relevant to Julian's plans. Octavian, however, has been neglected and thus this conference presents an ideal opportunity to address this omission. I will examine Julian's depiction of Octavian and how this compares to earlier assessments of him as well as contemporary late antique presentations of him, most notably in Sextus Aurelius Victor's *De Caesaribus*, completed in 361. Julian emphasises particular aspects of Octavian, such as his early changeability of character, his interest in philosophy, his attachment to Apollo, the hostility Poseidon bore him, his good administration and reforms, his piety, his charm and smoothness of manner, as well as his shrewdness and intelligence. Emphasised especially are Octavian's military deeds (he is chosen with Julius Caesar and Trajan as leading military emperors), his good fortune, and his attitude to deification (Silenus dismisses Octavian as a doll-maker as he made gods out of Caesar and Augustus, a remark that embarrasses and dismisses him). I will consider how unusual Julian's depiction of Octavian is, but also ask what purpose Octavian serves in the text. Why did Julian include him as a main candidate, and what does his assessment of him reveal about his own concerns? The paper will cast light on general late antique attitudes towards Augustus, but also on Julian's own preoccupations.

Jill Mitchell (University of Wales, Trinity Saint David) – Symmachus composes a panegyric for Augustus: an appreciation of Imperial panegyric in the late fourth century and its relationship to the oratory of the Augustan age

Quintus Aurelius Symmachus (c340-402) was a senator, letter writer, one of the last pagans of Rome and was regarded by his contemporaries as the best orator of his age. This paper will first analyse the origins and nature of late fourth century Imperial panegyric and then examine how Symmachus and others might have constructed a eulogy to a fourth century emperor, using as a model the various extant examples of Symmachus' own Imperial orations and those contained within the *Panegyrici Latini*. I will compare and contrast these fourth century speeches with how Augustus himself was praised by his contemporaries, focussing particularly on similarities of language and style between first and fourth century authors and trying to come to some conclusions as to how much fourth century epideictic oratory was influenced by the writers of Imperial praise in the Augustan age. I will also consider if Symmachus were to compose a speech of praise to Augustus, how much this oration might resemble those composed by Augustus' own contemporaries.

The focus of this eulogy to Augustus by Symmachus would certainly take as its subject the support for traditional religion which Augustus showed in his restoration of the cults of the *sacra publica* which were in disarray after the depredations caused by the Civil Wars of the late Republic. In particular Symmachus must have revered Augustus for his placing of the Altar of Victory in the Senate House on 28th August of 29 BCE; for he is without doubt best known for his appeal to the Emperor Valentinian II in his *Relatio* 3 of 384 while Urban Prefect of Rome for the re-establishment of the Altar of Victory once again in the Senate House and the restoration of financial support to the old pagan cults of Rome particularly to the Vestal Virgins of whom Symmachus was a priest. These had been removed by Gratian in 382.

Frances Foster (Cambridge) – Praising Augustus through his Ancestors: Servius on Representations of Augustus in Virgil

Virgil's *Aeneid* was written during Augustus's reign. The narrative of the *Aeneid* expressly incorporates Augustus into the poem through glimpses into the future on Aeneas's shield and in the parade of future heroes.

These direct portrayals of Augustus are extremely flattering. Some four hundred years later, at the start of his famous commentary on the poem, Servius claims that it was Virgil's intention to imitate Homer and praise Augustus through his ancestors. In this paper, I will argue that Servius reads Augustus's presence into the poem rather more strongly than some readers might. The four hundred year gap between Augustus and the emperors of Servius's era is considerable, and in many ways the imperial household had changed beyond recognition. Multiple emperors had been common for well over a century, the imperial house was Christian, and the court no longer resided in Rome - nor were emperors buried there.

I will analyse some of Servius's numerous references to and comments on Augustus and show how, some four hundred years later, Servius reads the *Aeneid*. I will argue that his commentary supports his claim that Virgil imitates Homer and praises the *princeps* through his ancestors.

Michael Sloan (Wake Forest University, North Carolina) – Augustus: The Harbinger of Peace (Orosius reception of Augustus in *Historiae Adversus Paganos*)

This paper asserts that Orosius presents Augustus as the harbinger of peace. The entire thesis of his *Historiae* rides on his ability to harmonize the life and rule of Augustus, as a pagan fore-runner of Christ, with the eschatological hope rooted in the incarnation of Christ. This paper examines how Orosius achieves this effect in his reception of Augustus and briefly suggests its implications and possible impact on the Carolingian age.

Much in the same way that the early Church fathers were reading the OT in view of the NT, Orosius harmonizes secular history with the events of the NT, specifically with the birth and eventual return of Christ. Signs, titles, and prophecies directed towards Augustus are appropriated towards the birth and life of Christ, e.g. the flow of oil from a lodging house on a momentous occasion in Augustus' life prefigured the anointing of Christ (6.20.7); the naming of Augustus is synchronized with the Feast of Epiphany (6.20.8); and the creating of a community by census prefigured the Eucharist and community of Christians (6.22.6). Within his allegorizing (one finds evidence of all "four senses of Scripture: history, allegory, tropology, anagogy" in his reception of Augustus) of the person and events of Augustus, we find typical medieval exegetical practices, such as the obfuscation or changing of known historical events and dates (e.g. 6.18.5,16,18; 6.19.1; 6.20.1,7); his imposing of Christian numerology to pivotal dates in Augustus' life (6.22.1,9,10); and the common, peculiarly Christian, practice of placing the prefix "prae" before otherwise common nouns or verbs to emphasize harmony (6.15.13: poeta *praemonuit*; 6.20.4: ut per omnia uenturi Christi gratia *praeparatum* Caesaris imperium conprobetur; and 6.20.8: ad obsequium *praeparationis* eius *praedestinatum* fuisse).

The rhetorical impact is the depiction of Augustus similar to that of an OT biblical hero such as Abraham. Thus, in Orosius' *Historiae*, early medieval authors found in it a justification not only for their fascination with Augustus and Rome (as well as the writers of that epoch), but Orosius' reception of Augustus in this near biblical manner may also suggest why such a secular title taken by Charlemagne, "Karolus serenissimus *Augustus* a Deo coronatus magnus

pacificus imperator Romanum gubernans imperium” (MGH 1.77; cf. Orosius *H.* 6.20.8), is palatable in the explicitly Christian context of the Carolingian Empire.

5b) Tacitus, Suetonius and Augustus

Alice Hu (University of Pennsylvania) – Tacitus’ *Philippics*: Tiberius, Augustan precedent, and literary memory

Throughout the tumultuous transition from republic to principate, Rome repeatedly found itself grappling with the problem of succession. In his *Annales*, Tacitus presents Rome, in the wake of Augustus’ death, struggling with uncertainty as to how to interpret and establish Augustus’ precedent. Cicero, in his *Second Philippic*, evokes a similar situation in Antony’s stint in power following Caesar’s assassination. This paper argues that Tacitus’ Tiberius and his ongoing process of defining his relationship to Augustan precedent is as much a literary as historiographical construct. I argue that Tacitus uses Cicero’s *Second Philippic* as a lens through which to illuminate a parallel between Tiberius and Cicero’s Antony, and thereby to suggest covertly what he cannot state openly about Tiberius’ policy towards his predecessor: namely, that Tiberius’ stance of unquestioning compliance with Augustan precedent was illusory. By aligning himself with the Cicero of the *Second Philippic*, Tacitus asserts his own power as a historian to manipulate, manufacture, and propagate literary memory.

In the second half of my paper, I argue that by assimilating himself to the Cicero of the *Second Philippic*, Tacitus suggests that his project as a historian is akin to Cicero’s aims in his speech. In so doing, he draws attention to the historian’s power to manipulate, manufacture, and propagate literary memory. Tacitus’ Tiberius seems unusually concerned with non-material forms of commemoration over physical monuments—in short, with exactly the kind of literary memory, *fama*, that Tacitus creates and promulgates, and precisely what Cicero upbraids Antony for neglecting. Cicero particularly revels in Antony’s neglect for his own *fama*, since it gives Cicero the opportunity in his speech to fashion Antony’s *fama* as a historian might, and, in fact, as Tacitus does for his Tiberius.

Aske Damtoft Poulsen (Lund University, Sweden) – Conflicting reports? Three accounts of Augustus’ involvement in the civil wars

This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of selected passages from Augustus’ *Res Gestae*, Suetonius’ *Divus Augustus*, and Tacitus’ *Annales* regarding Augustus’ involvement in the civil wars. It investigates how Augustus himself presented his actions and compares how Suetonius and Tacitus re-interpret Augustus’ role in the chaotic period of the late republic. It focuses specifically on how Augustus’ decision to participate in the civil wars and how his relationship with the senate is presented by the three authors, and shows how Tacitus undermines Augustus’ presentation of himself as a champion of the senate. It also examines how some key terms are used in the three accounts; *privatus* (used with pride by Augustus, with disdain by Tacitus), *dominatio* (used by Augustus to designate his enemies, by Tacitus of Augustus’ rule), *status* (used by Augustus in an edict preserved in Suetonius’ biography illustrating his wish to be seen as both founder and restorer of the state, used by Suetonius in connection with *novus* to describe Augustus new state, used by Tacitus to designate the new state as *versus*, overturned), *pax* (used with pride by Augustus, substituted for *otium* and *quies* – and *pax...cruenta* – by Tacitus) *libertas*, and *res publica*.

The paper concludes that what Augustus presents as a return to the old state, Suetonius identifies as a new state, while Tacitus claims that is a state turned upside down. It is firmly based in earlier scholarship; that of Alison Cooley, Karl Galinsky, F. R. D. Goodyear, and Erich Koestermann, but also offers – I believe – some new thoughts on the intertextual relationship between the texts.

Trevor Luke (Florida State University) – A Gift for the *Princeps*: Suetonius on Augustus’ Final Journey

At the opening of the ninety-seventh chapter of his biography of Augustus, Suetonius informs his reader that he has reached the topic of the emperor’s death and subsequent deification. What follows is an account of the lustrum of 14 CE and Augustus’ final journey which includes stops at Astura, Capreae, Naples, and Beneventum, before the emperor reaches his terminal destination of Nola.

The passage recounting Augustus’ final journey exhibits a number of characteristics of Menippean satire in the tradition of Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis*, including its mixture of prose and verse, references to bodily functions, and theme of apotheosis. Both works also contain numerous Saturnalian elements. On Capreae, Augustus has Greeks and Romans exchange styles of dress and speech in a form of Saturnalian role reversal. He offers *sparsiones* to his fellow banqueters (cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.6), who are also granted the freedom to jest. Reclining like Zeus at a banquet of the gods, he jokes in Greek verse about the memorial celebration for his departed favorite Masgaba being a kind of founder cult.

Unlike Seneca’s scathing ‘send-up’ of Claudius, Suetonius’ pre-apotheosis of Augustus is a gently jocose and learned diversion written partly with the intent of assimilating Augustus to the emperor for whom Suetonius penned the biography—Hadrian. Suetonius’ aged Augustus playfully banqueting and bantering with ephebes and scholars evokes the image of the court society of the philhellenic Hadrian, who relished such activities. This paper aims to illuminate aspects of the reception of Augustus in Hadrianic Rome and broaden our understanding of Suetonian biography.

Patrick Cook (Cambridge) – Embodying the Legacy of Augustus

The new ‘visual language’ of Augustan Rome, was nowhere more prominent than in depictions of the body of the *princeps*. A new type of political body was required for a new type of politics, and artists created an image of the emperor that was an icon of *imperium*, and which would influence later Julio-Claudian portraits. Even the return to ‘verism’ under Vespasian is a reaction against the Augustan style as modified and demonized by Nero. The representation of every emperor’s body was necessarily a response to the Augustan body.

One can make a similar claim about literary representations of the emperor’s body. Each of Suetonius’ *Lives* contains a detailed *ekphrasis* of the emperor’s body. Of these, the description of the body of Augustus is both the most detailed and the most influential. Suetonius does not portray Augustus’ body as flawless, but his description does elevate it above the level of a normal human body, making considerable use of astronomical imagery to suggest that it has a cosmological significance. Writing a century after Augustus’ death and deification, Suetonius makes it clear that the body of Augustus was a special body, worthy of an emperor and a *diuus*. In contrast, Suetonius’ description of the body of Tiberius, who was never deified, does not carry the same cosmological weight. The contrast between the two rulers is expressed through the descriptions of their bodies, as the body of Augustus sets the

standard against which corporeal *ekphrases* of later emperors are viewed and judged. This paper will explore that process of viewing and judging, exposing the mechanisms by which Suetonius has emperors showcase their fitness to rule by embodying the legacy of Augustus.

6a) Byzantine politics and literature

Birgitta Hoffmann (Roman GASK Project) – Belisarius triumph and Justinian's Equestrian statue - Justinian as a new Augustus?

In the aftermath of Justinian's conquest of North Africa and Italy, Belisarius celebrated according to Prokopios a 'Triumph in the Old Style' with other victories celebrated by an equestrian statue in the hippodrome in Constantinople. Both acts find close parallels in the way Augustan conquests in Africa were celebrated (incl. the creation of the Forum Romanum and the Forum Augustus as places of victory), including the fact that the last ever non-dynastic triumph in Rome was also celebrated over Africa.

Mischa Meier (2003/4, 147-165) sees the Belisarius' triumph very much in the context of an imperial programme of *renovatio imperii* and a possible celebration of the '*ludi saeculare*' and thus the actions as a late but emperor driven *imitatio Augusti* in a Christian/Constantinopolitan setting.

The Belisarius' triumph is not the only reference to victory parades during Justinian's reign. There are also victory celebrations with triumphal elements for the victory over the Persians (530), the Bulgars (both recorded on the inscription of the Horse of Justinian in the Hippodrom) and in the aftermath of the Nike uprising (Jord. Rom. 364: *sociosque eorum, qui evaserunt a caede, proscriptos, veluti grande hoste prostrato de manubiis triumphavit*). Finally a victory parade was held by Narses in the aftermath of the final Gothic defeat in Rome twenty years later (Agathias 2.11).

Mostly, these references are tantalising in their mention of triumphal elements, but too brief and not usually linked to an intended *imitatio* by the original authors, whereas Prokopios' 'triumph in the old style' actually mentions some clearly non triumphal elements (such as Belisarius walking). Instead the parallels with Augustus seem to continue an overall theme of his work, reminiscent of an intended parallel biography. The fact that this theme is lacking or not as clearly expressed in other writers covering the period such as Agathias raises the question of whose *imitatio Augusti* we are seeing: Justinian's or Prokopios'?

M. Meier (2003/4), *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians*. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht.

Kosta Simic (Brisbane) – The Byzantine Augustus: Examples from Chronicles – Homiletics and Hymnography

The aim of the present paper is to shed new light on the reception of the emperor Augustus in Byzantine culture by focusing on the evidence of Greek chronicles, church rhetoric and hymnography. The insertion of the figure of Augustus into the history of salvation and his Christianisation began very early. Correlating the notions of Roman and Christian universalism and highlighting their concurrent emergence, Christian authors argued that the Roman Empire and its first emperor had a place within the larger framework of the divinely conceived unfolding of human history. This idea, the first hints of which can be observed in the writings of Melito of Sardis, Hippolytus of Rome and Origen, was fully developed by

Eusebius of Caesarea in the context of his imperial ideology. Some homilists, including Gregory of Nazianzus and Pseudo-Chrysostom, reiterated the Eusebian concept.

In the first Byzantine chronicle composed by John Malalas, Augustus and his reign became thoroughly mythologised. After finding its quasi-official expression in Justinian's famous *Sixth Novella*, which articulated the ideal of "symphony" or the harmonious coexistence of Church and State, the Christianisation of Augustus became particularly topical in the context of the so-called iconoclast disputes. As this controversy was accompanied by sharp conflicts between the imperial and spiritual authorities, their roles and relations needed to be redefined. Judging from the Chronicle of George the Monk as well as from some church hymns, in which the emperor Augustus figures predominantly and the temporal parallelism between the establishment of the Roman Empire and the emergence of Christianity is strongly emphasised, it seems that a Christianised figure of Augustus played an important role in this redefinition.

Drawing upon the aforementioned sources, the present paper highlights the importance of Augustus for the Byzantine concepts of rulership and, in particular, for the Byzantine theories regarding the rapport between the *imperium* and *sacerdotium*.

Elizabeth A. Fisher (George Washington University, Washington DC) – The "Essential" Augustus in the *Excerpta* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus

Confronted with a massive inheritance from earlier periods of Greek literature, the scholarly emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus (r. 945—959) devised a novel system of classification and organization in order to enable his 10th-century Byzantine court circle to examine and benefit from the "useful" portions of history. His *Excerpta* consist of substantial passages selected from Greek historical works that were considered relevant sources of *exempla* for the circumstances and concerns of 10th-century Byzantium, thus providing focused access to a formidable body of material.

To accomplish this ambitious literary project, Constantine instructed a team of scholars to identify passages from twenty-six selected works composed between the 5th century BCE and the 9th century CE and then to assign the passages to places in fifty-three topical books, each topic regarded as significant in the time of Constantine. Five of these original fifty-three books survive, either intact or in substantial portions: *De legationibus gentium ad Romanos*, *De legationibus Romanorum ad gentes*, *De insidiis*, *De sententiis*, and *De virtutibus et vitiis*. This last collection contains over sixty references to Augustus, more than three times the total number of references in the rest of the surviving books.

I propose to examine the composite "moral" image of Augustus that emerges from the excerpts selected for *De virtutibus et vitiis* and to place this image within the context of behavioral norms in 10th-century Byzantium. For example, an episode from the *Roman History* of Cassius Dio describes Augustus' response to his daughter's public improprieties, offering *exempla* both of unacceptable female behavior and of appropriate conduct by an imperial parent. Since the longest continuous excerpt (ca. eight pages in the Tuebner edition) comes from independently preserved sections of Dio's work, it is possible to determine what portions the *Excerpta* omitted from Dio's account. The image of Tiberius in the *Excerpta* also provides an opportunity for comparison and contrast.

6b) The power of images

Matteo Cadario (Università degli Studi di Milano) – The image of Nero and Augustan legacy

The paper aims to investigate the role of Augustus' example in the Neronian propaganda. When, in the autumn of 54, Nero took the throne, in his first speech (written by Seneca), in which he announced Claudius' apotheosis, he had also declared his determination to rule by imitating Augustus (Suetonius, Nero 10.1). In his own way Nero remained loyal to that intent until the end of his reign, exploiting the Parthian war to develop the strong link that Augustus had first established between the Parthian victory, the new golden age and the symbols of Apollo and Sol/Helios.

So in 54/5, when Nero set up his *effigies* in the Augustan temple of Mars Ultor and was compared to the Apollo and Sol not only in the encomiastic poetry but also in some cuirassed images (Tralleis and Aphrodisias), he was following Augustus as a model. Then, in 64, when the announcement of the Parthian victory and the subsequent closure of the temple of Janus apparently realized the promised golden age, Nero portrayed himself wearing the radiate solar crown that was distinctive also of the official image of the deified Augustus. In this way he upgraded his *imitatio Augusti* placing himself on the same level of the deified Augustus.

It was the starting point for the making of new images in which the comparison to Apollo and Sun ridded of the Augustan precedents and began to rely directly on the personal skills of the emperor, as the love for racing and *citharodia*. The new iconography of Nero as solar charioteer, which was exhibited in 66 during the ceremony of Tiridates' coronation and then repeated in a cuirassed statue from Caere, is a strong mark of this change. Nero, having taken to the extreme the Apollonian and solar aspects of the Augustan model, tried to take advantage of his racing "career" to create a new image of his assimilation to the divine protector of his exploits.

Nandini B. Pandey (University of Wisconsin-Madison) – Augustus and the *Ara Coeli* Legend in Northern Renaissance Art

The medieval legend of the *Ara Coeli* held that the Sibyl prophesied Christ's advent to Augustus; the Virgin and Child then miraculously appeared in the sky, prompting him to dedicate an altar to them on the Capitoline. Building on Burke's 2005 analysis of this story's literary sources, this paper explores this fable's usage in Northern Renaissance art to serve a Christian version of history and debate the relationship between secular and spiritual power.

Classical sources associate Augustus' ascendancy with omens including a halo around the sun after Caesar's death, a comet (*sidus Iulium*) signifying Caesar's divinity and Octavian's status as 'son of a god' (*divi filius*), and others reported posthumously by Suetonius (*Aug.* 95). The *Ara Coeli* legend, however, transfers these icons to Christ as the true "son of god." The story proves especially popular within art of the Northern Renaissance, from Books of Hours to Suetonius' *Life of Augustus*. These works use symbolism, colour, and spatial arrangement to theorize different relations between church and state while seeking to integrate classical and Christian versions of history.

Symbols like crowns, sceptres, and orbs underscore Augustus' power in many versions, though he often lays these down to kneel before Christ and Mary, whose own crowns and relative youth highlight their role as "successors." Making striking use of colour, Antoine

Caron sets the story in a “Roman” landscape rendered grey to highlight the Holy Family’s glory; the gold mandorla that enfolds them eclipses the *sidus Iulium* atop the statue of Venus, suggesting their superiority to Caesar. While some works represent imperial and spiritual power as complementary, a side panel of the Bladelin altar depicts Augustus viewing the Virgin and Child through a window, suggesting his soul’s confinement by its pagan perspective. Furthermore, in many manuscripts, Augustus and the Sibyl appear as tiny figures in the margins of scenes devoted to Christ. This revises and reverses classical histories’ depiction of Augustus as the centre of empire and Christ’s birth as insignificant and peripheral. Together, these Northern Renaissance works of art trace Augustus’ evolution from an emblem of Rome’s greatness into a prophet of Christ’s.

Nicole Berlin (Johns Hopkins University) – Augustus as Propaganda: The Case of the Vatican Gallery of Maps

Upon ascending the papal throne in 1573 Pope Gregory XIII made the renovation of Rome’s sacred and public spaces a central part of his agenda. Upon the walls of his ambitious cartographic endeavour, the Vatican Gallery of Maps, the Pope deliberately manipulated Augustan history to legitimize and comment upon his own building program. The Gallery of Maps was constructed between 1579 and 1581 under the supervision of the cartographer Ignazio Danti and depicted monumental maps of Italy’s regions. Gregory XIII gave a number of seemingly minor events from Roman history a prominent place within the gallery. One such event was Augustus’ removal of the Montecitorio obelisk (or Obelisk of Psamtik II) from Heliopolis, Egypt, to the Campus Martius in Rome around 10–9 BCE to commemorate his victory over Egypt two decades earlier.

Surprisingly, Gregory XIII depicts the obelisk sailing into the sixteenth-century Roman port of Civitavecchia, identified by the panel’s prominent *titulus*, as opposed to Ostia, where Pliny the Elder tells us it arrived in Italy under Augustus. In this paper I analyse the implications of Gregory’s historical “revisions” such as this one with two goals. First, to identify how this strategy relates to the depiction of other feats of Roman engineering in the Gallery of Maps, such as Claudius’ construction of the port of Ostia. Additionally, I will show that the imagery in the gallery related to Gregory’s own building projects, specifically his attempted transfer of the Vatican obelisk to the centre of St. Peter’s square. This two-part analysis will reveal that Gregory XIII’s decision to illustrate the transportation of the Montecitorio obelisk was a deliberate attempt to align himself with the goals and achievements of Augustus himself. In this case, the dialogue created between past and present, ruined and rebuilt, allowed Gregory XIII to comment upon and advertise his ongoing renewal of Rome.

7a) Augustus in the novel

Martin Lindner (University of Göttingen, Germany) – In Search of a German Princeps: Günther Birkenfeld and his *Augustus* novels (1934-1962)

Günther Birkenfeld (1901-1966) was a successful German scholar, writer and political activist, whose name is almost forgotten today. Although he was known as a competent translator and editor, his fame mainly rested on historical fiction novels, e.g. *Die schwarze Kunst* (*The Black Art*, 1936) about the life and work of Johannes Gutenberg. About two years earlier, Birkenfeld had published the first version of his Augustus novel, which he would rewrite several times during the following decades. *Augustus – Roman seines Lebens*

(*Augustus – The Novel Of His Life*, 1934) was indebted to the spirit of its time in many ways. The author had aimed for a fast-paced narration about a destined ruler and beacon of morality, rescuing Rome from impending self-destruction. In 1941 Birkenfeld was drafted into the army and apparently used every free minute to work on his Augustus manuscript. The revised second version *Leben und Taten des Caesar Augustus (Life and Deeds of Caesar Augustus*, 1943) included more than 100 additional pages and countless alterations of the remaining text. Birkenfeld's hero is still "a political genius with high ethical values", but also faced with an impossible fight against all too human weaknesses within the society and his own family. The third version *Die Ohnmacht des Mächtigen (The Powerlessness of the Powerful*, 1962) strengthened this point further and shifted the style towards historical analysis. Even so, Birkenfeld remained confident that the Principate was more than just a historical episode. In his author's notes, he suggested that Augustus should be taken as an example for securing peace and stability in the post-war democracies of the 1960s. Ironically, the posthumous reprints turned back the wheel, making use of the 1943 version again and thus giving the "search for a German princeps" yet another twist.

Ayelet Peer – Letters to Augustus: John Williams' portrayal of the princeps in his novel *Augustus*

"But Gaius Octavius is my friend."

A single sentence attributed to Quintus Salvidienus Rufus skillfully captures the true essence of the novel. This declaration of friendship, ironically written by the first close friend to betray Octavius, unravels the intricate web being spun around the future emperor. Williams gently carries Augustus down from his divine pedestal to the realm of mere mortals; we read about his fears, regrets, resolutions. We even imagine him laughing.

Williams' decision to describe Octavius at the beginning through his immediate friends and enemies builds up readers' empathy for him since his friends voice their own opinions and concerns over his actions. We thus are given an opportunity to see the man or youth behind the brazen *res gestae*. Williams focuses on the boy becoming a man almost overnight, and the burden this rapid transformation has created.

In this paper I wish to examine the way Williams portrays Augustus and how his developing image compares with the ancient or modern sources we have, or even with our own conception of him. Augustus' true nature and character has always been somewhat enigmatic; he did not possess the fiery temper of his uncle or the flamboyant nature of his main rival Antony. That is why it is fascinating to try and understand who he might have been through the lens of a modern novel.

The story of Augustus is the story of Rome, a story worth telling and reading.

Juliette Harrisson (Newman University) – *I, Claudius* Augustus in text and on screen.

As early as Tacitus, views on how and why Augustus put the final nails in the coffin of the Roman Republic and instituted a monarchy have varied, some painting him as a beneficent 'Father of the Nation,' others as a despot who finished what Julius Caesar started.

In Robert Graves' 1934 novel *I, Claudius*, Augustus is painted in an entirely positive light, a warm and friendly man. Taking his cue from Tacitus' accusation that Livia had 'riveted her chains upon the aged Augustus' (*Annals* 1.3) and partly transferring to him Suetonius' criticism of Claudius (the book's sympathetic protagonist) as ruled by his wives, Graves

absolves Augustus of guilt for almost everything he did in order to place himself at the head of the Roman world, attributing almost every action to Livia (occasionally to a third party).

When Graves' novel was brought to the screen in 1976, although the chief conceit, that 'Augustus ruled the world, but Livia ruled Augustus' was maintained, the series (post-dating Syme's 1939 *The Roman Revolution*) pulls back from denying Augustus any agency in his own rise to power. The script of the adaptation allows Augustus to make more decisions himself, while Brian Blessed's performance in the role also ensures that it is clear that Augustus has a will of his own, even as Livia manipulates him. While maintaining a sense of Graves' 'overgrown schoolboy', Blessed's portrayal of Augustus with a sometimes threatening demeanour presents an Augustus who is often deceived, but not so completely manipulated, puppet-like, as Graves' Augustus had been.

This paper will compare the representation of Augustus in Graves' novel and in the 1976 TV series, examining the process of transferring Graves' Augustus to screen and the differences between the two representations, particularly concerning Augustus' power and complicity in his own historical actions.

7b) Bridging the gap: towards the Middle Ages

Joseph Geiger (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem) – The First Emperor

Whatever weight we may assign to the *res publica restituta*, Augustus wished to be regarded as 'optimi status auctor' (Suet. *Aug.* 28.2) and he employed a number of means to pursue this end, among them the visual one of distinguishing between the marble statues of the *summi viri* in his Forum and the bronze effigies to be set up by future generations (*SHA Alex.* 28.6; Dio 55.10.3). 'In common usage the reign of Augustus is regarded as the foundation of the Roman Empire': though Syme, on the very first page of *The Roman Revolution* acknowledges the triumph of Augustus' wish, the Princeps' variegated relationship with his Divine Father also included a rivalry as to who was to be regarded as the first of the Caesars and the founder of the new regime. Indeed Augustus prevailed under the Julio-Claudians and the Flavians, as may be learned, e.g., from Plutarch's *Caesars* starting with him, from the *lex de imperio Vespasiani*, from the coinage of these emperors and from the oath *in acta principum* and from the Elder Pliny (9.143). But with Trajan there came a change as we learn from the coinage and the imperial oath; also Suetonius started his *Caesars* with the Divine Iulius. Writers who earlier regarded Augustus as the first emperor now opted for Caesar (see Plut. *Numa* 19.6; Tac. *ann.* 1.1, later 13.3; Pliny *pan.* 11.1, later *ep.* 5.3.5). This fashion prevailed a generation later (e.g. App. *praef.* 6), but Dio, the last serious assessment in Antiquity, leaves no doubt as where the new regime took its inception. By the fourth century this all was old hat, reflected in the different personal opinions of such diverse writers as, e.g., Julian and the authors of the *de Caesaribus* and the *epitome de Caesaribus*.

The paper will pursue the fortunes of these views, with a foray to the Middle Ages, when Julius Caesar represented 'pagan' Rome among the Nine Worthies, and will attempt to explain the underlying causes of these varying fashions.

Carey Fleiner (Winchester) – The Augustan shaping of imperial education and its legacy in ancient and medieval historians

Following his own education, Augustus took a keen interest in the education of his grandsons and heirs. He chose their tutors, offered opinions on reading material, and even insisted they form their handwriting as he did. Girls in the family also sat in on these lessons in addition to learning domestic skills such as spinning and weaving. Sources on the Julio-Claudian family contain many references to the family's education, their literary pursuits and practical writing. They were apparently not only prolific letter-writers, but some also wrote memoirs and family histories. Through education, Augustus was acutely aware that he and his family were creating an imperial image for posterity. For example, Tacitus and Suetonius crafted their own characterisation of the Julio-Claudians based on their letters, speeches, and memoirs.

Augustus's interest in education and historical legacy had a subsequent effect on medieval authors. For example, Einhard, taking Suetonius's *Life of Augustus* as a model for his *Life of Charlemagne*, stressed the interest the Frankish emperor took in education and his strong promotion of education as a means to unify and strengthen the administration of his diverse empire.

This paper examines Augustus's interest in education for himself and his family and how the subsequent imperial image of education affected early medieval authors who were crafting personas of contemporary emperors. This paper firstly considers Augustus's own education and the subsequent effects of his hand in the education of his heirs. Second, this paper examines how imperial letter-writing, speeches and commentaries shaped contemporary imperial image, and then influenced subsequent Roman historians. Finally, this paper will consider the legacy of imperial education on early medieval biographers, particularly their association between education and imperial character, connecting the early medieval concepts of education and image-creation to that constructed by Augustus.

Jürgen Strothmann (Siegen) – Augustus and the new Roman emperor in the West. The case of the Carolingian views on Augustus

What is a Roman emperor in the Middle Ages? That is a fundamental question in understanding medieval thinking about god's plan and the place medieval Latin society had to take.

Some medievalists think that this new emperor in the following of Charlemagne is something original medieval and that the relation to Rome is nearly exclusively a case of religious and ecclesiological bounding. In their thinking there is no place for a virulent Idea of a relevant relationship to ancient Roman history. Only the well documented relationship to Constantine the Great as a reference to his role in the history of Christian politics is part of this view on the history of the emperors of the early and high Middle Ages.

If we take a look at the situation of the Carolingian kingdom and the political system of the early medieval and Byzantine world we have to think without the knowledge of later developments, such as the role of the so called donation of Constantine. The *Constitutum Constantini* can be seen as a document of consensual arrangement between Carolingian kings and papacy. So there would be no task to decide between the reference to early Christian emperors and on the early pagan Roman Empire.

We have to know that the Carolingian Roman Empire has to define itself a new and against the Roman empire of the East. So both ways were able to be gone. Charlemagne is successor

of Augustus, linked with Christ himself in the text of Christmas History with Luke II,1: “exiit edictum a Caesare Augusto”, and he is likewise successor of Constantine, but this only as Emperor in the West, following the text and context of the *Constitutum Constantini*.

So Augustus plays a central role in Charlemagne’s court, defining the new emperor at first as free from papal permission and from Byzantine absolute definition of an emperor.

8a) Augustus between the wars

Penelope Goodman (University of Leeds) – Beyond Italy: the 1938 bimillennium as a global phenomenon

The commemorations mounted in Fascist Italy for the bimillennium of Augustus’ birth on 23rd September 1938 are well known. Their study has revealed much about the workings of the Fascist movement, and the role of the cult of *romanità* amongst its strategies of appeal. But the Italian commemorations were not just addressed to a domestic audience, and nor was Augustus’ bimillennium marked in Italy alone. Across Europe, America and Australasia, people and institutions responded to the Italian programme, and also mounted their own commemorative events.

Although many of these events are well documented, they have received little academic attention. This means that the Italian commemorations are often viewed in isolation: an approach which risks pathologising them as uniquely characteristic of a totalitarian regime. Both Italian and non-Italian commemorations also regularly cast Augustus as symbolic of a shared cultural heritage uniting the countries of Europe and, by extension, north America and Australasia. As the threat of war became increasingly real, his bimillennial commemorations served as a medium through which these same countries could explore and address their relationship by analogy.

My paper explores the 1938 bimillennium as a global phenomenon, showing who was interested in the occasion, what they hoped to get out of it, and what Augustus had to offer to them. Prominent above all is a conception of Augustus as an icon of peace: an understandably potent image in a world still recovering from one war even while fearing a second. Meanwhile, the Augustan consolidation of the empire and the proliferation of art and literature during his reign encouraged intellectuals to view him as the architect of a sophisticated, cosmopolitan, and above all unified culture. Indeed, his bimillennial commemorations were often treated as a way of attempting to achieve something similar in the present. Understanding these dynamics casts new light not only on the 1930s, but also on the effectiveness of the historical Augustus’ self-fashioning in a context similarly shaped by the fear of (civil) war.

Fabio Cavallero (Rome ‘La Sapienza’) – Augustus and Mussolini: city planning and architecture. An effective use of power for the creation of a new cultural and communicative memory.

Augustus understood well the power of architecture such as an effective way to legitimate and to celebrate: the Principate. Rome became the instrument through which he piloted the creation of a new cultural and communicative memory. In fact, on one hand, "restructuring" of ancient romulean monuments (Temple of Jupiter Feretrius) meant re-founding cultural memory of the Romans, legitimizing the power of Augustus and presenting it as a new

founder as well. On the other, the construction of huge monumental complex (Forum of Augustus) celebrated and perpetuated the new power establishing a new communicative memory.

Eighteen centuries later Benito Mussolini did the same. He destroyed a renaissance district (Quartiere Alessandrino) entirely in search of the imperial monuments on which establish the new collective memory of Italians and celebrating himself as the founder of new Italian "Empire". On the other hand, he built modern monumental district (EUR) to show and perpetuate the power of the new order.

This allows a comparison between city planning policies implemented by two powerful men who did not hesitate to sacrifice large sections of urban landscape in order to exalt their political invention.

The new urban lay-out envisioned and created by Augustus and Mussolini in Rome, will be analysed in order to understand how they used city planning and architecture to change the perception of urban spaces aiming at the creation of a new cultural and communicative memory as well.

Finally, we will try to define how people previously living in the destroyed districts, who had got to be re-located, reacted against the disappearance of places and buildings so deeply connected to their personal experience and every-day life until the appearance of the new landscape (Regret Process).

James Chlup (University of Manitoba) – The Proconsul and the Emperor: John Buchan's *Augustus*

John Buchan wrote his *Augustus* (1937) to commemorate the bimillennium of the birth of the first Roman emperor. Eclipsed by Ronald Syme's masterful *The Roman Revolution* (1939), the merit of Buchan's *Augustus* is made apparent when it is understood as a culmination of two career trajectories, one literary and one political.

First, the biography ought to be understood in relation to Buchan's literary output (fiction and non-fiction) from *Blanket of the Dark* (1931) to *Sick Heart River* (1941). Buchan's action-adventure and historical novels demonstrate an interest in a more in-depth psychological analysis of his characters and their motivations. In this period Buchan also developed further his craft as a biographer: his *Julius Caesar* (1932) and *Oliver Cromwell* (1934) provided a foundation for writing *Augustus*.

Second, *Augustus* ought to be considered a product of the political environment in which Buchan wrote. Buchan's tenure as Governor-General of Canada (1935-1940) influenced his approach to writing about Augustus, who emerges as a figure of direct relevance for contemporary world politics. Buchan possibly intended *Augustus* to serve as a model for (or perhaps to appear as a composite of) contemporary political figures, including Canadian Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King, American President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and British Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin. In this political context, then, Buchan's *Augustus* is, arguably, a positivist text, seeking to provide a paradigm for the ideal leader to navigate the difficult political realities which Buchan and the reader knew the world was about to face.

Phyllis Brighouse (University of Liverpool, UK) – The Influence of John Buchan's Calvinism on his reception of Augustus

My paper concerns John Buchan's reception of Augustus in his 1937 biography *Augustus*, which was highly commended by contemporary academics. I concentrate on Buchan's stated aim for the final two thirds of the book: to analyse the MIND of Augustus. Buchan's essay 'The Great Captains' links a man's mind with his character, and as well as recounting the deeds and achievements of Augustus Buchan assesses the character of the man behind them. Buchan, as well as a Classicist, was also a committed Calvinist with a belief in predestination. Buchan's Calvinism was undogmatic, acknowledged man's fallen state and focussed on the goodness and Grace of God and the possibilities of redemption. Furthermore, his study of Classics 'broadened, mellowed and confirmed' his Calvinism. This has two specific consequences for Buchan's reception of Classics in general, and Augustus in particular, and 'The Great Captains' gives us an insight into this reception. Any Great Captain should have sound morality, be selfless, and physically and morally brave. Such a man would have a spiritual side to his nature and therefore some sort of understanding of God's will for this world, whatever his religious convictions, and an understanding of the Great Captain's role in carrying out God's will. Buchan gives this attribute to both Julius Caesar and Augustus in his biography *Julius Caesar*, and this paper considers Buchan's biography of Augustus as the biography of the Great Captain, with the qualities of the Great Captain's mind and character. There are anomalies, and Buchan has particular difficulty with explaining the proscriptions. Such anomalies, however, do not detract from his analysis, and his attempt to gain insight into the character of Augustus as a Great Captain of history.

8b) Virgil, Ovid and their successors

Rachel Thomas (University of Oxford: Merton College) – Literary Time-Travel: Commemoration of Augustus in Virgil and Ovid

This paper examines the preemptive commemoration of Augustus as found in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Previous scholarship has demonstrated the value of apotheosis for poets who, within Augustus' lifetime, set out to depict a world beyond the reign of the *princeps*; my paper suggests that two issues are critical for understanding this "preemptive commemoration". The first issue lies in the necessary acceptance of Augustus and his family as adhering to a rough paradigm of the semi-divine, modeled upon Hercules; the second, in the understanding of how the use of this Herculean paradigm allows poets to transcend time within the diegesis. By examining these two critical components, my paper proposes a method for reading these commemorative inclusions of Augustus and his family within poetic narratives.

The works of Virgil and Ovid both demonstrate two different perspectives on the deification and commemoration of the *princeps*. I begin by suggesting that we use Anchises' time-transcending comparison of Augustus to Hercules and Bacchus in *Aeneid* 6 to create a programmatic concept of the semi-divine that transcends the diegetic boundaries, thus equally applicable to wholly mythological figures in the poems as well as real-life figures. Next I argue Ovid's schemata of divinity, including Augustus' deification, demonstrate the incorporation of the Virgilian paradigm into the basic world-building of the *Metamorphoses*. This melding of Virgilian paradigm with the Ovidian world suggests the act of commemorating the semi-divine was at least partially the poet's aim in creating the narrative

framework. Furthermore, the acceptance and usage of this paradigmatic commemoration further signifies the political importance of commemoration (if apotheosis-based) to poets writing during the reign of Augustus, even before his death.

Giampiero Scafoglio (Seconda Università di Napoli) – Augustus in Dante's Thought and Works

In the Middle Ages the Augustan principate is considered as a privileged period in world history, as there are the conditions for the birth of Christ and for the dissemination of his message. Augustus is positively evaluated by Christian writers and Church Fathers (from Augustine to Thomas) because his moderate and enlightened policy contributes to achieving the appropriate historical background. Dante shares this view, that is so widespread in his time, but he elaborates it in a very original way and frames it within his political thought (in favor of the universal empire), going back to his *auctor princeps* Vergil (the poet of Augustus, in some way). Thus, Dante recalls Augustus several times in the *Epistles*, especially in *Ep. V* (to the princes and peoples of Italy) and *VII* (to the emperor Henry VII), in order to establish a comparison between the Roman emperor and the current one, to support the political and military mission of the latter in Italy. Augustus is positively judged by Dante as the symbol of both *imperium* and *pax* in the *Convivio* (4.5.6-9) and most significantly in the treatise *De monarchia* (1.16.1-3, 2.8.14 and 2.10.6-8): here the *princeps* becomes a key figure even within the discourse on the relationship between the two powers (temporal and spiritual). In the *Comedy*, then, Augustus is put in relation with Vergil (*Inf.* 1.71; *Purg.* 7.6); the great celebration of his *triumphus* is briefly mentioned in a simile (*Purg.* 29.116). The main reference to Augustus, however, occurs in the speech of another great Roman emperor, Justinian, who is himself a symbol of the reconciliation of imperial power with peace and religion (*Par.* 73-81): he outlines a rich and meaningful synthesis of Roman history and gives a special place to Augustus for having put the world 'in tanta pace' (in a great peace), sealing up the temple of Janus. Augustus is therefore a reference figure in the moral and ideological framework developed by Dante through his works and culminating in the *Comedy*.

Bobby Xinyue (UCL) – Augustus in Book 8 of Morisot's *Fasti*

In 1649, the French jurist and antiquarian Claude-Barthélemy Morisot completed Ovid's *Fasti* by composing the 'missing' second half of the poem – a further six books on the months of July to December. Compared to other 'supplement poems' of the early modern era (such as Maffeo Vegio's book 13 of the *Aeneid*), Morisot's *Fasti* has received little critical attention from scholars of Classics and Neo-Latin. This paper aims to add to existing scholarship by offering a study of Augustus' portrayal in the poem, with a particular focus on Book 8, where the figure of the *princeps* takes centre stage in Morisot's re-imagining of the month of August. This, in turn, will lead to an examination of how Augustus was perceived by the seventeenth-century French audience.

The main passages this paper will look at are the book's prologue, the calendar entry for Augustus' triple triumph, and the foundation days for the Temple of Salus and Temple of Spes. The episode of the triple triumph, especially, offers an extended and glorified version of the battle of Actium and the ensuing celebrations which Ovid himself (and, to some extent, the other Augustan poets) failed to provide. It will be argued that these passages form a grand opening to the book, which depicts Augustus as an invincible general, a restorer of peace and order, an equal to Jupiter, and a commemorator of Julius Caesar's legacies. I shall then

suggest that this image of Augustus has a special political significance for the poem's contemporary audience, who recently experienced the eruption of a civil war (the First *Fronde*, 1648-1649) just as the Thirty Years' War had ended (1618-1648). As the head of a growing centralised royal government that guided Rome from conflict to harmony, Morisot's Augustus could be seen as a model for the French monarchy during its struggle with a dissatisfied feudal aristocracy, and a paradigm for post-war absolute monarchy.

Paul Hammond (Leeds) - Dryden's Virgilian Kings

Dryden published his translation of the works of Virgil in 1697. He had lost his employment as Poet Laureate at the revolution of 1688-9 (being a supporter of James II, and a Catholic), and his translation of the *Aeneid* gave him the opportunity to reflect obliquely on recent history, and on the political and philosophical questions which that history prompted.

I devoted a substantial portion of my book *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome* (1999) to an analysis of the ways in which Dryden's *Aeneis* addresses questions of loss, exile, fate, fortune, and the will of the gods. In the present paper, *Dryden's Virgilian Kings*, I consider his *Aeneis* as a commentary on kingship. Other critics have focussed on those moments in the poem where barbed comments on usurpers seem to reflect on William III, but this paper considers more broadly the different kinds of kingship and leadership which the poem presents, including the figures of Aeneas, Evander, Latinus, and Turnus. A particular theme is the way in which kings relate to the gods, a subject of special concern to Dryden as a Catholic living under a government which he could not accept as exercising authority *jure divino*. The paper proceeds by means of detailed readings of Dryden's translations of the Latin, which often entail small but significant interpretative changes. And it begins with a consideration of Dryden's prefatory remarks on whether Virgil intended Aeneas to be a model for Augustus.

9a) Augustus on screen

Melissa Beattie (TFTS, Aberystwyth University) and Amanda Potter (Open University)
– *Res Gestae per Televisionem Nuntio Divi Augusti: Octavian and Rome*

The television series *Rome* (BBC/HBO 2005-7) featured as one of its main characters a pre-Augustan Octavian. While the series has frequently been the subject of academic work, what has not yet been done is to look at audience interpretation. The study will not make judgements based around ideas of an objectively 'right' or 'wrong' interpretation, as historical inaccuracies have been well-documented and, as is clear, extant primary sources themselves may or may not be factual. The study will instead examine the perception of Octavian / Augustus based on his representation in the series through the use of online, ethnographic interviews. This will provide empirical data with which we can analyse how viewers interpret the Octavian they see in the series. The study will therefore not only yield results with regard to this representation but will also serve as an example of how audience studies methods can be used by Classicists for reception work.

Jess Anderson (University of Leeds) – Augustus’ adventures beyond history: ahistorical screen treatments

Though Augustus is well known to Classicists, he has appeared less frequently on screen than comparable contemporaries such as Julius Caesar, Cleopatra and Nero. Survey data also suggests that he is less well-known to the general public. Has this lack of familiarity allowed film and television makers to take liberties with their representations of Augustus?

Previous studies focusing on Augustus’ portrayal on screen have tended to focus on ‘historically accurate’ representations. In contrast this paper examines the ahistorical representations of Augustus and assesses whether they offer any help in understanding the historical figure of Augustus. An ahistorical portrayal can be defined as one that uses recognisable elements of the real Augustus, but freely embellishes them with actions or characteristics that are unattested or directly in conflict with the historical record. Taking three case studies – *Herod the Great* (1959), *Xena: Warrior Princess* (2000) and *Empire* (2005) – that span different mediums, cultures and time periods, this paper will focus on how Augustus is presented and characterised. It will assess the aims and motivations of the director and production team in presenting Augustus in this light. The paper will examine how the audience responded to these different portrayals and what this tells us about the importance of historical accuracy in terms of creating a successful on screen characterisation.

Ultimately all representations of Augustus in film and television can be termed ahistorical, as they are fictionalised narratives that follow dramatic conventions and reflect the aims and priorities of their creators. Therefore, it is perhaps dangerous to give ‘historically accurate’ portrayals such privilege, and instead more profitable to recognise that the more obvious ‘ahistorical’ portrayals have some merit in offering new angles on Augustus’ life and career and showcasing the elements of Augustus’ character that persist in popular representations when historical realism is abandoned.

Fiona Hobden (University of Liverpool) – Life through a lens: Augustus and the politics of the past in television documentaries today

Augustus invites biography. Both the longevity of his life and its easy narrative arc make his rise from the favoured nephew of Julius Caesar to Rome’s first man to founder of an imperial dynasty a good tale to tell – especially when punctuated by internecine intrigue and bloody war. Yet, since the story of Augustus was first told, it has been edited for political effect: by the emperor and his Julio-Claudian successors, by their critics, and thereafter by political theorists and proponents of power. Thus, when producers of historical documentary on television turn to Augustus, there is a ready story to tell, but one that has been repeatedly fractured and reframed. What is more, as this paper demonstrates, their realization of Augustus on screen contributes to this process, as they build a new emperor through the distinctive story-telling medium of history on television and the filter of current political perspectives. Like the many other media addressed in this conference, television is active in the commemoration (i.e. active reimagining) of Augustus.

This, then, is the purpose of the present study: to examine the treatment of Augustus in factual television, to explore how and why historical programmes construct their subject, and to understand the continuing politicization of the emperor, who is delivered pre-packaged for national and global audiences and thereby launched into new political environments. The first episode of *The Roman Empire in the First Century* (‘Order from chaos’; PBS, 2002) and *Augustus: Totengräber und Friedensfürst* (ZDF, 2004) provide case studies for this

investigation. Set side by side, these two programmes, produced by national broadcasters in the United States and Germany respectively, demonstrate areas of fixity and fluidity in the representation of Augustus, as each establishes a narrative for the emperor which locates him within a visually, aurally and at times dramatically conjured Roman world that resonates nationally and internationally. Through the lens of television history, the politics of the past are projected into and become active in the politics of the present, as Augustus is written anew.

9b) The 21st-century Augustus

Anna Clareborn (Swedish Institute, Rome) – *Augusto* Reframed: Exhibiting Augustus in Bimillennial Rome

The bimillennium of Augustus' death is commemorated in Rome through various exhibitions and events, most notably *Augusto*, a large-scale exhibition at the Scuderie del Quirinale. Through a carefully curated selection of approximately 200 pieces, many of them on loan from other countries, this exhibit aims to communicate the 'dazzling personal story' of Augustus. Accordingly, the main focus of the exhibit is the peace and prosperity characterizing his reign, as well as the cosmopolitanism and intellectual dynamism traditionally perceived as synonymous with Augustan culture. After a little over three months on display in Rome, the exhibition, expressly intended for an international audience, will travel to France. Meanwhile, the Fascist commemorations of the 1938 bimillennium of Augustus' birth remain largely untouched in the Italian capital's exhibition venues, such as the Museo della Civiltà Romana, or the Museo dell'Ara Pacis. A notion frequently expressed in the preliminary reception of the *Augusto* exhibit is its potential to reframe Augustus, thus cleansing, or in any case distancing him from the problematic cultural heritage connotations associated with Mussolini's nationalist agenda. Whether the brief visit by the sophisticated, cosmopolitan *Augusto* and the internationalization of his 'brand' will live up to such expectations is yet unclear, but as will be emphasized in this paper, these conflicting approaches to the Augustan heritage clearly reflect the continuing struggle to renegotiate Italy's difficult political past in various cultural heritage contexts. The range of identities and evaluations of Augustus present in bimillennial Rome, however, must be said to have been pushed beyond the issue of Mussolini's emulation of Rome's classical past. As this paper seeks to demonstrate, the Augustus on display in bimillennial Rome can by no means be perceived as a finalized renegotiation, as the Augustan legacy has come to constitute an instance of problematic cultural heritage of its very own.

Chloe Bent (UCL) – Engaging with Augustus in the 21st Century: A biographical analysis of Rome's northern Campus Martius

Archaeological monuments are a staple within 21st century understandings of the Augustan past. Dotted across Rome, evidence of the Augustan building programme aids academic interpretation of Rome's "first Emperor." The importance of these monuments in contributing to research is showcased within the *Digital Augustan Rome* project, which maps the structures of Rome at the time of Augustus. Amidst the grandeur of Rome today, these Augustan monuments allow onlookers to visualise and materially engage with the man who 'found it [Rome] a city of brick and left it a city of marble' (Suetonius: *Augustus*. 28).

I argue that the complex of monuments which truly offer direct engagement with Augustus and how he wished to be remembered are situated within Rome's northern *Campus Martius* (Field of Mars). This tripartite complex combines the *Ara Pacis Augustae* (Augustan Altar of Peace), the *Horologium Augusti* (Augustan "Sundial"), and the *Mausoleum Augusti* (Mausoleum of Augustus). In reference to this complex, Rehak argues that 'such an ambitious sequence of building is only possible if we assume the direct participation from the very beginning of the *princeps* [Augustus] who authorised them.' That the monuments "speak" a language of power (*imperium*) that was understood by the public two millennia ago, a language that we are still capable of understanding today' (Rehak 2007: xiii).

Many scholars, including Rehak, have interpreted the complex and its significance in propagating the values of Augustus. I have capitalised upon this research by undertaking a biographical analysis. Each monument within the complex boasts an individual and diverse personal history, which often reflects contemporary opinions towards Augustus throughout the last two millennia. Through their births, early years, and rediscoveries, each life stage informs the current 21st-century states of these monuments and the complex as a whole. These biographies open a view into what these monuments can offer today's audiences who wish to directly engage with the legacy of Augustus.

Eleanor OKell (University of Leeds) – What does it mean to be an Augustus today? A comparative online perspective

This paper presents a snapshot of the use and cultural capital of the name Augustus and comparisons with Augustus – whether in relation to actual or literary figures – on the internet in 2013.

In 2012 Augustus was the 697th most popular child's name in America (in the 1880s it was 175th, but dropped out of the top thousand in 1968 re-emerging only in 1991), so the paper will begin by examining online 'name books', in which the established practice is to provide examples of famous namesakes, who are meant to be widely recognised as *exempla* and provide a reason to use (or not use) the name. The selection and analyses of – real and literary – Augusti provided by these sites can be taken as representative and the cultural capital of those Augusti will be shown to be both positive and negative through reference to online biographies, images, literary synopses and popular slang dictionaries.

The paper will then briefly explore a number of different contexts in which individuals are described as 'an Augustus' or 'a second/latter-day Augustus', including politics and religion, alternative histories, blogs/journalism and online chat rooms. Historically, those who attracted this type of epithet engaged in major building projects and/or were concerned with peace, e.g. Pope Sixtus IV or Abraham Lincoln, but this is no longer the case. Today this category includes figures such as Donald Rumsfeld and Nicolas Sarkozy, and the epithet is no longer honorific, although it may express grudging admiration. For this reason the paper will conclude with a number of cases in which individuals are stated to be, or self-identify as, 'a reincarnation of Augustus', which serves as a marker for perceived insanity.

Taken cumulatively, it is clear not only that the identity of the increasing number of Augusti in the English-speaking world has positive and negative aspects but also that comparisons with Augustus have secured a place in modern online discourses of praise and blame.

10) Karl Galinsky (University of Texas at Austin): Augustus in 2014

Conference response keynote: no abstract