



## PROGRAM

MONDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2014

**8.30-9.20: Registration (CCANESA, Madsen Building, University of Sydney)**

SESSIONS ARE HELD IN THE ORIENTAL STUDIES ROOM UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.

**9.20-9.50: Welcome: Professor Barbara Caine, Head of the School (SOPHI)**

### **Session 1**

**Chair: Associate Professor Bruce Marshall (Macquarie University)**

**9.50-10.40:** Professor Gregory Rowe (University of Victoria, BC): A Commemoration of Commemorations: the *Res Gestae* in the context of Augustan epigraphy

**10.40-11.20:** Dr Richard Westall (Catholic University of America, Rome Campus): Copies of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* and the eastern tour of Germanicus

**11.20-11.50 Morning tea (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

### **Session 2**

**Chair: Dr Ben Brown (University of Sydney)**

**11.50-12.30:** Ms Paulina Komar (University of Wrocław, Poland and University of Liverpool, UK): Consumption boom in Italy in the Augustan age – causes and consequences

**12.30-1.10:** Mr James Donaldson (University of Queensland): Herod and Augustus: the politics of marriage

**1.10-2.30: Lunch (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

**Session 3**

**Chair: Dr Lea Beness (Macquarie University)**

2.30-3.10: Dr Hannah Mitchell (University of Warwick): Monumentalising aristocratic achievement in triumviral Rome: Octavian's competition with his peers

3.10-3.50: Dr Frederik Vervaeke (University of Melbourne): *Subsidia dominationi*: the early careers of Tiberius and Drusus revisited

3.50-4.30: Mr Martin Stone (University of Sydney): Marcus Agrippa: Republican statesman or dynastic fodder?

**4.30-5.00: Afternoon tea (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

**Session 4**

**Chair: Associate Professor Kathryn Welch (University of Sydney)**

5.00-6.00: **Professor Nicholas Purcell (Brasenose College, Oxford):  
Augustus between public and private**

**Venue: General Lecture Theatre 1 (Main Quad)**

**6.30-8.30: Reception (Women's College, University of Sydney):**

**IN THE HALL OF MAECENAS**

## TUESDAY 30 SEPTEMBER 2014

### Session 5

**Chair:** Professor Jeff Tatum (Victoria University, Wellington)

9.00-9.40: Emeritus Professor Edwin Judge (Macquarie University): Alternatives to Caesar

9.40-10.20: Mr Bradley Jordan (University of Melbourne): C. Octavius Mag. Eq. Des.:  
The *magisterium equitum* and Caesar's intentions for Octavius

10.20-11.00: Dr Bronwyn Hopwood (University of New England): What's in a name?  
Appian and the nomenclature of Oktavios Kaisar

**11.00-11.30: Morning Tea (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

### Session 6

**Chair:** Dr Kit Morrell (University of Sydney)

11.30-12.10: Mr Gustavo García Vivas (University of La Laguna, Tenerife): 'That sickly and  
sinister youth': the first considerations of Syme on Octavian as a historical  
figure

12.10-12.50: Dr Andrew Pettinger (University of Sydney): The *lectio senatus* of 18 BC: a  
failure of Augustus' *auctoritas*?

**12.50-2.00: Lunch (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

### Session 7

**Chair:** A/Prof. Lindsay Watson (University of Sydney)

2.00-2.40: Mr Matthew Loar (Stanford University): Hercules, Mummius, Augustus: the  
Roman Triumph in *Aeneid* 8

2.40-3.20: Dr Anne Rogerson (University of Sydney): Virgil's Trojan Games

**3.20-3.45: Afternoon tea**

### Session 8

**Chair:** Professor Eric Csapo (University of Sydney)

3.45-4.20: Mr Roger Pitcher (University of Sydney): Concordia in Ovid

4.20-5.00: Dr Geraldine Herbert-Brown (University of Sydney): *Sulmo mihi patria est* (T.4.10.3): Searching for Ovid's Sulmo

5.00-6.00: TODD MEMORIAL LECTURE RECEPTION  
(FOYER, EASTERN AVENUE BUILDING)

6.00-7.30: TODD MEMORIAL LECTURE  
PROFESSOR KARL GALINSKY (UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN):  
*MEMORY AND FORGETTING IN THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS*

**Venue:** Eastern Avenue Auditorium

### WEDNESDAY 1 OCTOBER

#### Session 9

**Chair:** Dr Sebastiana Nervegna (University of Sydney)

9.00-9.40: Ms Aura Piccioni (Regensburg University): *Ultio* for *Pax*: the paradox of the *Saeculum Aureum*

9.40-10.20: Dr Jelle Stoop (University of California, Berkeley/University of Sydney):  
*Nos patriam fugimus*: Augustus and contempt for the empire

10.20-11.00: Professor Eric Orlin (University of Puget Sound): Constructing Augustan Italy

**11.00-11.30: Morning Tea (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

#### Session 10

**Chair:** Dr Patricia Watson (University of Sydney)

11.30-12.10: Dr Robert Cowan (University of Sydney): Sideshadowing Actium: Horace's *Epistles*, Lollius' *naumachia* and the contingency of the Augustan principate

12.10-12.50: Professor Philip Hardie (Trinity College Cambridge): Augustan poetry and the irrational

**12.50-2.10: Lunch (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

**1.00-2.00: MEETING OF THE AUSTRALASIAN WOMEN IN ANCIENT  
WORLD STUDIES SYDNEY CHAPTER: ALL WELCOME,  
REGARDLESS OF GENDER.**

### **Session 11**

**Chair:** Dr Jane Bellemore (University of Newcastle)

2.10-2.50: Associate Professor Kathryn Welch (University of Sydney): The Shield of Virtues Revisited

2.50-3.30: Professor Alexander Weiss (Leipzig University): Augustus as Reconciler?

3.30-4.10: Dr Tom Stevenson (University of Queensland): Augustus as *parens orbis*

**4.10-4.40: Afternoon tea (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

### **Session 12**

**Chair:** Dr Eleanor Cowan (University of Sydney)

**5.00-6.00: Professor Barbara Kellum (Smith College, NY):  
Winning hearts and minds: Augustan visual strategies**

**Venue:** General Lecture Theatre 1 (Main Quad)

**CONFERENCE DINNER: THE GRANDSTAND BAR, UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY**

**<http://www.thegrandstand.com.au/>**

## THURSDAY 2 OCTOBER

### Session 13

**Chair:** Professor Gregory Horsley (University of New England)

9.30-10.00: Dr Eleanor Cowan (University of Sydney): Writing the Roman (r)evolution: Velleius and Augustus

10.00-10.30: Mr Nick Geller (University of Michigan): The words that (re)built Rome: architectural imagery in Vitruvius and Augustus

10.30-11.00: Mr Andrew Stiles (Merton College, Oxford): Past, present and future in AD 68-69: Augustus as *exemplum*

**11.00-11.30: Morning Tea (CCANESA, Madsen Building)**

### Session 14

**Chair:** Dr Andrew Pettinger (University of Sydney)

11.30-12.10: Associate Professor Tom Hillard (Macquarie University): *Festinans lente*: the role of time in the Augustan achievement

**12.10-12.50: Professor Maria Dettenhofer (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich): Augustus and the Senate**

**Venue:** Oriental Studies Room

**12.50-1.00: CLOSING REMARKS**

**1.00-2.00: Lunch (optional) at a local pub**

## ABSTRACTS

Eleanor Cowan (University of Sydney)

### Writing the Roman (r)evolution: Velleius and Augustus

That Velleius Paterculus was familiar with the *Res Gestae* has long been established (Woodman, 1983; Hellgouarc'h and Jodry, 1985). This paper further investigates the relationship between the short *opus* of Velleius (for which no original title survives) and two monumental re-imaginings of Rome's history – the Forum of Augustus and the *Res Gestae*. Augustus' version of Roman history (if we can in fact think of it as 'his') sought to establish a monopoly over the way in which this history was, or could be, told. Questions about the impact of 'Augustan history' on later writers and thinkers therefore go to the very heart of our investigation into how Augustus' achievements were understood by his community after his death. The statuary in the Augustan Forum and the relationship between the Forum and the Augustan poets have been the subject of other studies (among many Judge, 1985/2008; Kellum, 1985/2008; Galinsky, 1996). Velleius' near-contemporary Manilius' reception of Augustan history-making has also received attention (Chambers, 2005/6; Geiger, 2008; Abry, 2011). This paper offers a reconsideration of Velleius' references to, and assessment of, Augustus' achievements.

Robert Cowan (University of Sydney)

### Sideshadowing Actium: Horace's *Epistles*, Lollius' *naumachia* and the contingency of the Augustan principate

Among the personal hobbies which Horace recommends his young friend Lollius conduct at a discreet distance from his *potens amicus* is the re-enactment of the battle of Actium, which should only be undertaken in the privacy of his father's estate (*Epist.* 1.18.58-64). Critics have noted that the potential offence in this seemingly affirmative celebration of the "miracle of Actium" lies in the casting of Lollius' brother as his opponent, thus acknowledging the civil nature of the battle which was at least downplayed, if not elided, in official discourse (Ahl 1984, Bowditch 1994, Porter 2002, *pace* Lange 2009). They have overlooked, however, the further subversive element in Horace's reference to "whichever of the two (*alterutrum*)" Victory crowns. This presents the counterfactual possibility, both in the *Epistle* and in the *naumachia*, of a parallel mimesis that Antonius might have won the battle of Actium. This instance of "sideshadowing" (Bernstein 1994, Morson 1994) demands to be set in a number of contexts, such as the use of counterfactuals in historiographical depictions

of battles and the phenomenon whereby some public *naumachiae* had outcomes contrary to that of the historical battle they were re-enacting (Coleman 1990, 1993). In particular, the very possibility of an Antonian victory renders the Augustan principate contingent, in opposition to the providential, teleological inevitability with which it, and especially its foundational battle, were depicted elsewhere in Augustan poetry. Such an interpretation is supported by Lucan's allusion to this passage in his Dyrrachium episode, the only other non-Lucretian instance of *alterutrum* in extant Latin poetry.

**Maria H. Dettenhofer (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich)**

### **Augustus and the Roman Senate**

Augustus' relationship with the Senate was essential for the stability of his rule. Although being by far the richest and most powerful patron in Rome, and wishing to build up a family dynasty, Augustus had no way of ever excluding the Senate from the government. To avoid unmasking himself as *rex*, he had to disguise his rule as republican. He required, therefore, the Senators as background actors.

There were several stages in this crucial relationship between the Senators and the Princeps: from underestimation of young Octavian, followed by total opposition and deeply rooted mistrust towards the winner of the civil war, to a long-lasting era of very different forms of resistance and even a boycott, which finally led to almost complete subservience.

After various approaches to changing the relationship according to his needs commencing in 18 B.C., he finally succeeded with the *lex Iulia de senatu habendo* in 9 B.C. Regulation, regimentation, and a strong integration of the Senate, including the Senatorial families, proved to be the keys to success. Time had also worked for Augustus, who was by then fifty-two years old. But it always remained a form of uneasy coexistence between the Senate and the Princeps.

After the failure of his dynastic dream, followed by a quite unexpected final challenge to his Principate in the last decade of his rule that put everything in question, Augustus had to accept that he needed the Senate to a certain extent.

**James Donaldson, University of Queensland**

### **Herod and Augustus: the politics of marriage**

Suetonius famously claimed that Augustus, 'united the kings with whom he was in alliance by mutual tie, and was very ready to propose or favour intermarriages or friendships among them.' Of all these kings aligned with Augustus in the early Imperial period, Herod of Judea must be the best represented in the sources. Many authors have considered the



relationship between Herod and Augustus, most notably in a recent (2005) Institute of Jewish Studies conference proceedings. But the topic of marriage and alliance is somewhat neglected when it comes to the Herodian relationship with Augustus. This paper examines three key marriages in the Herodian family, as evidence of Herod's political relationship with Augustus. First, the marriage between Herod's heir presumptive, Alexander, and the daughter of Archelaus of Cappadocia is considered as a critical example of Cappadocian and Herodian support for Augustus' Eastern policy. Second, two marriages between the Herodian and Nabataean kingdoms are examined: the failed marriage proposal between Syllaeus and Salome, and the marriage of Herod's son, Antipas, to a Nabataean princess. Each episode provides a unique and under-explored insight into Augustus' attitude towards allied kings and these rulers' own recognition of Augustus as king-maker.

**Karl Galinsky (University of Texas)**

**Todd Memorial Lecture**

**Memory and forgetting in the Age of Augustus**

Concern for memory, and for shaping memories, pervaded all aspects of Roman culture: history (largely identified as preservation of *memoria*), *monumenta* (connected with memory by etymology), literature, and religion. Social and cultural memories were plural and often in contestation. They always were an ongoing process of construction and reconstruction, and reconfigurations occurred at major junctures. The age of Augustus was such a juncture, and I will review a variety of the resulting phenomena both in the capital and the provinces. Like the Augustan age, *memoria* looks to both past and future. Was there an Augustan memory management? In what way could memories be controlled? What about imperatives such as remembering to forget and forgetting to remember? These issues are not limited to the Augustan age and we will reference some contemporary examples, such as memorials and their controversies, too.

**Gustavo García Vivas (La Laguna, Tenerife)**

**“That sickly and sinister youth”: the first considerations of Syme on Octavian as a historical figure**

Throughout 1934, Ronald Syme published several articles in which he set out his first considerations about Octavian, the future emperor Augustus. From this early stage of his career, Syme's discourse would begin to bring into focus the suspicious, cold, calculating and extremely cautious nature of Caesar's adopted son.

To elucidate this statement, we will discuss the works published by Syme in these years, in particular, those published in 1934 on the Bellum Cantabricum in the *American Journal of*

*Philology* and his two major contributions to the *Cambridge Ancient History*, also published at that date. In both he analyzes the northern frontiers of the empire in the time of Augustus and in the years from Tiberius to Nero, respectively.

Especially important for our purpose is a brief review by Syme of Mario Attilio Levi's *Ottaviano Capoparte*, also from 1934, which has gone unnoticed by most scholars. This text is essential to understanding the "young" Syme before *The Roman Revolution*.

Our goal is to prove that Syme's negative attitude toward Octavian does not arise spontaneously in the years 1937-1938, when he was writing *The Roman Revolution*; rather it is a latent and conscious process that began at least four years earlier.

**Nicholas Geller (University of Michigan)**

### **The words that (re-)built Rome: architectural imagery in Vitruvius and Augustus**

"I leave behind a city of marble, which I received as a city of brick." This boast is no doubt hyperbolic. But its importance lies not so much in the truth of what Augustus may have said (if he ever said it at all). What matters more is how this phrase is emblematic of the way that architectural imagery was essential to the Romans in how they conceived of what their *res publica* had become in the Augustan age and beyond.

This paper will read Augustus' own *Res Gestae* with a view to Vitruvius' *De Architectura* in order to suggest the important role that architectural discourse played in how the first emperor rebuilt the Roman state after years of civil war. Vitruvius saw all structure – be it physical or political – as architectural by its very nature. Might Augustus have shared a similar outlook as he transformed the physical and metaphorical landscape of Rome? This paper will seek to answer that question while demonstrating the ways that the *princeps* employed the language of architecture to express how he constructed Rome anew without disturbing its foundations.

What is so remarkable is not just that Augustus left Rome a marble city; more than that, it is the way that he used such a claim (or probably ones like it) to give a recognizable and solid shape to the unprecedented power he had established for himself.

**Philip Hardie (Trinity College, Cambridge)**

### **Augustan poetry and the irrational**

The establishment of the Augustan regime presents itself as the assertion of order and rationality in the political, ideological and artistic spheres: the rule of Apollo after the Dionysiac excesses of Antony, the calming of the madness of civil war. A standard reading of

the *Aeneid* focuses on the poem's attempt to put an end to the *furor* of civil war in the name of *ratio* and *pietas*, but also registers Virgil's acknowledgement of the impossibility of ensuring the lasting rule of reason over madness. The 'classical', Apollonian, poetry of the Augustan period retains a fascination with the irrational. The elegiac poets both regret and celebrate their enslavement to an erotic frenzy, that may have implications for their wider commitment to the Augustan project. Horace in the *Odes* is torn between Callimachean restraint and Dionysiac abandonment. *dulce est desipere in loco* may be an anodyne formula to paper over a less easily contained attraction to the intoxication of madness. This paper will attempt a sketch of the ways in which the irrational manifests itself in texts by these and other authors, across the generic range of Augustan poetry, and will explore the strategies by which the irrational is suppressed or contained, with attention to the wider political, cultural and religious contexts of the period.

**Geraldine Herbert-Brown (University of Sydney)**

### **SULMO MIHI PATRIA EST (T.4.10.3): searching for Ovid's Sulmo**

"It is beside the point to seek for autobiography in Ovid's erotic elegies". "... the pretence at least is that [the poet] represents Ovid of Sulmo". Wilkinson 1955, 46, 52.

"... we shall miss the whole point of the *Amores* if we insist on looking for autobiographical details..." Barsby 1973, reprint 1979, 18.

"Ovid's interest in the Paeligni is confined to the reflected glory that he thinks his poetry will bring them." Booth 1991, 172 ad *Amores* 2.16.1.

"Ovid is concerned far less with geographical or topographical accuracy than with locating his Sulmo among the literary landscapes of Augustan poetry". Boyd 1997, 54.

"Ovid... was for most of his career among the least historically minded of 'Augustan' poets..." Farrell 2013, 88.

"... a naïve study... would endeavor, in vain, to find the 'real' people, places and events from the narrative of the poems, as if the purpose of reading (and writing) poetry is to discover (and present) historical truths." Spentzou 2013, p.x.

The above views exemplify the traditional approach adopted by Ovidian critics over many decades. I hope to show that this approach, which dismisses as fictional any authorial experience infused into the poems, risks missing the vital connection between Ovid's artistic persona and his politico-social identity. Ovid is not just an amatory elegist. He also identifies himself eight times across his elegiac corpus as a son of Sulmo of the Paelignians (*Amores* 2.1; 2.16; 3.15; *Fasti* 4.80-82, 685-6; *Tristia* 4.10; *Ex Ponto* 1.8.41-2; 4.14.49). He wanted his allegiance with Sulmo to be noticed, both before and after exile.

Sulmo was a real name of a real place in central Italy east of Rome. A geographical place name was not an apolitical land or townscape to those who had lived through, or who had heard the stories of, the traumatic events which led to the unification of Italy and the fall of the Roman Republic.

In making Sulmo his point of reference in the real world, Ovid both signals a political and geographical separation from his literary forbears as well as endows his elegy with associations and implications to his contemporaries which may escape his modern readers. This paper is the search for Ovid's Sulmo and what it may tell us about the poet's poetical and political stance vis-à-vis the princeps who banished him in AD8.

**Thomas Hillard (Macquarie University)**

***Festinans lente: the role of time in the 'Augustan achievement'***

Bimillennia prompt appreciations of the passage of time. This paper proposes an assessment of time's impact on an era. Sensitive observers *at* the time were also conscious of the longest *durée*; Ovid painted Augustus' ascent to heaven as the climax to a susceptible parade beginning with Creation. Virgil also had an appreciation of *deep* time, envisaging geological metamorphoses.

"for time's great antiquity has been sufficient to compass even so mighty a change.  
(*Aeneid* 3.415)

Under Augustus' premiership, a dramatic revolution took place, yet it was hardly an event. It happened over a long period. And time was Augustus' ally. He seems aware of the fact; *festina lente*, he advised (preferring Greek, *σπεῦδε βραδέως*).

Whereas Roman culture is often seen as hostile to change—*at enim ne quid novi fiat contra exempla atque instituta maiorum* (Cic. *leg. Man.* 60)—we know that the truth was more complicated. There was an appreciation of what could be wrought by the passage of time. Old laws gave way to new: *an non saepe veteres leges abrogatae novis cedunt* (Varro *de LL* 9.15.20). As with law, so even with custom. *Consuetudo* ruled in times of peace; otherwise circumstance prevailed. The paper explores time and circumstance at the turn of the millennium.

**Bronwyn Hopwood (University of New England)**

**What's in a name? Appian and the nomenclature of OKTAOUIOS KAISAR**

At *Bella Civilia* 4.8-11 Appian claims to provide a Greek translation of the Latin proscription edict of November 43 BC. The authenticity of the edict reproduced by Appian is

widely accepted. The most significant challenge to this view rests on the opening title of the edict which gives the names of the Triumvirs as ‘Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius, and Octavius Caesar’. Given that by November 43 BC Octavian is believed to have taken the name of his adoptive father, Gaius Julius Caesar, and to have eschewed the name Octavianus entirely, it is striking to find his name formulated in an official edict in this way. Since Appian exhibits particular care over the nomenclature of Octavian in the *Bella Civilia* in general, how should the references to Caesar’s heir at *Bella Civilia* 4.2.8 and 4.17.130 be understood?

**Brad Jordan (University of Melbourne)**

### **C. OCTAVIUS MAG. EQ. DES.: the *magisterium equitum* and Caesar’s intentions for Octavius**

In recent scholarship there has been little open dissent from the *communis opinio* that, in 44 BCE, C. Octavius was designated *magister equitum* for the remainder of that year. However, in the absence of agreement on the political rank and role of the dictator’s subordinate, there is still little consensus on the significance of this appointment. Opinions range from Kienast (1982), that it suggests Caesar’s intent to nominate Octavius as a successor; to Meier (1995), that this was a significant military appointment for the dictator’s great-nephew; to Gardner (2009), that it was an event of little historical significance.

This paper intends to examine Octavius’ position as *magister equitum designatus* within the wider context of the magistracy itself. It will analyse the specific role that the office of *magister equitum* played during Caesar’s dictatorships from 48-44. Ultimately, it will return to the nomination of Octavius, and investigate the importance and implications of his sudden promotion to the key position of *magister equitum*.

**Edwin Judge (Macquarie University)**

### **Alternatives to Caesar**

Neither a transformative ‘revolution’ (Syme) nor an elusive reform (Badian’s ‘plan’ that Augustus ‘must have’ had) escapes the constitutional straitjacket devised by Mommsen’s ‘dyarchy’. Even with the endemic crisis of the third century it seemed locked in until the millennial heir of Florianus could complete the subjugation of the world (the ‘French’ and ‘Germans’, with all Africa, Persia and the Sarmatians) by sending a governor to (fabulous) Taprobane (Sri Lanka) and a proconsul to (monstrous) Iuverna (Ireland?). He would then give back the imperium to the Senate, to live by the ancient laws (SHA, Tac. 15.2).

But an Augustan history of Rome had from the start made it all unnecessary. Two edicts spelled out the principle for the future (Suet., Aug. 28.2; 31.5). The retrospective elogium

flanking the Temple of Mars Ultor (Degrassi, Inscr.It. 13.3, tr. E.A.J, 'The eulogistic inscriptions of the Augustan forum', pp. 175–81) exemplified it from the past. There was indeed to be a crisis-driven sequence of self-asserted managers of the republic, each peculiar to the particular emergency of his age. Various alternatives to Caesar, thrown up against the Julio-Claudian house, put this model to the test.

**Barbara Kellum (Smith College)**

### **Winning hearts and minds: Augustan visual strategies**

This paper posits a new interpretation for many of the famous works of Greek art on display in the area around the Theater of Marcellus in Augustan Rome. I will suggest that these sculptures and paintings functioned as the mythological and historical counterparts for the two most prominent family members honored there: Octavia, the beloved sister of the *princeps* and mother extraordinaire, as well as her son Marcellus, the nephew and first son-in-law of Augustus. It was rumored that Augustus favored Marcellus as his successor, but in 23 BCE the youth died suddenly after a brief illness at the tender age of nineteen, and became the family's first tragic hero. His mother's grief was so profound that it too became legendary. I will argue that it was primarily through *visual* means that this area of the city became a veritable family broadcast center and that the juxtapositions of objects were designed to appeal to a distinctively Roman associative pattern of viewership. Ancient texts indicate Augustus's rhetorical stance was to repeatedly deny any interest in establishing a succession, but these displays insist that making stories of the imperial family perpetually present and integrally a part of the lives of everyday Romans was a priority from the beginning.

**Paulina Komar (University of Wrocław and Liverpool University)**

### **Consumption boom in Italy in the Augustan age – causes and consequences**

The Augustan age was a time of significant political, economic and social changes in Italy. The reorganization of the political system and incorporation of new land into empire had its impact on the Roman economy, whereas economic transformations resulted in social metamorphoses. The change in consumption patterns is one of the manifestations of the transformations that were initiated by the actions of Augustus. It seems that a consumption boom associated with the rapid increase in importation from provinces can be observed between the 1st c. BC and the 1st c. AD.

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate that the consumption boom in staple goods indeed existed and that it was related to the reforms that were introduced by Augustus. The study of amphorae that served for the transport of basic commodities, such as wine, olive oil and fish sauces, will be the main argument in favour of the increase in consumption between the late republican and the early imperial period. Furthermore, the consequences of this

consumption boom will be analysed. Particular attention will be devoted to the issue whether the increase in consumption may be seen as an indicator of economic growth in Italy in the Augustan age.

**Matthew Loar (Stanford University)**

**Hercules, Mummius, Augustus: the Roman triumph in *Aeneid* 8**

I propose that Vergil uses the image of a triumphant Hercules in *Aeneid* 8 as a way to tap into a rich layer of Republican triumphal history that is instantiated in Rome's monuments, portraying Augustus ultimately as one more in the long line of notable Republican *triumphatores*. I suggest specifically that Hercules represents a cipher of L. Mummius Achaicus, sacker of Corinth in 146 BCE and dedicator of a victory monument to Hercules Victor (CIL 6.331 = ILS 20; *Aen.* 6.836-7). I connect Hercules to Mummius by arguing that Evander alludes to Mummius' Temple of Hercules Victor *ad portam Trigemina* in the Forum Boarium when he describes Hercules as *Alcides... victor* arriving with the spoils of *tergeminus* Geryon (8.202-3). The references to Mummius and his victory monument, I argue, encapsulate the Republican triumphal tradition onto which Vergil grafts Augustus. At the same time, these allusions also speak to larger questions of how the Augustan period navigates the visual reminders of its Republican history and where Vergil positions Augustus within the schema of that history. The move in book 8 from Mummius to Augustus, from Hercules Victor in the Forum Boarium to Apollo Palatinus on the Palatine, reflects Vergil's (and, eventually, Augustus') reorientation of the city's triumphal foci. Vergil's Augustus, then, cast very much in the mold of his Republican predecessors, restores the *res publica* by performing a distinctive Republican rite.

**Hannah Mitchell (University of Warwick)**

**Monumentalising aristocratic achievement in triumviral Rome: Octavian's competition with his peers**

One of the core aspects of the image of Augustus in later ages is his status as a great and innovative urban builder. That he achieved this reputation can obscure some of the interesting developments and, perhaps, changes in direction in the way he manipulated public building, particularly as a vehicle for image-management. One significant but understudied aspect of this is the extent to which Octavian/Augustus' building projects were influenced by, or in competition with, those of his contemporaries. In this respect, the building projects of the triumviral *triumphatores* present an interesting case study. The construction of no less than seven buildings was begun in the years 43 – 31 BC by triumphing generals, and paid for by the spoils of their wars. These commanders exploited the time-honoured strategy of using monumental building for their own self-glorification. Octavian was conspicuously lacking in

victories meriting a triumph in this period, as he had been engaged in fighting predominantly civil wars. How did the fact that others were capitalising on triumphal building affect Octavian's developing interest in monumental building and the nature of his self-presentation? By analysing the triumviral buildings as competitive projects, we gain further insights into both how the Roman aristocracy perceived politics in this period, and how Octavian operated in relation to these expectations and pressures.

**Eric Orlin (University of Puget Sound)**

### **Constructing Augustan Italy**

The victory of Augustus has been called the triumph of the Italian municipalities, but its practical results – the presence of building projects all over the peninsula – have been an underappreciated aspect of this transformation. The phrase *tota Italia* suggests in some sense Italy came to be conceived as a distinct unit, but to what extent did the reshaping of the physical environment lead Italian communities to see themselves, or to be seen, as part of a larger Roman community?

Due to space limitations, I will limit my observations to construction projects in several of the new Augustan *regiones*, focusing on differences between areas long under Roman influence and only recently brought into “Italy”. I focus on what might be considered mundane projects – bridges, roads, aqueducts and walls – as much as on the major urban architectural monuments such as amphitheaters and temples, to observe the reshaping of Italy as a whole. The similarities and differences between regions reveal the altered relationships, different from region to region, between the communities of Italy and Rome. In each case, the projects demonstrated not only the good will of the emperor, but also his domination of the landscape. More significantly, I argue that the new *monumenta* helped either to replace Republican and Civil War memories or to create new ones, beginning to forge a new community centered around the person of the emperor, the new focal point of Roman identity.

**Andrew Pettinger (University of Sydney)**

### **The *lectio senatus* of 18 BC: a failure of Augustus' *auctoritas*?**

Was 18 BC the beginning of the Principate, or, at least, the beginning of the end of confusion? Many scholars take that view, and certainly there are good reasons to do so. Sweeping powers renewed, bold legislation passed, and ‘unworthies’ dumped from the senate; all suggest uncontested power. From here, the Time's Arrow of History moves inexorably for Augustus. But hindsight obscures more than it reveals. This paper will test the dominant view of 18 BC by a close examination of the *lectio senatus* performed in that year. Our sources identify problems for Augustus, but, with one eye on his ultimate survival as Princeps, most



historians ignore them as unimportant, or else deny their existence altogether. Did Augustus want a Senate of 300? Did Augustus want to choose the members himself, or share the task? Did Augustus want a traditional senate of *optimi* to provide advice and guide decisions, or a group of lackeys? Did Augustus get the senate he wanted? Did Augustus have a choice? This paper, then, introduces a problem, and argues that the solution may require a reconsideration of how we think about the period in general.

**Aura Piccione (Regensburg University)**

***Ultio for Pax: the paradox of the Saeculum Aureum***

“*Iam Fides et Pax et Honor Pudorque / priscus et neglecta redire Virtus / audit apparetque beata pleno / copia cornu*” recites the *Carmen Saeculare* (lines 57-60). This is the beginning of a new Golden Age, of the *Saeculum Aureum*. Augustus himself writes (*Res Gestae* 25, 1-2; 26, 2-3) that he brought peace. It is meaningful that he dedicated a cult to Mars Ultor and adopted as protector Apollo, in this case god of revenge, who killed, with the help of his sister, the children of Niobe. On the reverse of a silver cistophorus minted at Ephesos (28 B.C.), appears Pax; on the other side, the image of Augustus and the legend “*Libertatis P[opuli] R[omani] Vindex*”. *Vindex*, “avenger”, and Pax, “peace”: it is nearly a paradox, it represents a “minatory” peace; the *vindices* are Mars Ultor, Apollo and Augustus himself. Like that Peace-Nemesis that is minted, years later, on coins of Claudian time: Nemesis isn’t just the goddess of justice, but she becomes, sometimes, also the goddess of revenge. In the Golden Age there are gods of revenge: the Pax Augusta is based upon revenge, is a warning to the enemies, but also to the provinces.

**Roger Pitcher (University of Sydney)**

***Concordia in Ovid***

The importance of Concordia in the ideology of the Augustan era has attracted recent attention, notably Kathryn Welch ‘Velleius and Livia: Reflecting History’, in Cowan (ed.) *Velleius Paterculus* 2011 pp. 309 – 334. With reference to the shrine to Concordia built within Livia’s *porticus* on the Esquiline and dedicated in 7, she takes issue with earlier scholarship (Flory, Severy and Littlewood) which limits Concordia to that of a harmonious marriage and says “One wonders how such a powerful (and omni-present) association could be kept separate in a post-civil-war society.” This paper will take this as a starting point to examine in detail the references to Concordia in Ovid, notably *Fasti* I 637 – 650 and VI 89 – 96 & 637 – 648, and argue that her role is integral to the ongoing public presentation of the family of Augustus and argue that indeed, based on his evidence, Concordia has ongoing implications in the political world of his day. In addition to consideration of Ovid’s use of history (cf. Syme *History in Ovid*) and his usefulness for historians, this paper will address

questions of the poet's use of terminology appropriate for Augustus, Livia and Tiberius. The prominence of this divinity suggests continuing tensions which must be kept in check, showing that the Augustan settlement did not necessarily lead to the cessation of conflict. Attention will also be drawn to the juxtaposition of Fortuna with Concordia in *Fasti* VI 569 – 636 and possible implications. Also under consideration will be the significance of the building of the Temple of Concord in the Roman Forum.

**Nicholas Purcell (Brasenose College, Oxford)**

### **Augustus between public and private**

'Public' and 'private' are familiar labels for different strategies adopted to shape Augustus' position in the Roman community. The terms have had a long and influential history since Antiquity, which has been explored in new ways in the last generation. They had also had a long and contested life by the time Augustus and his advisors made use of them. This paper looks at how and why the classification of public and private was changing in the first century BC, and what the wider associations and contexts of the classification were. It emerges that public and private were less stable or static concepts than we normally assume, and that they did not function as a straightforward binary pair in quite the way we expect. In the light of these explorations, I then revisit some of the ambiguous uses of the terminology in Augustus' actions, with special attention to the revealing subject of switching from public to private or vice versa. The hope is that new light may be thrown on some well-known and on some less familiar cases. To conclude, a new, and (if the argument holds) significant, case of the adaptation of this set of ideas is identified.

**Anne Rogerson (University of Sydney)**

### **Virgil's Trojan Games**

Augustus' "revival" of the *lusus Troiae*, following Caesar's example, is well-known. In this paper I examine Virgil's description of the *lusus Troiae* in *Aeneid* 5, and in particular the apparently benign (but startling) statement with which it ends: that the boys who perform the ritual represent Troy, and their troops are called 'Trojan' (*Troiaque nunc pueri, Troianum dicitur agmen*, 602). Commentators explain the odd formulation "Troy now the boys" as a reference to the fact that "Troy" is the name sometimes given to the *lusus Troiae*. In this paper, however, I stress the identity of Troy and the boys performing the *lusus Troiae*, and consider the implications of Virgil's little-scrutinised account of the game's survival in Augustan Rome.

I examine the passage in relation to the "reconciliation" of Juno and Jupiter in *Aeneid* 12, and then discuss how Virgil's use of Roman boys to embody Troy in the age of Augustus contributes to contemporary debates about Roman civic identity. While other writers stress

the undesirability of rebuilding Troy, Virgil shows how the city can be endlessly revived, through countless generations, in a moment of performance. Trojan-ness is thus made part of being Roman, and associated particularly with being a child.

**Gregory Rowe (University of Victoria, BC)**

**A commemoration of commemorations: the *Res Gestae* in the context of Augustan epigraphy**

On the one hand, we regard the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* as a form of autobiography – as an original and integral composition by Augustus – and we often assert that it is *sui generis*. On the other, we can cite dozens of monumental inscriptions and coin legends, as well as passages from literature, that predate the *Res Gestae* and anticipate its wording precisely. In this paper, I propose a new way of reading the *Res Gestae*. Following standard epigraphical method, I look at the *Res Gestae* in the context of contemporary inscriptions, and argue 1) that the honours, benefactions, and military achievements catalogued in the *Res Gestae* had normally been expressed or commemorated in inscribed monuments already long before the *Res Gestae* was posted outside Augustus' Mausoleum; 2) that these earlier epigraphical commemorations should be seen as precedents for the *Res Gestae* in both content and form; and 3) that the *Res Gestae* itself should be seen as in large part reproducing the contents of senatorial decrees and other honours to Augustus.

**Tom Stevenson (University of Queensland)**

**Augustus as *Parens Orbis***

Recent treatments of the development of the Augustan regime have agreed that Augustus was recognised as *parens orbis* when he was hailed as *pater patriae* in 2 BC. In this paper I would like to argue that although a common basic ideal was involved, one 'father' honour did not follow mechanically from the other or represent an elaboration of it, that the different formulations imply differing perspectives of the people concerned, and that the *patria* continued to hold a special meaning for Romans and Italians into the early Empire that it did not for non-Roman inhabitants of the empire more broadly.

**Andrew Stiles (Merton College, Oxford)**

**Past, present and future in AD 68-9: Augustus as *exemplum***

With Nero's death, which was brought about primarily owing to the dissatisfaction expressed towards his increasingly tyrannical and negligent form of autocracy, the Julio-Claudian 'dynasty' came to an end. The lack of an obvious successor to Nero resulted in a power vacuum, and appeals to different kinds of authority began to be made by various

interested parties. This problem – what the basis of ‘legitimate power’ in Rome actually was – is one of the main themes addressed in the sources which record the crisis of AD 68-9. The paradigm of Julio-Claudian exceptionalism (in various contexts – military, religious, political etc) which had developed within, and alongside, the institutions of the *res publica* since the time of Caesar, had necessarily come to an end. At the same time, largely owing to the militarised origins of the crisis, a return to the earlier paradigm of a pre-Caesarian senatorial oligarchy also appeared unlikely, if not impossible. Yet it was not a smooth transition towards a more ‘meritocratic’ conception of the role of *princeps*. In order to forge a new future for Rome and its government, those competing for the position emphasised different aspects of the past, and the actions and ideologies of particular earlier *principes*, according to their own preferences, to provide a sense of continuity. This paper will discuss the relationship between Vespasian and Augustus, and how Vespasian’s use of Augustus as an *exemplum*, while undertaking the transition from military to civic leadership and founding his own dynasty, differed from the way in which the later Julio-Claudians had used him.

**Martin Stone (University of Sydney)**

#### **Marcus Agrippa: Republican statesman or dynastic fodder?**

When Octavian placed *res publica* once more at the disposal of the Senate and People of Rome in his sixth and seventh consulships, it is rarely noted that these were the second and third consulates of Marcus Agrippa. He was therefore not just the colleague of Augustus twice in a row but his partner in the restoration programme. This may be associated with his earlier curious occupation of the aedileship as a reinvigoration of Republican office-holding. Dio’s selection of *him* as spokesperson for Republicanism in 28 BC was not random. And the subtle theology in the statuary of the Pantheon shows him neither down nor out. Yet it is Agrippa who went on to supply the material for an incipient royal family. What did he feel about this? Is he partner, surrogate or victim in the initiation of the *domus Caesaris* project? The manner and style of these adoptions are the key to an historic innovation in which Agrippa was not named, let alone deified, though he thought about it.

**Jelle Stoop (University of California, Berkeley/University of Sydney)**

#### ***Nos patriam fugimus*: Augustus and contempt for the empire**

With Augustus, the Romans began to take care of their empire in ways that had not convincingly occurred to them before. In that we may characterize the empire by the scatter of Romans abroad, and their employment in the functioning of the republic, it is argued that Augustus, against a tradition of contempt for the abroad, initiated a view of empire that was no longer a temporary investment in resource-extraction but a permanent commitment to exporting its most valuable resource, that is, Roman citizens.

We ought better to understand the revolutionary nature of Augustus' pushback against a tenacious *mentalité* that conceived of 'its abroad' as the net sum of relationships with foreign communities for the purpose of economic exploitation. The abroad had been a periphery whereto Romans went on business, with the understanding that *negotium* was but a temporary, and accordingly despised, investment in empire. Actium, however, crystalized a reunion between east and west, thereby providing a world of permanent fixture, territorial as well as ideological, for a Roman diaspora, and in particular to two developments in human resources that had proven most compromising for republican cohesion in the preceding century: now, on an unprecedented scale, veterans with full citizenship were settled across the Mediterranean and *equites*, who not unlike *negotiatores* were an economic elite owing their existence to exploitation even though they had hitherto been politically subordinated, were pumped into Augustus' imperial engine as *procuratores*.

**Frederik Vervaeet (University of Melbourne)**

***Subsidia dominationi: the early careers of Tiberius and Drusus revisited***

Whereas many aspects of the Augustan age continue to enjoy ongoing or renewed interest, the early careers of Tiberius Claudius Nero (16 Nov. 42 BCE) and Nero Claudius Drusus (March/April 38 BCE), Livia's sons from her marriage to Ti. Claudius Nero (pr. 42), have not been subject to much discussion or controversy of late. On the one hand, this could, perhaps, be explained in that they were quite young during the formative stages of the so-called Augustan monarchy, the critical settlements being those of 27, 23 and 19 BCE, the eye-catchers *par excellence* in the political history of the early Augustan era. On the other hand, Livia's sons would only really emerge into the spotlight of both ancient sources and modern scholarship after the untimely passing of M. Vipsanius Agrippa in 12 BCE. This paper aims at revisiting the evidence for Tiberius' and Drusus' careers in the decade or so before the latter's death in Germany in 9 BCE, the period preceding the rapid rise (and demise) of Gaius and Lucius Caesar. There are, indeed, strong indications that Livia's sons played a far more important part than has hitherto been recognized, both in terms of their official position and their role in assisting Augustus with one of his most important political objectives, namely the imperial monopolization of the public triumph.

**Alexander Weiss (Leipzig University)**

**Augustus as reconciler?**

Recently two altar inscriptions from Ionian Metropolis were published which were set up for Octavian most likely soon after the battle of Actium and praise him with the epithet *hilasterios* (Dreyer/Engelmann, *ZPE* 158, 2006). The editors don't comment extensively on this epithet apart from (rightly) mentioning that it is very unusual. It is not one of the well-

known, but slightly outworn praise words of the Hellenistic ruler cult, nor is it at all a common word in Greek literature. Interestingly, it is more common in the Septuagint and later Christian literature. This paper argues that *hilasterios* most likely means ‘conciliatory’ in the Metropolis inscriptions, which therefore praise Octavian as ‘reconciler’. The Metropolis altars are important evidence for the perception of Octavian’s policy of reconciliation after the battle of Actium. On the other hand, this policy was not one-dimensional. The altars were certainly not set up because of any sort of ‘official’ demand. Nor did Octavian offer reconciliation to everyone and every city. This will be further explored in the paper.

**Kathryn Welch (University of Sydney)**

### **The shield of virtues revisited**

Very rarely is a famous man’s description of his career from antiquity backed up by a physical object. Yet the copy of the *Clupeus Virtutis* from Arles indeed reflects Caesar Augustus’ penultimate chapter of the *Res Gestae* (34).

Reflects, but not replicates. Instead of Augustus’ seventh consulship, we have mention of his eighth. Where Augustus simply mentions the award for untrammelled *virtus*, *iustitia*, *clementia* and *pietas*, the Arles copy adds after *pietas* the limiting phrase *erga deos patriamque*.

This paper will compare the text of the *Res Gestae*, the shield of Arles and other remnants. It will suggest why the differences in wording are significant and what the original wording was most likely to have been and why. The senate’s decision to award the honour to the new *princeps* was perhaps not meant to signify acceptance of the past (or the present) but to establish a blueprint and a promise for the future. However, even though the *princeps* retained the original symbolism (and almost all of the original wording), he found a way to modify the text. The outcome was very different from the original contract.

**Richard Westall (Catholic University of America, Rome campus)**

### **Copies of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* and the eastern tour of Germanicus**

It may be opportune to rethink the historical dynamics that resulted in the creation of monumental copies of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* in both the original Latin and a Greek translation. Although it has been observed that these copies are limited to the sole province of Galatia (Cooley 2009: 18) and that they date to the period AD 14-20 (Cooley 2009: 9, 18), no one has remarked that this would coincide with the moment of Germanicus’ presence in the East. Even though the prince is known to have taken another route in order to arrive at Antioch-on-the-Orontes (Halfmann 1986: 168ff.), his passage through Galatia by means of the overland route would have been a reasonable surmise at the time. Indeed, pointing in the

same direction is the fact that Germanicus is known to have sailed past Byzantium and into the Black Sea in AD 17 (Tac. *Ann.* 2.54). Likewise suggestive is the fact that a statue of Germanicus was indisputably part of the group that stood atop the monument inscribed with the *RGDA* at Apollonia (Cooley 2009: 17). Consequently, these copies of the *RGDA* are most likely an attempt on the part of the provincials to secure imperial goodwill.