

The Other Population:
Senatorial and Equestrian Statues in Rome and the Provinces from the
Republic to the Flavians

Distinguished Majors Thesis in History

Sarah Emily Bond
April 15, 2005

Thesis Advisor:
Professor Elizabeth Meyer

Distinguished Majors Program Director:
Professor Erik Midelfort

Ars longa, vita brevis

- Hippocrates, *Aphorisms* 1-

Dedicated to Elizabeth Meyer
my mentor, my patron

I could not expect any resolution against Gaius Verres to be passed in the senate-house where I saw before me Gaius Verres' gilded statue.¹

As Cicero approached the senate-house of Syracuse, the imposing gilded statue of Gaius Verres that stood in the grand meeting hall of the senate came directly to his attention.² Because of the prestigious honor of a statue, the placement of the statue in the center of the city's most prominent public building, and the gilded finish of the statue, Cicero could immediately infer Verres' relationship with the Syracusan community. The statue of Verres was a clear indicator to Cicero, as well as to any Syracusans, Sicilians, or visiting foreigners, of the *patronus-et-cliens* relationship between Verres and Syracuse.

The statue of Verres in the Syracusan senate-house communicated who was the possessor of power within the community, solidified the social bond between Syracuse and her patron, and by communicating the adoption of a Roman governor as patron, also indicated its provincial ties with Rome. The sight of the statue alone led Cicero to conclude that the Syracusans, as clients of Verres, would be unwilling to testify against their patron in court, and indicated that he needed to look elsewhere for people to speak out against Verres.³ This single senatorial statue spoke of the political status, patronal ties, and leaders of the provincial city of Syracuse, but together with the thousands of statues that inhabited Rome, Italy, and the provinces, the population of senatorial and equestrian statues reveals the "politics, power, and patronage"⁴ of an empire.

Statues had many specialized functions within Roman society, and had the special ability to advertise a person's deeds and perpetuate his memory in posterity. Although

¹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.138.

² Gaius Verres was a Roman senator and served as provincial governor of Sicily from 73-71 B.C. He was then declared the patron of Sicily and its capital, Syracuse (Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.114 ; 2.4.17-25). Cicero claims that "...what a difference there is between you and this Sicilian who was condemned by you, the patron of Sicily...you, patron of the Sicilians, the solitary state of the Mamertini..." (Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.114).

³ Tanner (2000) 35 argues that Cicero inferred the Syracusans' loyalty to Verres from the statue of Verres which stood before the Senate house.

⁴ Tanner (2000) 35.

statues within Roman society had originally served a commemorative purpose, in the middle of the Republican era, statues within Roman society began to be utilized as advertisements of power and lineage. As clients began to erect statues to show deference and solidify the social bonds between themselves and their noble patrons, statues took on an added function within Rome as a means of social cohesion. As Rome grew, patrons gained clients not only from Rome, but also from the provinces. Statues of senators and equestrians filled the city, jockeyed for position amongst themselves, and demonstrated the overall power of the Roman elite. But when Rome shifted from senatorial rule to imperial supremacy, those in power sought to limit statues that might rival their own.

As Rome entered the imperial age, statues of Roman senators and equestrians were limited within the imperially dominated city of Rome, and the nobility's ambition for honor and statues in order to advertise its own eminence had to be diverted elsewhere. The provinces provided an excellent outlet for this ambition, and allowed the Roman nobility to promote themselves while also providing an opportunity for provincial cities to use them as the noble *clientelae* in Rome had, in order to establish and solidify the patron-client bond.

The shift in senatorial and equestrian statues from being predominantly in Rome to being primarily in the provinces begins to take place during the shift from Republic to Empire following the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., and by the end of the Flavian era, senatorial and equestrian statues were erected almost exclusively in the provinces. The changing population of senatorial and equestrian statues within Rome and the provinces is indicative of the political shift from senatorial to imperial power, illustrates ones of the means by which social connections were reified and solidified and improved connections between the center and periphery under the empire.

Just as in Rome, besides the Romans, there was also a populace of statues... so besides this real world there is another world of illusion, mightier almost, in which the majority live.⁵

By 31 B.C., the number of statues within Rome had grown to an astronomical number. *Statuae Romanae* were a population unto themselves that grew constantly, vying for key positions within the city. Its members campaigned for votes, evoked memories of the past, visually communicated Roman social ideals, and, above all, demanded attention. A statue was a kind of afterlife that allowed a person's deeds and *memoria* to live on: immortal in stone. A statue's ability to embody the very essence of a person was an almost mystical power that Romans utilized in order to preserve an individual's *memoria* in posterity. The population of statues within Rome also allowed the Republic to live on. Statues by their very existence embodied and commemorated the ideals of the Republic, and reflected its social organization. In the political arena and in the city, the most honored men occupied the most prominent positions as decreed by the Senate, but every citizen was also permitted the opportunity to represent himself.

The republican culture of the "other populace"⁶ was forever altered by the events of 31 B.C. Following the victory of Octavian at Actium, a new "uniform visual language"⁷ was spoken throughout Rome. Augustus' program of cultural renewal saturated the city with *statuae* that depicted prominent *Julii*, embodied the Augustan ideals of the principate, and *supra omnia*, extolled Augustus. Augustus realized that visual language could change the consciousness of Roman society, and rebuilt the city as a means of monopolizing visual communication and portraying his own historical narrative. Augustus used statues as a way of legitimizing his regime and removing those whom he did not desire within it: replacing the haphazard statues of the Republic and the

⁵ Goethe (1826) 293.

⁶ See Cass. *Var.* 7.13.7.15. (trans. S. Barnish). for more on statues as the "other population of the city..."

⁷ Zanker (1990) 76.

memoria of civil strife and dissension with an orderly vision of Augustan power and magnificence. As a result of Augustus' monopolization of the visual language, the number of senatorial and equestrian statues greatly decreased.

Augustus' control of visual language as a means of legitimizing, maintaining, and communicating power was utilized by his successors. Both Tiberius and Caligula set new restrictions on who could erect statues, as did Claudius and Nero. Many statues of senators and equestrians were either torn down or moved, yet laws passed in the age of Tiberius prevented imperial statues from suffering this fate. Senators and equestrians who had once competed for the honor of a statue in the Forum or in other prominent areas were now limited in their ability to increase their *dignitas* within Rome. The imperial regulation of equestrian and senatorial statues within the city attests to the power that statues held even in the imperial age. By the end of the Julio-Claudian era, a new population of statues had arisen within Rome, one of arrogant men and their sycophantic followers, a population that reflected the oppressive supremacy that the imperial rulers imposed on their subjects.

Causa Memoriae: Statues in Roman Society

To Romans, statues were more than artistic renderings; they were an almost living embodiment of the person that they depicted. Roman writers such as Cassiodorus, Varro, and Sidonius Apollinaris convey this: Cassiodorus likened the vast number of statues within the city to a living *populus*,⁸ and Varro explained the purpose of statues on tombs by saying that they were "...on tombs, and in fact along the roads, in order that they [could] warn anyone coming along that the deceased themselves were once mortal, just as

⁸ Cass. *Var.* 7.13.7.15.

they are now mortal.”⁹ Apollinaris also anthropomorphized statues, describing statues avidly in *conlocutionibus*.¹⁰ Many proverbs in the *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* also imply life in statues. One such proverb is attributed to Plutarch, and claims that you can “tickle a statue.”¹¹ The Roman perception of statues as being somewhat human is important to understanding the power of statues. Although mortals died and disappeared from society, statues could gather some of their eminence, perpetuate their memory, and preserve it in posterity.

Because statues perpetuated an individual’s *memoria*, removal of a statue severely damaged a person’s ability to live on in posterity. In Rome, one way that a statue could be legally taken down was when an individual received the punishment of *damnatio memoriae*.¹² This penalty was usually given to a person convicted of *maiestas*,¹³ and required all images of a person to be demolished along with any text that might bear his name. Although the practice became more popular in the imperial age, there were two instances of *damnatio memoriae* in the Republic. Cassius and Brutus received the punishment informally after the assassination of Caesar in 44 B.C.,¹⁴ and Antony received *damnatio memoriae* and was declared a *hostis iudicatus* following the battle of

⁹ Varr. *Ling.* 6.49 (trans. R.Kent).

¹⁰ “In conversations,” Sid. Ap. *Ep.* 5.7.4. (trans. Harries). See Stewart (2003) 42-43; D. Freedberg (1989) 74-76.

¹¹ Leutsch and Schedewin, *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, 2.287. See Stewart (2003) 42 and Plutarch’s account of Flavius and Marullus tearing off the wreathen *coronae* that people had placed on top of Caesar’s statues in order to protest Caesar’s monarchical rule (Plu. *Jul.* 61 (trans. Scott-Kilvert.)). Also see the story told by Suetonius that after the death of one of Germanicus’ children, Livia dedicated a statue to him that was dressed as Cupid. Augustus used to keep a miniature of the statue next in the entrance to his bedroom so that he could kiss it when he entered (Suet. *Cal.* 7 (trans. Graves)).

¹² The damnation of one’s memory.

¹³ Treason against the state. Roman treason laws and specific cases from the Republic to the Principate are detailed nicely in Bauman (1963).

¹⁴ Informal in the sense that it was never officially declared by the Senate. Tac. *Ann.* 4. 35 (trans. Woodman) says that the *imagines* of Brutus and Cassius were missing from Junia Tertulla’s funeral procession. This is an indicator of *damnatio memoriae*, when a family is no longer allowed to display a man’s *imago*.

Actium.¹⁵ Plutarch says that Octavian even had the statues of Antony pulled down when he went into Alexandria.¹⁶

It is important to note that this practice was especially employed when a new ruler came into power. Sulla, Augustus, Tiberius, and Claudius all used it as a way of destroying their enemies' posterity and preventing these rivals from advertising their ideals visually. Emperors would increasingly use the practice in order to assert their own power and eliminate any competition. Statues were treated as actual people, and their destruction damaged a person's honor and his or her legacy. Juvenal gives an account of the burning of Sejanus' statues, likening it to an actual cremation,¹⁷ and Dio recounts that after the assassination of Caligula, his statues were overthrown and dragged around by their pedestals.¹⁸ *Damnatio memoriae* sought to remove the memory of a person from history. Because the statues of a person who received this punishment could no longer communicate the political ideologies and accomplishments of that individual, *damnatio memoriae* was a devastating punishment.

Statues were a testament to a person's deeds and indeed his very existence, but if this testament were to be heard, a statue also had to be put in a place where people could listen. The power of a statue's message was amplified when a statue was placed in a prominent place, and in Rome the two most prominent areas were the Capitol and the Forum Romanum. Since the time of the kings, the Capitol had been the religious center of Rome. The temple of Jupiter Feretrius was the first temple dedicated to Jupiter in Rome and was erected upon the Capitol. It was believed to have been consecrated by Romulus circa 753 B.C. and was the center of Roman worship until Tarquin the Elder

¹⁵ A public enemy of Rome. Suet. *Aug.* 17.2. See Varner (2004) 18.

¹⁶ Plut. *Ant.* 86.5. (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

¹⁷ Juv. 58.11.3 (trans. Barnish).

¹⁸ Dio 59.30 (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

built the Temple to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, traditionally in 581 B.C.¹⁹ Romulus was the first to place the spoils of war in the temple, and from then on, triumphing generals ascended the Capitol to adorn the temple.²⁰

The Capitol was not only a religious center, it was a citadel. After the expulsion of the kings, the political and military significance of the Capitol intensified.²¹ In 491 B.C., when Coriolanus marched on Rome, Romans fled to the Capitol for safety,²² and when the Gauls attacked in 390 B.C., the Capitol stood as the only area of resistance. The Capitol was also the place where the Senate held their first meeting each year.²³ Statues of illustrious men such as Quintus Fabius Maximus,²⁴ Scipio Africanus,²⁵ Aemilius Paullus,²⁶ and Pompey²⁷ were erected on the Capitol to commemorate their triumphs, and other prominent men, such as Quintus Marcius Rex²⁸ and Quintus Caecilius Metellus²⁹ also had statues on the Capitol. Statues placed there were able to utilize the Capitol's significance to promote an individual's eminence and accomplishments more powerfully.

Both the Capitol and the Forum were places frequented by thousands of people a day, creating thousands of opportunities to communicate one's own power and importance. The Roman Forum was the epicenter of the Roman World. It pulsed with life and was a vital part of the city. Roman writers also recognized the diversity of activity in, and importance of, the Forum:

¹⁹ Jupiter Feretrius: Liv. *AUC* 1.10; Dion. Halic. 2.34; Jupiter Optimus Maximus: Liv. *AUC* 1.38. ; Tac. *Ann.* 3.72.

²⁰ Liv. *AUC* 1.10 (trans. Spillan).

²¹ Rodocanachi (1906) 10.

²² Dion. Halic. 8.22.

²³ Liv. *AUC*. 11.8; Tac. *Ann.* .3.72.

²⁴ Plu. *Fab.* 22.8. (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

²⁵ Liv. *AUC* 38.56.12; Val. Max. 4.1.6 (trans. Walker) ; Cic. *Att.* 6.17 (trans. Shackleton-Bailey).

²⁶ *CIL* I. p.459 (167 B.C.) *L. Aemilius L. f. III Paullus Procos. An DXXCVI. Ex. Macedon et Rege Perse Per Triduum IV. III. Pridie Kal. Dec.*," Lucius Aemilius Paullus...proconsul in the 586th year since the foundation of Rome, for his conquests in Macedonia and against King Perseus, a three-day triumph, on the 28th, 28th, 30th November."

²⁷ *CIL* I. p.460 (60 B.C.) "Cn. Pompeii...a two day triumph on the 29th and 30th of September. Liv. *AUC.* 42.20.

²⁸ *CIL* 3.p.846

²⁹ Cic. *Att.* 6.1.6.

Now, till he comes back, I'm going to tell you where you can find people of every kind. After this it won't call for any great exertion whatever kind of fellow you want to meet, good or bad, honorable or the reverse. Now, for perjurers, try the Comitium, liars and braggarts, by the shrine of Cloacina... In the fish market, members of dining clubs, in the Lower Forum, respectable and well-to-do citizens out for a walk; flashier types, in the Middle Forum, along the canal.³⁰

Politicians, freedmen, and merchants all used the Forum. The Comitium and the Regia were the centers of political life, commercial buildings such as the Basilica Aemilia housed great silversmith shops and fish markets,³¹ and temples such as the Temple of Saturn and the house of the Vestal Virgins marked the importance of the Forum as a religious space. The Forum was the hub of commerce, politics, and social life in Rome and this made it a prominent place to have a statue.

The Rostra was the focal point within the Forum, and arguably the most prominent place one could place a statue within Rome. In 416 B.C. the beaks of the naval ships of the Antiates were affixed to the tribunal in celebration of Roman victory,³² forming a platform where important senatorial decrees were read aloud and large debates were held.³³ Funerals of prominent senators and equestrians were also held on the Rostra, for it was there that the deceased's son would give a speech about the great deeds and accomplishments of the man who had died.³⁴ The *imagines* of the other prominent men in the family would then be paraded out in a grand procession and their deeds would be recounted. Polybius commented that "by this constant renewal of the good report of brave men, the fame of those who have performed any noble deed is made immortal."³⁵ So

³⁰ Plau. *Cur.* 466-74 (trans. P. Nixon).

³¹ Liv. *AUC.* 11.51.

³² Pl. *NH.* 34.11 (trans. Rackham).

³³ For the Rostra as a place for decrees of the Senate or for vital pieces of information to be read, see Poly. 3.85. (trans. I. Scott-Kilvert).

³⁴ Poly. 6.53.

³⁵ Poly. 6.54.

what could be greater than having a permanent account of one's *res gestae*³⁶ inscribed on a statue base in front of the Rostra? Statues around the Rostra became symbols of high status and accomplishment. Republican heroes such as Gaius Duillius and Gaius Maenius had columns erected beside the rostra with statues of them on top,³⁷ and Sulla also placed an equestrian statue of himself in front of the Rostra,³⁸ as would Caesar and Octavian.³⁹ The Rostra, the Forum, and the Capitol were all extremely significant places that were dear to the Roman people. Competition for the erection of statues in these areas was fierce and having a statue there was considered a great honor.

One example of context amplifying the power of a statue is provided by the removal of the statue of Pompey from the place where Caesar died. The statue was forever seen as an ironic symbol, since Caesar died at the very feet of his greatest enemy.⁴⁰ Plutarch wrote that:

In the end, when Caesar saw that Brutus had drawn his dagger, he pulled his toga over his head and sank down, whether by chance or pushed there by the assassins – against the pedestal of Pompey's statue. The pedestal was drenched with his blood, and it might be thought that Pompey himself was presiding over the vengeance on his enemy, who lay stretched at his feet, quivering from his many wounds.⁴¹

Augustus would later move the statue to the Theater of Pompey.⁴² This is a clear testament to the power of images within certain contexts: by moving the statue of Pompey, Augustus reduced the symbolic power that the statue of Pompey had gained from its physical location and the memory of what had happened there, and silenced its

³⁶ "deeds accomplished" the list of things one accomplished in life was referred to as their *res gestae*. Augustus would later inscribe his *res gestae* in bronze for all to see.

³⁷ Plin. *NH.* 34.11.

³⁸ App. *BC.* 1.97 (trans. Carter).

³⁹ These are attested to by numismatic evidence. See Grueber (1970) Caesar: 102, 506; Octavian: 399, 405, 406, 409.

⁴⁰ Cic. *Phil.* 1.36 (trans. Bailey). Also see Plutarch's later opinion that the meeting place had been "chosen by providence so as to favor [the tyrannicides'] purpose, for the session was to be held in one of the porticoes...in which stood a statue of Pompey" (Plut. *Bru.* 14 (trans. Scott Kilvert)).

⁴¹ Plut. *Caes.* 66 (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

⁴² "Augustus placed the statue of Pompey over the royal door of his theater," Suet. *Aug.* 31 (trans. Graves).

visual communication by placing the statue among the dozens of other statues of Pompey at his theater. Pompey, retrospectively seen as a symbol of the Republicans who had opposed Caesar, no longer communicated his Republican ideals as strongly. Augustus, himself, also rebuilt the theater and this too was an attempt by Augustus to control the power of space.⁴³ Augustus turned Pompey's great Republican monument into Augustan propaganda, and tried to silence the statue of Pompey by moving it to a less evocative place. Augustus knew that statues could gain or lose power depending on their location. Statues had a mystical power that, when allied with a prominent location, was able to communicate power and honor. As a consequence, and as was the case with Pompey's statue, statues of elites could be threatening to imperial power.

Statues in the Republic

Roman portrait statuary first began to grow in popularity in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. At its inception, portrait statuary existed almost exclusively for commemorative purposes. Statues of *viri magni* evoked memories of their great deeds, and were *exempla* of ideal character. As Cicero comments, the early Republican Senate "thought fit that a monument should be erected to any man whose death was caused by an embassy, in order that other men would tempt more perilous wars and be more bold in undertaking the office of an ambassador."⁴⁴ Republican military heroes and prominent statesmen were commemorated by the Senate, as well as by family members, friends, clients, and individual *collegia* who wished to memorialize their virtue and accomplishments.

⁴³ "The Capitol and the theatre of Pompey, both works costing very large sums, without any inscription of my own name," Augustus, *RG* 20. Although Augustus did not inscribe his name on a plaque on the theater itself, the *Res Gestae* was a huge bronze inscription *plane in conspectu* for the public to see, on the Campus Martius. Augustus was now associated with the space, replacing Pompey as its patron.

⁴⁴ Cic. *Phil.* 9.3. (trans. Shackleton Bailey).

In 260 B.C. a statue of Gaius Duillius, the first naval general to obtain a victory over Carthage, was erected next to the Rostra in the *Forum Romanum*. The statue stood on top of a column, on the bottom of which was a large plaque extolling Duillius' great military victory over the foreign kingdom of Carthage. Statues such as the one of Gaius Duillius, by decree of the senate placed in the *Forum Romanum*, became symbols of Rome's foreign conquests.⁴⁵ Even allied nations commemorated, with a statue, Romans who had given them aid. Gaius Aelius received a statue from Thurii in 285 B.C, after he had introduced a law against Sthenius Stallius, who had attacked the town. As a show of *gratia*, the Thurians presented him with a statue and a crown of gold, "...and various races successively in some such way placed themselves under Roman patronage."⁴⁶ Foreign kingdoms began to develop strong bonds with prominent men in Rome, and showed their gratitude by erecting statues for them in both Rome and their own kingdom. The vertical ties of patronage were publicized and strengthened by the gift of statues. *Clientes* could show deference towards their patron, and their patron gained even more prominence as a result.

In the early Republic, *gentes* often erected statues in order to commemorate their ancestors.⁴⁷ Although affluent and influential families could afford to erect bronze or gilded statues in their *domus* as well as in prominent public areas such as the Forum and Capitol, less wealthy families could often only afford to erect a statue of the deceased in their *atria*. Clients and freedmen would also erect statues of their patrons in their own

⁴⁵ Gaius Duillius was the first general to attain a naval triumph over Carthage (260 B.C.). *CIL* 6.1300; *ILS* 55;

Plin. *NH* 34.2; Suet. *Aug.* 31.5; Hor. *Carm.* 4.8.13 (trans. Alexander).

⁴⁶ Plin. *NH* 34.32 Also see *ILS* 21 for another example of towns giving statues to patrons.

⁴⁷ Statues erected *post mortem* were often put up by the deceased's *gens*. See *ILS* 46, *CIL* 6.1311, and *ILS* 13. "The overwhelming majority of all epigraphic texts from the city of Rome that were set up by senators or members of their families, or were inscribed for them, may be either actual funerary inscriptions or at any rate have been erected after their death. Out of some 260 published in *CIL* 6 [inscriptions within the city of Rome]...some 180 may be assigned to this category" (Eck (1984) 133).

atria, in order to memorialize their patronage.⁴⁸ Statues in the home spoke with the *familia*, clients, and friends about the ideals and deeds of the deceased, but these statues were only able to communicate with a select group of people. Cicero wrote that statues were most effective when “one...employ[s] a great many loci, which are clear, defined, and placed at moderate intervals.”⁴⁹ Statues that spoke to more people enhanced statues’ ability to perpetuate the *memoria* of an individual, and in the late Republic, as statues of living men became more prevalent, statues were placed in public areas as a means of self-advertisement instead of just commemoration.

In the late Republic, statues of prominent familial forebears were still erected in the Forum, on the Capitol, next to roads, and in many other areas, but their descendants often took the opportunity to erect statues of themselves along with them. In 57 B.C., the grandson of Quintus Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus rebuilt the triumphal arch erected by his grandfather in 121 B.C. and added statues of himself, a relatively unknown senator, alongside his famous ancestors, Aemilius Paulus and Scipio Aemilianus.⁵⁰ He also credits Aemilius Paulus with three triumphs instead of the two that he actually received.⁵¹

Cicero notes another case of a mistaken addition to an ancestor’s *res gestae*. Cicero mocks Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nasica in a letter to Atticus because in 50 B.C. Quintus erected a gilded statue of his ancestor, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, on the Capitol, and “accidentally” listed him as a censor.⁵² Are these two examples cases of accidental attribution of deeds, or are they attempts to embellish the prominence of the individual in order to enhance the renown of the *gens*? It is highly possible that these

⁴⁸ See Lahusen’s list of statues of senators erected in houses: Lahusen (1983) 277. Also see Eck’s citations of statues in the *domus*: *CIL* 6.1474; 1490; 1739-41; 31632; 31685; 31752; 37094; Eck (1984) 156.

⁴⁹ *Cic. De Or.* 2.87.358.

⁵⁰ *ILS* 43 et 43a.

⁵¹ *Plut. Aem.* 51.

⁵² *Cic. Att.* 1.17. For the importance in Roman society of knowing the deeds of one’s ancestors, see Flower (1996) 65.

seemingly inadvertent ascriptions were simply a common way in which Romans embellished upon their ancestry and thus made themselves look better. As Harriet Flower says:

For the ordinary Roman citizen who was presumably not in the habit of reading histories, the ancestors of leading families were familiar primarily from their *imagines*, as well as from public memorials, trophies, buildings and statues.⁵³

Statues became an effective method of self-aggrandizement, and a way in which senators and equestrians could covertly advertise themselves and improve their own and their family's standing, all while seemingly showing deference to their ancestors.

As statues became increasingly about political ambition and projecting political and social status, they lost the Early Republican characteristic of being rare honors.⁵⁴ The city became more and more saturated with *statuae* of ambitious men, and others, such as Cicero, noted that *statuae* had become more about propaganda than about the commemoration of *viri magni*.

We see in the forum a statue of Lucius Antonius; just as we see one of Quintus Tremulus, who conquered the Hernici, before the Temple of Castor. Oh the incredible impudence of this man! Has he assumed all this credit to himself, because as a *mirmillo*⁵⁵ at Mylasa he slew the Thracian, his friend?⁵⁶

Cicero is saying that Lucius Antonius was a mere gladiator who did not deserve to stand beside such a great Republican hero as Quintus Tremulus. The late imperial historian Ammianus Marcellinus looked back on the Romans of the late Republic and also commented on the use of statues as self-advertisement, saying, "some set their hearts

⁵³ Flower (1996) 65.

⁵⁴ cf. Liv. *AUC.* 8.13 (321 B.C.) "Garrisons were placed in the captured towns, after which they [L. Camillus and C. Maenius] returned to Rome to enjoy a triumph which was by universal consent accorded to them. An additional honor was paid to the two consuls in the erection of their equestrian statues [by the Senate] in the Forum, a rare incident in that age."

⁵⁵ a *mirmillo* was a Roman gladiator who was armed in a Gallic fashion with a helmet, a sword, and an oval shield. He received his name from the fish that was on his helmet.

⁵⁶ Cic. *Phil.* 6.12.

upon statues, believing that in this way their fame [would] be secured forever, as if there were more satisfaction to be gained from senseless bronze figures than from the consciousness of a well-spent life.”⁵⁷ Statues became more about furthering the *ambitio*⁵⁸ of a person than about setting *exempla* for men to emulate, and were an essential component for success within the competitive socio-political system of the Republic.⁵⁹

Cicero sees the erection of this statue as shameless self-promotion by a man who does not deserve it, but is most outraged by the fact that the statue is erected in the *Forum Romanum*, next to a statue of a great Republican hero, Quintus Tremulus. Cicero makes it clear that it is where the statue is placed that makes it so unpalatable to him. The statue of Lucius Antonius communicated a pseudo-*dignitas* that was unworthy of the space that it inhabited. Cicero’s reaction to Lucius Antonius’ statue exemplifies the fact that statues and their spatial context worked together to portray a message. Yet the sheer number of statues being erected began to muffle the voices of the honorable men of the “other populace.” Self-aggrandizing politicians and odious men lived side by side with prominent heroes of the Republic. Something had to be done to reassert the integrity of space in Rome and reestablish the power and honor of the statue.

Because the senate, the popular assemblies, Roman citizens, and anyone else who wished to could erect statues within the city, statue placement in the Republic was widespread. Although the senate periodically cleaned out the Forum, there are no known legal restrictions that would have curbed statue erection within the city. The relative freedom to erect statues flooded the city with likenesses of patrons and prominent ancestors, and detracted from the capacity of statues to utilize important spaces and thus

⁵⁷ Amm. Marc. 14.6.4 (trans. W. Hamilton).

⁵⁸ *Ambitio* literally meant the striving of someone for public office and public honors. Although comparable to our modern-day understanding of ambition, *ambitio* implied the drive for public office and honor specifically. For more on the use of *ambitio* as a desire for popularity, power and honor through display, see Cic. *Att.* 1.17; Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.26 (trans. Alexander) ; Ov. *Fas.* 1.103 (trans. Boyle and Woodard).

⁵⁹ Stewart (2003) 129-30.

better communicate power and *dignitas*. The population of statues overwhelmed prominent areas such as the Forum and the Capitol, growing from an elite confederacy into a disorderly mob.

In the middle of the second century B.C., the senate finally acknowledged that its *laissez-faire* attitude toward the erection of statues had allowed the city to be overrun. The senate was also concerned that not all of these statues were of illustrious, virtuous men. Many of the statues of men who had been brought up on charges of *maiestas* or had been exiled were still standing in the Forum. As a result, the censors, in an effort to reassert senatorial power, dispel overcrowding, and rid the city of negative *exempla*, cleaned out the Forum in 158 B.C.⁶⁰

Statues of men accused of *maiestas*, such as Spurius Cassius, who had aspired to be king, were melted down upon their removal. Pliny explains the actions of the censors by saying that “evidently in that matter also those [censors] guarded against *ambitio*.”⁶¹ The Senate sought to quell competition for power and to project a unified image of the Republic. In order to do this, the powerful statues of treasonous men had to be silenced. By cleaning out the Forum, the censors renewed the spatial power of the Forum through exclusivity and reasserted senatorial power. The senate decreed that only statues erected with the permission of the senate would remain in the Forum. Thus the Senate increased its own prominence, re-established the Forum as an honorable and prominent public space, and visually projected the image of a virtuous and unified Republic.

Controlling statue placement was a key way in which the Senate could assert its authority, but also rid itself of rival images that promoted an adversary. Control of statue erection and placement enabled those in power to create and communicate in a visual

⁶⁰ Plin. *NH* 34.30.1.

⁶¹ Plin. *NH* 34.30.2. See Stewart (2003) 130 et Lahusen (1983) 18-19. Stewart and Lahusen concur with Pliny that the Senate sought to quell *ambitio*.

language that advertised their own honor and political gravity. The Senate controlled statue erection in the Forum in the late second century and early first century B.C., but as other men came to power, they too would see the advantage of being able to restrict statue placement.

Following the Civil Wars of the late nineties and eighties B.C., Sulla sought to embed his political constitution firmly in the state, and similarly to control the language of the statues following the brutal struggle for power between Marius and himself. When he was declared dictator in 82 B.C., he proceeded to proscribe hundreds of the supporters of Marius, Carbo and Norbanus in order to rid himself of any rivals and to secure his own power as dictator. Sulla did not allow for any rivals in his reign as dictator, whether they were made of flesh or made of stone.

Sulla removed the *statuae* of those proscribed, and recreated the Forum and the Capitol to project his own visual language-- minus the statues of Marius, of course.⁶² The Senate awarded Sulla an equestrian statue in front of the Rostra, and dozens more statues of Sulla were erected throughout the city.⁶³ One such statue was found on the Quirinal, one of the seven *colles* of Rome with large temples and prominent houses; the statue is dated within the dictatorship of Sulla (82/78 B.C.).⁶⁴ Sulla's lack of clemency toward his enemies sent a clear message to the people of Rome: that there were only two categories of people, Sullan supporters and the condemned.⁶⁵ Sulla controlled the erection of statues

⁶² App. *BC.* 1.97. We know that Marius' statues were taken down because Plutarch tells us that Julius Caesar put them all back up (Plut. *Caes.* 6).

⁶³ For the statue of Sulla in front of the Rostra, see App. *BC.* 1.97-98; Plu. *Sulla.* 34.3; Cic. *Phil.* 9.6.13. More statues were erected of Sulla than just this: his funerary monument was set up in the Campus Martius (Plut. *Sul.* 38), and Caesar also restored statues of Sulla that had been torn down (Suet. *Iul.* 75).

⁶⁴ A travertine statue base found on the Quirinal, in Rome, in the sixteenth century. *CIL* 6.1297; *ILS* 872: *L(ucio) Cornelio, L(uci) f(ilio) / Sullae Felici, / dictatori, / Vicus Laci Fund(ani)* : To Lucius Cornelius Sulla the Lucky, the son of Lucius, dictator, [put up by] the neighborhood of the Lacus Fundanus. See Gordon (1983) 92.

⁶⁵ Cf. Plu. *Caes.* 6.1 : [a decade after Sulla had abdicated] "There were two parties in Rome- one that of Sulla, which, since his time had been all powerful, the other that of Marius, which was then in a very low state indeed, with its numbers all scattered and scarcely showing their heads."

and rival images in order to illustrate this ideal. Sulla recognized that controlling the erection of statues helped to project an image of power and solidarity. This was a lesson that the successive rulers of Rome would also learn.

On a night in 65 B.C. Julius Caesar, then curule aedile, crept up to the Capitol and erected numerous golden statues of his uncle-by-marriage, Marius, in the places where Marian statues had stood before the dictatorship of Sulla.⁶⁶ News of Caesar's daring deed was interpreted in many ways. Plutarch claims that many thought that

...the revival of honors which by laws and decrees were properly dead and done with was a sign that Caesar was aiming at securing supreme power in the state for himself; that, after he had previously softened up the people's feelings, he was now making this experiment to see whether, as a result of his lavish personal displays, they had become sufficiently tame to put up with his humor and allow him to indulge in these innovations.⁶⁷

Julius Caesar was using *statuae* in two different ways. By re-erecting statues of his famous relative he was showing deference to his *maiores*, while at the same time made an anti-Sullan political statement. Caesar was showing his opposition to Sulla, in an attempt to test the waters and see whether Rome was ready for a new leader.

Caesar would eventually receive the power that he fought so hard to acquire, but when he came to power he faced the same dilemma of communicating and preserving power that Sulla had encountered. While Sulla had gone to radical lengths to quell the *ambitio* of his rivals, Julius Caesar tried to establish absolute power and win support by granting amnesty to his enemies (e.g., Brutus and Cassius) and by winning over the nobility with promises of high office.⁶⁸ Romans once again erected statues of patrons and ancestors, such as one erected for the city quaestor, Marcus Acilius Caninus, on the

⁶⁶ Plu. *Caes.* 6.2.

⁶⁷ Plu. *Caes.* 6.3.

⁶⁸ Plu. *Caes.* 58.

Capitoline hill,⁶⁹ but now also felt obligated to honor their recently established supreme patron. The Senate decreed many statues for him, many of which were placed in his new forum.⁷⁰

By early in 44 B.C., Julius Caesar had already been named perpetual dictator and had begun various building projects throughout the city. In these proprietary endeavors he regularly moved statues and cleared spaces in order to place his own buildings there. In 44 B.C., when he began a new theater near the Tiber, he ignored religious sanctions and destroyed existing temples and their statues in order to clear the area.⁷¹ He made massive plans to redo the city and project a visual language that advertised his own prominence above everyone else.⁷² As Cicero commented, "What a shame! A countryman of yours is enlarging the city, which he had never seen two years ago, and he thinks it too small to hold the great man alone!"⁷³ Instead of restricting statue erection, Caesar simply overtook prominent spaces, moving whichever statues stood in his way. Caesar justified the movement of these statues by erecting buildings, but in reality, the removal of statues kept rival imagery from communicating to the masses.

Caesar's duplicitous motives were again shown when he re-erected Pompeian statues that had been torn down in the Civil War.⁷⁴ Plutarch quotes Cicero as saying that "by his generous action Caesar had not only set up Pompey's statues but had firmly fixed and established his own."⁷⁵ While Caesar did not literally erect statues of himself next to

⁶⁹ *CIL* 6.1265.

⁷⁰ *Pli. NH* 34.18.

⁷¹ *Dio* 43.49 (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

⁷² *Suet. Jul.* 79.

⁷³ *Cic. Att.* 13.35 (trans. Winstedt) Julius Caesar hired an Athenian architect to help him remodel Rome. Since Atticus, a close friend of Cicero, was an Athenian, Cicero refers to this architect as a "*gentilis*"; cf. 13.20: "I did not understand what [Caesar's] proposals for improving the city are..."; 33a: "...Capito began talking of the improvements of the city: the course of the Tiber is to be diverted from the Mulvian bridge along the Vatican hills; the Campus Martius to be built over..." See also Favro (1992) 70.

⁷⁴ Although Suetonius and Plutarch mention this event, they do not specifically say where. They may have been the statues erected of the two men on the Capitoline Hill.

⁷⁵ *Plut. Cic.* 40 (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

Pompey, his patronage of the statues completely changed their message. Now it was Caesar who was in control, and by erecting statues of his former rival, Caesar was attesting to his own power and confidence.

The last decades of the Republic were a time of civil and political turmoil, making it a necessity that rulers solidify and legitimize their own power quickly. Statues were one way by which both Caesar and Sulla did this, although each had his own method. Sulla proscribed his enemies and had rival images removed, while Caesar struggled to project the image of harmony under his leadership. But this was not successful. In Caesar's struggle to bring Rome back together after the Civil War he had allowed rivals back into the city and then simply proclaimed his own absolute power. Resentment of this power eventually caused Caesar to be killed by the very men to whom he had granted amnesty. Young Octavian knew that if he were to secure his power in Rome, he had to quell the *ambitio* of his rivals carefully and construct the image of a new Rome with himself as the central figure. A key component in this new plan would be statue placement and allocation. Just as men such as Quintus Fabius Maximus and Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nasica had used their ancestors to increase their own prominence and legitimacy, so too Augustus would use statues to validate his position.

Projecting a New Paradigm of Power: Statues in the Augustan Age and After

Augustus succeeded, where Caesar had failed, in establishing himself as absolute ruler; he did so because unlike Caesar, who took no trouble to disguise his absolute power, he found ways to use the accepted methods of the old ruling caste to justify his position.⁷⁶

Following the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., Augustus faced the same dilemmas of legitimizing and preserving his power that Sulla and Caesar had. Augustus learned from

⁷⁶ Flower (1984) 246.

the failed approaches of both men, and formulated a different plan to solidify his power. Augustus endeavored to perpetuate his own version of history in order to legitimize and establish himself, while systematically changing memories of the Republic. Statue choice and placement were key in that they could visually communicate this new history. Thus Augustus established his project for urban renewal, part of which called for the moving of statues of prominent equestrians and senators of the Republic, and part of which called for new buildings and the erection of new statues. By changing the contexts of many of these statues and situating them within his own buildings and *fora*, Augustus manipulated Roman history, and effectively constructed the perception that his was a legitimate and positive authority.

Octavian's first step was to wipe out any image of his rivals that could evoke memories of his struggle for power. Following the battle of Actium, Caesar had all statues of Mark Antony torn down.⁷⁷ As Plutarch states, the statues of Cleopatra were allowed to stay only because her friend Archibius gave Octavian two thousand talents.⁷⁸ As soon as his most threatening rivals had been removed from view, Octavian resumed massive building projects--such as finishing the *Forum Julium* and completing the *Basilica Julia*--in order to narrate his own history visually. Augustus' moving of the statue of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, is one example of Augustus' revisionist history.

The statue had originally been placed in the colonnade of the *Metelli*, but when Augustus tore down the colonnade and built what would later be called the *porticus Octaviae*,⁷⁹ the statue was placed in the main entrance. By using the statue in a building that he had erected, Augustus adopted the statue's symbolic value and used the maternal

⁷⁷ Plut. *Ant.* 86 (trans. Scott-Kilvert).

⁷⁸ Plut. *Ant.* 86.

⁷⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 29.

ideal of Cornelia to promote his Julian marriage laws.⁸⁰ Indeed, he had hoped to advertise the same ideals with the statues of Octavia that were also erected there.⁸¹ The lauded mother of the *populares* Gracchi and the sister of the *princeps* shared the same building so that Augustus could further associate himself with Republican ideals, while also promoting his political campaign to increase the population of Rome. The exploitation of Cornelia's statue is only one example of Augustus' cooption of the ideals represented by a statue in order to communicate his own objectives.

Augustus often integrated existing statues into his buildings and then erected statues of his own ancestors directly beside them.⁸² By having his ancestors in the same space as such *magni viri*⁸³ as Romulus and Aemilius Paullus, Augustus was communicating his own nobility. Although Augustus' saturation of the city with statues of *Julii* ancestors seemed to be an act of familial piety, it was also another way in which Augustus communicated his power and status. As Pliny comments, "In Rome, statues are to be seen on the Palatine on the pediment of the temple of Apollo and almost every building put up by the deified Augustus."⁸⁴ Augustus filled the city with his own population of statues, a population that would drown out the sight and sound of any other rival.

As part of his public rhetoric, Augustus also encouraged senators and equestrians to rebuild temples and erect buildings. But this would have been a highly difficult thing

⁸⁰ Augustus using statue for ideals: Plin. *NH* 34.14. Augustus' marriage laws: Dio 54.16.1; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 34.50. Augustus setting examples "Nevertheless, when, during a public show the order of knights asked him with insistence to revoke [the marriage-law], he summoned the children of Germanicus, holding some of them near him and setting others on their father's knee; and in so doing he gave the demonstrators to understand through his affectionate gestures and expressions that they should not object to imitating that young man's example."

⁸¹ For more on Octavia's statues, see Fiory (*TAPHI* 1993) 287-308.

⁸² Statues of Julius Caesar were especially numerous. The temple of the Divine Julius had a statue of him, as did the Temple of Mars Ultor, both of which Augustus built. *Aug. RG* 19; *RG* 4.21.

⁸³ "great men" This term is often used to refer to prominent hero-figures, especially those from the Republic.

⁸⁴ Plin. *NH* 36.13.

for a senator or equestrian to do. Rebuilding or erecting structures in prominent areas was an extremely expensive endeavor. Only highly affluent senators and equestrians would have been able to afford this. There was also the fact that Augustus had taken over almost every part of the city, from the *Forum Romanum* to the Theater of Pompey, in his plan to “restore” Rome. Eck goes so far as to claim that Augustus controlled all building, and that he only allowed triumphing men to erect buildings within the city.⁸⁵ This would have limited the number of builders as well. Augustus’ encouragement of senators and equestrians was merely an affectation, undertaken so that he would not seem to be preventing the *nobiles* from performing the acts of patronage that they had performed in the Republic.

Although statues of equestrians and senators were still erected within the Campus Martius, the general public did not see them. They were erected *post mortem* in an individual’s funeral tomb and were hidden from public view.⁸⁶ Even these tombs were not exempt from the shadow of Augustus: Augustus also overpowered the areas of the *Campus Martius* not already built over by Julius Caesar with Augustan imagery. He rebuilt the theater of Pompey and the area near the Tiber, and then dominated the space with his own massive Mausoleum, the Ara Pacis, and the Horologium. Augustus’ mausoleum eclipsed the comparatively humble tombs of his fellow senators and equestrians and epitomizes Augustus’ perception of his own eminence. The Campus Martius was fully transformed into a testament of Julian power and prestige that overtook the massive space that the Campus Martius encompassed.

⁸⁵ Eck (1984) 136. Suetonius gives us a list of the senators who erected buildings in the age of Augustus, and indeed each one had won a full triumph prior to 26 B.C. (Suet. *Aug.* 29). Also see Tac. *Ann.* 3.72.

⁸⁶ Note ILS 1320: *dis minibus sacrum/ C. Caesio Q. f. Ter. Nigr. / ex prima admissione, / ex quattuor decuris, / curio minor / Caesia C. I. Theoris / patrono / et sibi*. To the departed spirit, a dedication to Gaius Caesius Niger, son of Quintus of the tribe Teretina, in the first rank of admission, member of the four decuries, lesser curio, Caesia Theoris, freedwoman of Gaius, for her patron and herself. Also see ILS 917 and 917a.

Augustus knew the importance of context for statues, as has already been seen in his transfer of the statue of Pompey to the theater of Pompey. Although the statues in the *Campus Martius* were no threat to him, statues of prominent men of the Republic, which stood on the Capitol, were. Whereas the *Campus Martius* was a common area for all citizens, the Capitol was a prominent part of the city dominated by the *triumphatores* of the Republic. These great generals included Sulla, Pompey, Marius, Aemilius Paullus, Scipio Africanus, and even Romulus. As Lahusen comments,

Rather, the honorific statues of various ages and types which had accumulated on the Capitol in the course of the centuries without any unified concept did not conform to the statuary program of the *maiores Augusti* and *summi viri* which Augustus wanted to realize in his new Forum.⁸⁷

He had many of the statues of these great men moved to the *Campus Martius*, and then had others reproduced and placed in the niches in his forum.⁸⁸ The great heroes of the Republic were pawns to Augustus. He chose those who would remain in his version of history, and extolled only those who projected his own ideals.

Ovid's *Fasti* provides a vivid picture of what it must have been like to enter the Forum of Augustus.

Mars Ultor drops from heaven to view his honors
 And the Temple in the Augustan Forum
 Both the god and the work are massive. Mars deserved
 No other dwelling in his son's city
 This temple merits trophies won from the Giants.
 Here Gradivus aptly starts feral wars,
 Whether impious foes provoke us from the East,
 Or any from the West must be tamed.
 The Lord of Arms views the gables of the towering work,
 Like the unconquered goddesses at the top.
 He views weapons of different shapes on the doors,
 And the earth's arms defeated by his troops.
 Here he sees Aeneas bearing his burden of love
 With many noble Julian ancestors;

⁸⁷ Lahusen (1986) 2.

⁸⁸ Suet. *Cal.* 24.

There he sees the Ilian lugging a general's arms
 And glorious deeds under rows of men.
 He gazes at the temple fringed with Augustus' name,
 And thinks the work greater when *Caesar* is read.⁸⁹

Ovid claims that even Mars was in awe of the forum that Augustus had built. The overwhelming size of the colonnades and immense temple of Mars Ultor towered above spectators, while great men of the Republic told the stories of their accomplishments. These great men stood united with the statues of Julian ancestors, their gazes fixed upon the statue of Augustus standing in the center.

Augustus had bought the large plot of land on which he erected the forum for 100,000,000 sesterces, *ex manubiis*--from the spoils--of his conquests in Germany, Spain, and Egypt, and as Romans and foreigners alike entered the Forum of Augustus they would have been struck by the massive structure at the end of the two parallel colonnades: the Temple of *Mars Ultor* (Mars the Avenger). The Parthian standards, as well as spoils from other foreign conquests, were housed in this temple,⁹⁰ and the senate used the temple as a place in which to deliberate about declarations of war and the conferral of triumphs.⁹¹ In the center of the temple stood a massive statue of Mars, flanked on his left side by a statue of Venus and on his right side by a statue of the divine Julius Caesar.

The temple was a testament to the power and glory won by Augustus, by the grace of the gods, at the battle of Philippi in 42 B.C. Augustus had successfully avenged the murder of his father and had come to rule the entire Roman Empire. The Parthian standards also represented the successful avenging of a loss to a foreign enemy. Augustus had negotiated the return of the Parthian standards in 36 B.C. and had thereby restored the honor that Rome had lost when Crassus was defeated at Carrhae. The temple attested

⁸⁹ Ov. *Fas.* 5.551-568.

⁹⁰ Dio 54.8.3.

⁹¹ Suet. *Aug.* 29.

the solidarity and superiority of the Roman people against any threat to the empire, whether foreign or domestic. Provincial governors departed and returned from their terms in the *provinciae* in ceremonies held at the Temple of Mars.⁹² Here, as they faced the statue of Mars, they were reminded of their obligation to Rome, and as they turned to depart through the two massive doors of the temple, they were reminded of their duty to the emperor.

On the same axis as the statue of Mars Ultor, in the middle of the Forum, and at the epicenter of two hemi-circular *exedrae*, stood a statue of Augustus. Augustus faced directly toward the temple and into the eyes of Mars himself. In the *exedra* that flanked his left side were the niches that housed statues of the *Julii* family, most notably Aeneas and the Alban Kings. Augustus' right side was flanked by an *exedra* with niches that housed statues of *summi viri*, Roman heroes of the Republic. Augustus' place within the Forum was indeed a personification of Augustus' view of his place within the empire and his place in posterity.

Augustus depicted himself as the superlative example of honor, strength, virtue, and breeding, and this was certainly communicated within his forum. The statues of Julian "ancestors" in the western *exedra* were proof of his superior breeding,⁹³ and the statues in the eastern *exedra* of great Republican heroes provided *exempla* of Augustan ideals.⁹⁴ Augustus singled out those men "who had brought the Roman people from its modest beginnings to its present position of greatness and world rule,"⁹⁵ and attempted to

⁹² Dio 55.10.2-4.

⁹³ There is proof that Augustus felt as though he needed to justify his lineage. Suetonius comments that Mark Antony tried to belittle Augustus' mother's line by saying that his great-grandfather was born in Africa and was a perfumist and later a baker. Cassius of Parma also mocked Augustus for his low ancestry. He was reported to have said to Octavian: "Your mother's flour came from a miserable Arician bakery, and the blood-stained hands of a money-changer Nerulum kneaded it." (Suet. *Aug.* 4).

⁹⁴ Suetonius quotes Augustus as saying, "This has been done to make my fellow citizens insist that both I (while I live) and my successors shall not fall below the standard set by those great men of old" (Suet. *Aug.* 31).

⁹⁵ Suet. *Aug.* 31.

communicate his deference for the Republic visually. But was this deference as much of an illusion as *restituta res publica* had been?⁹⁶

The Forum of Augustus was a clear example of Augustus' new version of history. Augustus reinforced the divine link between the *Julii* and Venus, and also linked himself with great men such as Aeneas and Romulus. Augustus claimed that the statues of his "ancestors" stood beside the great men of the Republic as united *exempla* of virtue and nobility; yet Augustus was simply using the façade of piety to establish associations with divinities and noble men that would justify and legitimize his rule. Augustus praised these great men of the Republic, but he still did not allow them to surpass his own achievements. Augustus recorded the *res gestae* of each of the men on their statues, yet these paled in comparison to Augustus' own *res gestae*, which was 32 times longer than that of any of the *summi viri*. As was the case with the *summi viri* and his embellished ancestry, Augustus reconstructed the past in order to legitimate his rule and communicate his power.

By Augustus' death in A.D. 14, Rome had become a visual projection of Augustus' ideals and a laudation to himself. Senators and equestrians who had once competed for the highest offices could now only strive for a secondary status within a political hierarchy that placed the *princeps* above all others. As Eck says, "Neither by the propagating of the *res publica restituta* nor by the description of the ruler as *princeps* could this fact be conjured away."⁹⁷ Augustus had a building or statue in every prominent part of the city, and also controlled who erected statues in his forum.⁹⁸ The Senate also especially began to favor statues of the *princeps*, his family, and those whom Augustus

⁹⁶ In 27 B.C. Augustus claimed to "restore the Republic" to the senate and the people. Yet Augustus had more power than ever before. The restoration of the republic was in name only, as Augustus became more and more of an autocrat and less of the "first citizen" which the name *princeps* implied. See Eck (1984) 130.

⁹⁷ Eck (1984) 130.

⁹⁸ See Zanker (1990) 289-91, as well as Musumeci (1978) 191.

favorable as a way of getting into the good graces of Augustus.⁹⁹ The result was a decrease in senatorial and equestrian statues. Paul Zanker comments that,

For the old aristocracy and even for those who now rose within the imperial administration, the urge to show off became pointless, at least in Rome itself. The fact that Augustus dispensed public honors and determined who would receive a statue in the available space still remaining in the *Forum Augustum* obviated any desire for self-glorification.¹⁰⁰

While Zanker is --as we shall see--incorrect in his assumption that equestrians and senators no longer felt the desire for self-glorification, he rightly points out that the opportunities for self-glorification had become considerably constricted. If senators and equestrians wished to receive honors, they had to curry favor with the emperor, and often statues were a means of doing this.¹⁰¹ Toadying nobles, along with the fact that Augustus allotted many honors¹⁰² and his sycophantic senate decreed the rest, further decreased the number of senatorial and equestrian statues in Rome.

Augustus had been the founder and the foundation of the principate since its establishment. By the time of his death in A.D. 14, few people could even remember the days of the Republic. The people looked for a new *princeps*, and accepted Augustus'

⁹⁹ e.g., *ILS* 81; *EJ* 18; Braund (1985) 10: Inscription found in the Roman Forum which dates to 29 B.C.: "The Senate and the people of Rome to Emperor Caesar, son of the divine Julius, consul five times, consul designate for a sixth, emperor seven times, the state having been saved." Statues of Drusus were voted for him by the Senate upon his death in order to console Augustus and Livia (Dio 55.2.5).

¹⁰⁰ Zanker (1990) 291.

¹⁰¹ e.g., *ILS* 103; *EJ* 42; Braund (1985) 44: base of a golden statue of Augustus that Augustus allowed to be erected in his forum: "To Emperor Caesar Augustus, father of his country, Further Spain, Baetica, because through his beneficence and perpetual care, the province has been pacified. 100 pounds of gold." cf. *RG* 24.2.

¹⁰² Augustus had final say in allowing triumphs (Suet. *Aug.* 38). No one after Balbus (27 B.C.) was given a full triumph except members of the imperial family. Augustus could even refuse someone the right to put his spoils in temples. In 28 B.C. Augustus refused to allow Licinius Crassus to dedicate his *spolia opima* in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius (Dio 51.24.4). Augustus decreed statues as well, such as the one he put up of his physician, Antonius Musa, in his forum (Suet. *Aug.* 59). Augustus could also take objection to those who had too many statues up. Such was the case with Cornelius Gallus, the prefect of Egypt, who had numerous statues of himself erected in Egypt (Dio 53.23.5).

heir-apparent, Tiberius.¹⁰³ It was a time of mourning but an opportune time for strategic action. There was a new competition under way, and that was to see who could catch the ear of the new emperor. Tacitus describes this frenzy to curry favor with the emperor: "...[there was] a rush into servitude from the consuls, fathers, and equestrians. The more illustrious each was, the more false and frantic... they blended tears with joy and mourning with sycophancy."¹⁰⁴ Senators and equestrians now competed for a place beside the new emperor, in hopes of getting the prominent positions and honors he had the power to confer.

As the principate of Tiberius continued, the modes of competition for public office shifted from statuary displays to imperial praise. Tiberius controlled the consulship¹⁰⁵ and only awarded it to those whom he deemed worthy. Harriet Flower argues that there was a decrease in the number of public statues of senators and equestrians because there was a decrease in *ambitio*--less desire to run for public office.¹⁰⁶ And since statues had often been used as a way of campaigning for office,¹⁰⁷ this may be another valid reason why senatorial and equestrian statues decreased.

Yet when Tiberius began to control access to high offices, senators and equestrians realized that the only way they could increase their prominence was with the backing of the emperor. Tacitus even argues that "... the nobles, each in proportion to his readiness for servitude, were being exalted by wealth and honors."¹⁰⁸ This is certainly possible. Tiberius began to give more powers to the consuls and the provincial governors,

¹⁰³ Tiberius was not officially the "heir" because there was not officially a "monarchy." As the majority holder in Augustus' estate (he had two-thirds and Livia had one third) and his adopted son, Tiberius was the obvious successor (Suet. *Aug.* 101).

¹⁰⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 1.3.4.

¹⁰⁵ In A.D. 15 Tiberius required all men who ran for the consulship to register with him first, "if they felt confidence in their favor or merits" (Tac. *Ann.* 1.81.2).

¹⁰⁶ Flower (1996) 279.

¹⁰⁷ Statues were often depicted wearing the *toga candida*, which was toga that advertised the fact that a person was running for office.

¹⁰⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 1.2.1.

and this in turn was a great incentive for them to get into his good graces.¹⁰⁹ Contrary to what Zanker believes, competition for honors had never died; it had just been rerouted. The nobility toadied to the emperor for magistracies, and thus gained honors and accolades through his favor.

Ancient sources as well as the epigraphical record support Tacitus' contention that statues were often given to those whom Tiberius favored. Tiberian supporters such as Sejanus and Lucilius Longus were given statues by the Senate and by Tiberius. Dio gives several examples of statues erected for these individuals. On the subject of the statues of Sejanus, Dio claims that "...one could not have counted the multitude of statues of him set up by the senate and the equestrian order and the tribes and the foremost citizens."¹¹⁰ One such statue was erected in the Theater of Pompey following the great fire there in A.D. 22.¹¹¹ Even non-nobility whom Tiberius favored were given statues. In A.D. 23 Lucilius Longus, a good friend of Tiberius who had kept him company in Rhodes, died. The Senate decreed a statue for him, "despite his being a new man."¹¹² Tiberius rewarded his friends handsomely; it was only his enemies who had to fear him.

Although Tiberius gave many liberties to the consuls and high-ranking magistrates, he was still very protective of his position as *princeps*. In his effort to protect imperial rule, Tiberius re-enacted the treason laws that had been established in the *lex Julia*, and began to allow the trials of rivals for *maiestas*.¹¹³ Those who were convicted of *maiestas* often received *damnatio memoriae* as one of their penalties. In A.D. 16 Marcus

¹⁰⁹ Suet. *Tib.* 31. (trans. Graves). "He left a great deal of public business to the magistrates and the ordinary processes of law; and the consuls grew so important again that an African delegation came before them, complaining that they could make no headway with Caesar..."

¹¹⁰ Dio 58.2.7. A statue base of one such statue was excavated in Rome, see *CIL* 6.10769.

¹¹¹ Tac. *Ann.* 3.72.3.

¹¹² Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.2.

¹¹³ Suet. *Tib.* 58; Tac. *Ann.* 1.72.2. The *Lex Julia maestatis* was established at an unknown date in the reign of Augustus and is cited by Justinian in his *Institutiones* 1.48.4. The law established treason, sedition, criminal attack against a magistrate, and desertion of the army as crimes committed against the Roman people and its security. The *princeps* was not exempt from them. See Bauman (1967).

Scribonius Libo Drusus, accused of seditious activities, received *damnatio memoriae* and his family was forced to remove all statues and *imagines* of him from view.¹¹⁴ In A.D. 20 Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, who was also convicted of treason against the state received *damnatio memoriae*. The Senate decreed that “the statues and busts of Gnaeus Piso, the father, wherever they have been put up, be removed.”¹¹⁵ Tiberius was taking direct action not only to punish those who sought to take his power, but also to remove any trace of them from posterity.

Statues were an essential part of this. Statues evoked memories of a person and transmitted his ideals, making it essential that Tiberius kept these “traitors” from communicating anything seditious. Just as the senate had removed the statue of Spurius Cassius from the Forum, so Tiberius sought to remove any reminder of treasonable activities.¹¹⁶ Tiberius knew that these statues were dangerous, and realized that it was imperative to erase their memory from the minds of the Roman people.¹¹⁷ But was this even possible? Men such as Cassius and Brutus had received informal *damnatio memoriae*,¹¹⁸ yet the absence of their *imagines* in a funeral procession still evoked their deeds. Tacitus recounts the funeral of Junia Tertulla, the wife of Cassius and sister of Brutus, in A.D. 22, and notes that “...outshining all were Cassius and Brutus, for the very reason that likenesses of them were not in view.”¹¹⁹ Tiberius must have known that he could not eradicate a man’s memory completely. Rather, Tiberius must have viewed

¹¹⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 2.32.1. See also Flower (1998) 160-161; Varner (2004) 16-18.

¹¹⁵ Inscription found in Eck (1993) 75. See Flower (1998) 23-25; Varner (2004) 16.

¹¹⁶ Plin. *NH* 34.30.1.

¹¹⁷ Note an inscription originally from the Augustan age which has the name of Gnaeus Piso erased: *ILS* 95; *EJ* 39. Ti. Claudius Ti f. Nero pontifex cos. iterum imp. iterum ludos votives pro reditu imp Caesaris divi f. Augusti pontificis maximi Iovi optimo maximo fecit ex s.c. / !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!. From *Fasti* lists it is known that Gnaeus Piso gave the votive games for the return of Augustus in 7 B.C..

¹¹⁸ Informal in the sense that it was not decreed by the Senate. However statues of the men were torn down, and their *imagines* were not permitted to be paraded in familial funerals.

¹¹⁹ Tac. *Ann.* 3.76.2.

damnatio memoriae as an effective way of preventing seditious men from communicating their ideals and evoking memories of their acts in the future.

Tiberius went to great lengths to protect Augustus' version of history. This included the protection of all statues of the divine Augustus and the imperial family. Suetonius cites an instance in which "one man was accused of decapitating an image of Augustus with a view to substituting another head; his case was tried before the Senate..."¹²⁰ The later conviction of this man indicates that the mutilation or transference of imperial statues was a serious offense. This notion is reinforced by another instance recounted by Tacitus, where the praetor of Bithynia, Granius Marcellus, was brought up on treason charges by his quaestor, Caepio Crispinus, and accused of treason partly because "Marcellus' statue had been sited higher than those of the Caesars...."¹²¹

Tiberius took extreme measures to preserve the paradigm of power that Augustus had created, and the culture of fear that these measures created further discouraged senators and equestrians from erecting statues to anyone but the members of the imperial household and those Tiberius favored.

The instatement of the treason laws allowed Tiberius to control all points of influence within the empire. The elite, as well as historians, poets, and the masses came under scrutiny with the treason laws. A historian who had referred to Brutus and Cassius as the "last of the Romans" was executed, as was a poet who had written "treasonous" verses.¹²² Suetonius' also wrote that Tiberius ordered a man to be killed simply "for letting an honor be voted him by his native town council on the same day that honors had once been voted to Augustus"¹²³ Tiberius sought to eradicate anyone who threatened his power, including those within the imperial house. He was rumored to have been the man

¹²⁰ Suet. *Tib.* 58.

¹²¹ Tac. *Ann.* 1.74.3.

¹²² Suet. *Tib.* 61.

¹²³ Suet. *Tib.* 58.

behind the murder of Germanicus, and rumors of his “lust for seeing people suffer”¹²⁴ became known throughout the empire. Tiberius sought to perpetuate the paradigm of power that Augustus had established and was quick to eliminate anyone who threatened it.

Gaius Caligula became emperor in A.D. 37, following the death of Tiberius. Upon gaining the title of *princeps*, Caligula abolished the *maiestas* laws that Tiberius had so ruthlessly utilized.¹²⁵ The people of Rome hailed him as the great son of Germanicus and praised him for recalling exiles and paying back those who had been wronged by the imperial tax system.¹²⁶ Although Caligula’s reign began with a flood of amnesty and generosity, as he established himself as *princeps*, Caligula’s attitudes toward the role of the *princeps* drastically changed. “So much for the emperor; the rest of this history must deal with the Monster.”¹²⁷

In A.D. 38 Caligula reinstated the *maiestas* laws and began to prosecute those whom he suspected of seditious activity.¹²⁸ He had people who insulted members of the imperial household brought up on charges of *maiestas*, and made it known to the senate that he had the power of life and death over them.¹²⁹ He deprived noble families of their familial emblems, and even stripped Gnaeus Pompeius of the surname “Magnus” because it had been inherited from Pompey the Great.¹³⁰ Starting in 38, Caligula heightened the culture of fear that Tiberius had cultivated, and made it known that he would not stand for any rival.

¹²⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 59.

¹²⁵ Dio 59.4.3.

¹²⁶ Suet. *Cal.* 13-16; Dio 59.2-3.

¹²⁷ Suet. *Cal.* 22.

¹²⁸ Dio 59.16.

¹²⁹ Dio 59.10.4; fear of senators; Dio 59.23.8.

¹³⁰ Suet. *Cal.* 35.

The erection of statues of non-imperial individuals, such as senators and equestrians, was even more restricted in the age of Caligula than it had been during the reign of Tiberius. While Tiberius had never formally promulgated an edict forbidding the erection of statues to non-imperial persons, Caligula formally assumed complete control over the erection of all *statuae*.¹³¹ Indeed, Caligula issued a decree in which he stated that “no statue or bust of any living person anywhere could be set up without his permission.”¹³² Although there is epigraphical and ancient evidence that Caligula awarded statues to his favorite gladiators,¹³³ there is no mention of statues awarded to any other non-imperial individuals.

Caligula’s lack of respect applied not only to the living, but also to the *memoria* of the dead. Caligula destroyed statues of prominent senators and equestrians from all eras of Roman history, and even the statues of illustrious republicans that Augustus had removed from the Capitol were not spared. Suetonius commented that “in his insolent pride and destructiveness [Caligula] made a malicious attack on men of almost every epoch.”¹³⁴ Caligula took the example of his predecessors to an extreme. Whereas Augustus sought to integrate parts of Republican history into his own historical narrative, Caligula wanted to eradicate the remnants of the Republic. Caligula did not simply want to dominate the visual language; he wanted to be the only one speaking it.

The flood of images and statues depicting Caligula that were put up during his time as *princeps* made his informal, posthumous *damnatio memoriae* more difficult to carry out.¹³⁵ Caligula’s extravagant and often cruel actions earned him the hatred of the people. The Roman people not only wanted to erase his memory from the city, but to

¹³¹ Suet. *Cal.* 34.

¹³² Suet. *Cal.* 34.

¹³³ Dio 59.14.6; *CIL* 6. 10052-4; 10057-8.

¹³⁴ Suet. *Cal.* 34.

¹³⁵ For the numerous statues of Caligula in Rome and the provinces, see Varner (2004) 35-42.

eradicate every trace of him. The *populus* attacked Caligula's statues as if in battle and dragged many of his statues around by their pedestals in order to rid the city of all remnants of the former emperor.

After Caligula's assassination in A.D. 41, Suetonius claims that the senate seriously considered the restoration of the Republic.¹³⁶ The senators met on the Capitol as they had in times of crisis during the Republic, instead of the Julian senate house, and many senators sought to destroy all images of the Julio-Claudians as a means of signifying the reinstatement of a Republican government.¹³⁷ Although the senate eventually chose not to endanger themselves by overruling the praetorian guard's declaration of Claudius as emperor, it is worth noting that the senate sought to use Augustus' paradigm of eradicating rival imagery, in order to signify the restoration of senatorial power.

When Claudius came to power, he stopped Caligula from receiving a formal *damnatio memoriae*,¹³⁸ but allowed statues of Caligula to be torn down at night.¹³⁹ Once the statues and evocative images of his predecessor had been effaced and torn down, Claudius proclaimed that the decrees of Caligula were null and void.¹⁴⁰ As a result, statues could again be erected without the emperor's approval. There were several statues erected of senators and equestrians in Rome at this time; examples of prominent senators on the *Via Salaria* are a testament to this.¹⁴¹ But these instances again exemplify how the placement of a statue in a less prominent area could limit its visual communication and thus decrease the honor of a statue. Marcus Crassus Frugi received a triumph in the reign

¹³⁶ Suet. *Cal.* 60.

¹³⁷ Ibid. "Some wanted all the memory of the Caesars obliterated, and their temples destroyed..."

¹³⁸ Dio 60.4.5-6; Suet. *Claud.* 11.3.

¹³⁹ Dio 60.4.5.

¹⁴⁰ Suet. *Claud.* 11.3.

¹⁴¹ ILS 954: *M. Licinius / M. f. Men. / Crassus Frugi / pontif., pr. urb., / cos., leg. / Ti. Claudi Caesaris / Aug. Germanici / in Mauretania*; and ILS 955.

of Claudius,¹⁴² but instead of receiving a statue on a prominent street near the *fora* or *Campus Martius*, Crassus had a statue given to him by Claudius on the *Via Salaria*, an insignificant road far to the North of the *Campus Martius*. On the other hand, Claudius' own triumphal statue was considerably grander and placed on the *Via Flaminia*, a major road that was used by everyone going northbound out of the city. Claudius built an equestrian statue of himself next to his triumphal arch on the *via Flaminia* after he celebrated a triumph in Rome for his victory over the Britons.¹⁴³ Clearly, Claudius sought to honor Crassus for his military victories in Mauretania, but the latter's honors could not be allowed to outshine that of the emperor.

Claudius' awarding of honors was highly arbitrary. He awarded consular regalia to second-class provincial agents, yet required anyone trying to become a senator to prove that he had been a Roman citizen for five generations.¹⁴⁴ He then allowed the son of a freedman to become a senator (provided he was adopted by a knight) and awarded triumphal regalia to men who had never won any major foreign battles.¹⁴⁵ By the time of Claudius it was clear to senators and equestrians that obtaining high public office and receiving honors did not depend upon merit or the senate, but rather on the emperor.

Claudius had witnessed the first assassination of an emperor, and so was even more paranoid than his predecessors had been on the question of whether there were conspirators plotting against his life. Claudius claimed not to want statues of himself

¹⁴² Suet. *Claud.* 17.3; This was not a "full triumph" of the sort that emperors and men of the Republic had received. Balbus was the last man to receive a full triumph in the Julio-Claudian era (27 B.C.).

¹⁴³ Aureus, A.D. 46-7 found in Rome, depicts on the obverse the head of Claudius. TIBERIUS CLAUDIUS CAESAR AUGUSTUS, PONTIFEX MAXIMUS, IN HIS SIXTH YEAR OF TRIBUNICIAN POWER, IMPERATOR TEN TIMES. On the reverse side is a triumphal arch with an equestrian statue in front of it between two trophies; on the architrave; OVER THE BRITONS. See Braund (1957) 210; Smallwood (1967) 43. cf. Dio 60.22.1. Also see *ILS* 216; a plaque found in the Campus Matius which was probably affixed to the triumphal arch on the *Via Flaminia*.

¹⁴⁴ Suet. *Claud.* 24.

¹⁴⁵ Suet. *Claud.* 24.

erected, saying that statues were a nuisance, a waste, and a vain expenditure.¹⁴⁶ This surely was a reference to the excessive number of statues that had been erected by Caligula.¹⁴⁷ Claudius saw that too much self promotion could be dangerous to his reputation, but still did not wish anyone else to have the honor of a statue. By denying that he wanted statues of himself erected, Claudius could hide his other actions under a cloak of modesty, and use the vanity of statues as a pretext for removing rival images. Eventually, Claudius went so far as to declare that:

Since the city was being filled with many images, he moved most of them elsewhere, and for the future, forbade any private citizen to do this, unless the senate had given permission, with the exception of those who had constructed or restored a building; he allowed them and their images set up in the places concerned.¹⁴⁸

But even the claim that there was a loophole for senators and equestrians in Claudius' plan to wipe out any rival imagery may be untrue. Lahusen and Mommsen argue that only a very small *circulus* was allowed to erect buildings after the Republican age, and this would have provided only a few people with the opportunity to put up a statue in a building that they erected or restored.¹⁴⁹ One thing is certain: the great cost would certainly have limited the number of people who could have even afforded to build large buildings or restore old ones. Claudius, just like Caligula, severely limited the ability of senators, equestrians, and any other Romans to erect statues, and in doing so, again suppressed his rivals from communicating their own power and prestige within the city.

All of Claudius' precautions against revolutionaries and conspirators did not keep him from being poisoned in A.D. 54. After his assassination, the seventeen-year-old Nero

¹⁴⁶ Dio 60.5.5.

¹⁴⁷ Tiberius had commented that "...if posterity's judgement turns adversely then stone structures [i.e. statues] are regarded as if they were tombstones of people who do not deserve respect" (Tac. *Ann.* 4.37.8). Also see the story of Julius Caesar, and how giving him a crown and voting him excessive honors were ways in which his adversaries tried to increase his enemies (Dio 43.21.2).

¹⁴⁸ Dio 60.25.3.

¹⁴⁹ Lahusen (1983) 80-84; Mommsen (1887) 447-52.

was named emperor. Nero promised the Roman people that he would rule mercifully and generously, and “as a further guarantee of his virtuous intentions, he promised to model his rule on the principles laid down by Augustus.”¹⁵⁰ Although most of Nero’s promises of mercy and Augustan virtues did not last beyond the first few years of his reign, Nero did adopt Augustus’ configuration of statuary space as a way of portraying power.

Nero introduced a Hellenistic style of architecture to Rome, and also began to build balconies onto apartments and add platforms for the *vigiles*.¹⁵¹ Indeed, Elsner believes that if Nero had lived as long as Augustus, he might have been successful in making Rome into a visual representation of Neronian power.¹⁵² Nero did not stop at rebuilding, as well as adding additions to existing structures; he also demolished buildings, such as the temple of the Divine Claudius, in order to put up his own buildings. Further building was done following the great fire of A.D. 64, since only four of the city’s fourteen quadrants remained undamaged after the disaster.

Nero took the opportunity the fire provided to “capitalize on the ruins of his fatherland and construct a house...”¹⁵³ The *Domus Aurea* had a triple portico a mile long, and Tacitus reports that it was widely resented by the Romans within the city because it took up so much land within the city center.¹⁵⁴ The house represented the new age of Neronian power, but to the people of Rome, it embodied the excess and lavishness with which Nero lived his life. As Martial commented, “one house took up the whole city of Rome.”¹⁵⁵ Although there is not much epigraphical evidence that can definitively say whether Nero allowed statues to be erected by senators and equestrians, we can deduce

¹⁵⁰ Suet. *Nero*. 10.

¹⁵¹ Suet. *Nero*. 16; Elsner and Masters (1994) 112-117 talks about the hellenistic style that Nero began to perpetuate throughout the city.

¹⁵² Elsner and Masters (1994) 112-127.

¹⁵³ Tac. *Ann.* 15.42.1.

¹⁵⁴ Tac. *Ann.* 15.42.

¹⁵⁵ Mart. *Spect.* 2.4 (trans. Pecke). It should be noted that Martial was commissioned to write *De Spectaculis* for the inauguration of the Flavian amphitheater in A.D. 79. The amphitheater was erected on a portion of the area where the *Domus Aurea* had stood.

from comments by ancient writers that even if a senator or equestrian had wanted to erect a statue anywhere in the city center, it would have been highly difficult.

In Rome, the *domus* was private property,¹⁵⁶ and could therefore not be utilized by others as a place to erect statues. The imperial house was no different. Nero owned his *Domus Aurea* just as Cicero had owned his *domus* in the countryside. The emperors had built numerous palaces since the establishment of the principate, many of which focused on and around the Palatine. Augustus had taken over a large house on the Palatine built by the Hortensii¹⁵⁷ and Caligula had extended the *Domus Tiberiana* on the northwestern Palatine all the way to the *Forum Romanum*.¹⁵⁸ There is not much surviving epigraphical evidence of statues in the Neronian era, which is a result of Nero further decreasing the areas in which statues could have been erected by building large private buildings such as the *Domus Aurea*. Because the laws of Claudius were still in effect in the time of Nero, we also know that no statues could be erected anywhere in public areas of Rome unless the senate decreed them. And as we have seen, the senate was highly deferential toward the emperor.

Nero also began to cultivate a culture of fear much in the way that Caligula had. He had full control over both senators and equestrians. He even forced 400 senators and 600 equestrians to do battle, as if gladiators, in the arena,¹⁵⁹ and retained the power to designate consuls and exclude men from the senate.¹⁶⁰ Nero also exercised full control over the delegation of honorific statues since Claudius' law concerning the erection of statues had not been repealed, and showed no respect for existing honorific statues either.

¹⁵⁶ See Cic. *Att.* 74.2.7; *Ad Fam.* 5.6.2.

¹⁵⁷ Suet. *Aug.* 29.

¹⁵⁸ Dio 59.28.5; Plin. *NH* 36.

¹⁵⁹ Suet. *Nero* 12.

¹⁶⁰ Suet. *Nero* 15.

He melted down statues of senators, equestrians, and religious figures in order to reimburse the treasury for his own private expenditures.¹⁶¹

Although Nero was excessively harsh on senators and equestrians whom he did not like, he rewarded loyal friends lavishly. Nero exalted these people and displayed their images as illustrations of honor and supreme allegiance to the Roman state. When Lucius Volusius Saturninus, a high-ranking imperial official and former consul who had served under five emperors, died in A.D. 56, Nero presented him as a positive *exemplum* of faithful commitment to the imperial family.

...and likewise [decreed] the erection of triumphal statues for him-- a bronze in the forum of Augustus and two marble statues in the new temple of the deified Augustus--and also consular statues, one in the temple of deified Julius, a second within a pavilion on the Palatine, a third in the precinct of Apollo within sight of the Curia; and also an augural statue in the Regia, an equestrian statue near the Rostra, and a statue of him seated in the curule throne at the theatre of Pompey in the portico of the Lentuli.¹⁶²

As Stewart points out, this outpouring of honors was unprecedented; there was no other single award on such a large scale, except possibly following the death of Germanicus.¹⁶³ Nero commemorated Saturninus with statues throughout the city in order to present him as an example of piety and devotion to the emperor. They were visual reminders in the most prominent areas of the city that loyalty to the emperor reaped rewards.

In March of AD 68, the governor of Gallia Lugdunensis, Gaius Julius Vindex, defiantly withdrew his allegiance to Nero and encouraged the governor of the northern and eastern parts of Spain, Servius Galba, to break his oath of allegiance to Nero as

¹⁶¹ Suet. *Nero* 24.

¹⁶² Inscription found at the family house of the Saturnini. Reynolds (1971) 136-52; Eck (1972) 461-84; Stewart (2003) 81-2.

Tac. *Ann.* 3.30 and 13.30.2 for Saturninus' consulship and subsequent death.

¹⁶³ Stewart (2003) 81.

well.¹⁶⁴ Clodius Macer, an imperial general who was stationed in North Africa, also broke his oath of allegiance to Nero, followed by the praetorian prefect, Nymphidius Sabinus, who then persuaded his troops to abandon Nero along with him.¹⁶⁵ The unrest over Nero's eccentricities and absolutist policies sparked these mutinies and led the senate to convene and decree that Nero was an enemy of the state.¹⁶⁶ Before the senate could have him executed, Nero committed suicide, ending both his reign as emperor and the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

The reaction to the news of Nero's death was mixed. Both Tacitus and Suetonius agree that much of the populace was unsure how to respond to the death of the emperor, and fearful about the political future of Rome. Tacitus remarks that "the death of Nero, after the first outburst of joy with which it had been greeted, soon had aroused conflicting feelings not only among the senators, the people and the soldiers in the city, but also among all the generals and their troops abroad."¹⁶⁷ For the many Romans who had "long soaked themselves in allegiance for the Caesars,"¹⁶⁸ the death of Nero was a terrifyingly liberating event.

The destruction, pulling-down, or re-erection of Neronian statues at this time illustrates this political uncertainty. While those who hated Nero tore down statues of the emperor and his wife, Poppaea,¹⁶⁹ those who still supported him had statues of the late

¹⁶⁴ Suet. *Ner.* 40-41.

¹⁶⁵ Suet. *Galb.* 11.

¹⁶⁶ Suet. *Ner.* 49.2.

¹⁶⁷ Tac. *Hist.* 1.4.2. trans. Fyfe.

¹⁶⁸ Tac. *Hist.* 1.5.1.

¹⁶⁹ Dio 63.23.1-2 claims that the soldiers of Vindex, stationed in Gaul, tore down the statues of Nero and shattered them as a way of showing their allegiance to their general, and Suetonius comments that the statues of Poppaea were dragged from their pedestals (*Ner.* 24.1). Galba is also said to have allowed the statues of Nero that were torn down to be re-erected (Suet. *Oth.* 7.1. trans. Graves); cf. Dio. 48.31.4, which recounts how the crowd at the games of Octavian and Antony deplored the pair's treatment of Cato and then proceeded to topple their statues. During the reign of Nero, itself, there are several humorous anecdotes about Romans showing their distaste for Nero by tying the sacks, which were used to put the parricides in before being thrown in the Tiber, over the heads of Nero's statues (Suet. *Ner.* 45.2).

emperor secretly placed on the Rostra at night.¹⁷⁰ Others, who were not sure how to react, simply tore down the statues of Nero and put them in safe keeping, until the political leadership of Rome was decided.¹⁷¹

Just as they had for hundreds of years, the people of Rome expressed their political sentiment through statues; those who hated Nero destroyed his statues to signify their newfound liberty, and those who still felt a sense of *officium*¹⁷² to Nero and the Julio-Claudian dynasty signified their loyalty through the erection of Neronian statues. Although there was indecision over political loyalty within the city, outside of Rome, the senators who had helped to bring the Julio-Claudian principate to an end were unambiguous in their intent. Senators who had endured the eccentricities of Nero and paid their dues to the emperor in order to gain their positions now saw an opportunity to seize the principate. Roman senators within Rome and those abroad with their troops saw that the Roman Empire was in a state of political flux, and with no Julio-Claudian left to claim the throne, Roman *ambitio* began to resurface.

Galba was the first general to be proclaimed emperor in the year following the death of Nero. Galba, a member of the distinguished *gens* of the Servii, was a man with a noble lineage¹⁷³ and a distinguished record of service to the state. He had been governor of Aquitania and in A.D. 33 held the consulship, followed by two more governorships, a proconsulship in Africa under Claudius, and an imperial legateship under Nero in

¹⁷⁰ Suet. *Ner.* 57.

¹⁷¹ The verb *reponere* ("to put back up") is used by Suetonius to refer to Galba's allowing statues of Nero to once again be put up. This means that many of the statues of Nero must have been stored somewhere and then brought back out following Galba's decree (Suet. *Oth.* 7.1.); Varner ((2004) 67-68 agrees. Also see the two statues of Nero found stored under the temple of Apollo in Tomei (1997) 78-79.

¹⁷² "duty," cf. Caes. *BG.* 5.27.7.

¹⁷³ In other words, many men in his family had held the consulship and were of senatorial rank, such as his father, Sulpicius Galba. Suetonius comments that Galba, while not being a Julian, was still from "a very great and ancient aristocratic house" (*Gal.* 2.1.).

Spain.¹⁷⁴ Galba had been a loyal and trusted friend of the Claudian family, and, as many senators did, used his connections with the imperial family to get ahead in a political system that depended more on one's connection to the emperor than one's merit.¹⁷⁵ He was a favorite of Livia Augusta, Augustus' wife, and was left the highest sum of money in her will.¹⁷⁶ Although Galba climbed the *cursus honorum* using his noble lineage and imperial *beneficia*,¹⁷⁷ by all accounts he was a fair and honest governor of his provinces and esteemed by the soldiers he commanded.

When Galba came to power he recognized that although he was of noble birth, he did not have an imperial lineage. So Galba used the tactics of many of the noble men of the late Republic and the Julians, themselves, and inflated his lineage on statues.¹⁷⁸

Suetonius claims that Galba

used to amplify the inscriptions on his own statues with the statement that Quintus Catulus Capitolinus was his great-grandfather; and when he became emperor he even had a tablet set up in the palace forecourt, tracing his ancestry back to Jupiter on the male and Pasiphae, Minos' wife, on the female side.¹⁷⁹

These claims, advertised on Galba's statues, not only created a divine lineage, but also connected him with a hero of the Republic who had fought to overthrow Sulla's constitution and was the last *princeps senatus* of the republican era.¹⁸⁰ Galba's

¹⁷⁴ Suet. *Galb.* 9.

¹⁷⁵ See on this phenomenon also Saller (1982) 42-78.

¹⁷⁶ Suet. *Galb.* 5.2. Although Galba was left a large sum by Livia, Suetonius claims that Tiberius refused to honor her will and ended up only giving him 5,000 sesterces, a very modest sum.

¹⁷⁷ "Favors": imperial *beneficia* were favors from the emperor, which included citizenship, magistracies, honors or anything else within the emperor's power to give (i.e. almost anything). But it should be recognized that these were not simply "presents" in our modern sense; *beneficia* were favors because they tied the recipient to the provider in a social bond, and were expected to be paid back in some form.

¹⁷⁸ The example of Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nasica, who erected a gilded statue of his ancestor and falsely credited him with the title of censor, and a descendant of Aemilius Paulus who put on his own statue that Paulus had received three triumphs (although he only received two), were previously given as examples of false attributions on statues in order to enhance one's lineage and prestige.

¹⁷⁹ Suet. *Galb.* 2.

¹⁸⁰ For Quintus Lutatius Catulus Capitolinus as the last head of the senate and as a republican hero, see Dio 36.13; Sall. *Cat.* 35; Suet. *Caes.* 15.

epigraphical claim to a divine lineage that traced back to Jupiter was most definitely an attempt to create a link with the Julii household, who traced their origins back to Venus, the daughter of Jupiter. Galba hearkened back to the paradigm of Augustus and used statues to communicate his own nobility to the populace.

Galba's attempts to legitimize and solidify his power were not successful. Although there is not much epigraphical evidence for Galban statues (many were destroyed following his assassination in the Forum on A.D. 69) we can deduce from ancient sources that they were in existence because of the mention of their desecration following his overthrow. Tacitus remarks that the first and fifth legions hurled stones at the images of Galba¹⁸¹ and that his statues on the Capitol were destroyed.¹⁸² Under Vespasian, the Senate voted to re-erect statues of Galba that had previously been outlawed, but Vespasian vetoed this measure on the grounds that Galba had plotted to have him killed.¹⁸³

The next senator to try his hand at ruling Rome was Otho, who seized the title of emperor after having Galba assassinated in the Forum on January of A.D. 69. He was then proclaimed emperor by his troops as they "...placed Otho on a platform on which they had stood the golden statue of Galba shortly before, and amidst the standards they surrounded him with their ensigns."¹⁸⁴ This scene once again illustrates the "ambiguous position between lifeless and lifelike"¹⁸⁵ that statues held in Roman society, and shows that statues continued to be a projection of power.

Although Otho only ruled for a few months, he attempted to utilize a different approach to visual communication than his predecessor had: instead of linking himself to

¹⁸¹ Tac. *Hist.* 1.55.

¹⁸² Plut. *Galb.* 26.7; Plut. *Galb.* 22.

¹⁸³ Suet. *Galb.* 23.

¹⁸⁴ Tac. *Hist.* 1.36.

¹⁸⁵ Stewart (2003) 113.

Jupiter—and by implication, the Julio-Claudian family--through his statues, Otho directly connected himself with Nero through an emphasis on their physical similarities, and then reinforced this connection when he allowed statues of Nero to be re-erected.¹⁸⁶ He further associated himself with the late emperor by allowing his followers to hail him as Nero Augustus, and made his first imperial decree an endowment for the completion of Nero's *Domus Aurea*.¹⁸⁷ In order to try to calm the social turmoil of the months following Nero's death, Otho presented himself not as a liberator, but as a continuator of the Julio-Claudian line, and used statues to advertise this visually.

Otho's attempt to distance himself from Galba and to connect himself with Nero was a clear attempt to legitimize his power.¹⁸⁸ Although Otho tried to connect himself with Nero as a means of legitimizing his seizure of the principate, he had only a few months to establish himself as emperor before being overthrown, and as a result, had little impact on the "other populace" of Rome. In April of A.D. 69 Otho was defeated at Cremona, and suffered the same fate as Galba: his statues were torn down to make room for a new senator with the *ambitio* to be emperor: Aulus Vitellius.¹⁸⁹

Although Vitellius had been proclaimed emperor by his troops in January of A.D. 69, the Senate did not formally declare him emperor until April, when Otho was defeated at Cremona.¹⁹⁰ Vitellius had little time to establish his own visual language within Rome, but ancient sources do comment that there were equestrian statues erected of him by his troops.¹⁹¹ Defecting troops also enacted their loyalty to Vespasian by tearing down

¹⁸⁶ Suet. *Oth.* 7.1. For Otho's fashioning of himself as the new Nero, see Tac. *Hist.* 1.78; Plut. *Oth.* 3; Varner (2004) 107.

¹⁸⁷ Suet. *Oth.* 7.2.

¹⁸⁸ See Varner (2004) 107-108.

¹⁸⁹ A colossal portrait of Otho was defaced and stuffed in a sewer in Ostia, and is a good example of how citizens within the Roman empire enacted the overthrow of an emperor by tearing down his statue (Calza (1964) 47 no.65.).

¹⁹⁰ Suet. *Vit.* 9-10.

¹⁹¹ Suet. *Vit.* 9.

Vitellius' statues,¹⁹² and when Vitellius was executed in the *Forum Romanum* following his overthrow, he was made to witness his own statues being torn down.¹⁹³ Vitellius' reign was tumultuous and unstable, and just eight months after gaining power Vitellius was deposed and dead.

The urban prefect, Flavius Sabinus, and his nephew, Domitian, were the organizers of the coup to overthrow Vitellius. Sabinus, who had once made all the troops of Rome swear allegiance to Vitellius, now seized the opportunity to put his own family in power.¹⁹⁴ A battle for the principate was fought in the city of Rome, itself, and when the Vitellians pursued Sabinus, Domitian, and the other Flavian supporters, they took refuge on the Capitol. Tacitus claims that Sabinus then used statues from the *Area Capitolina* to blockade the *Clivus Capitolinus*.¹⁹⁵ Tacitus, who remarks that "...they would have burst through the burnt gates of the Capitol, if Sabinus had not torn down all the available statues--the monuments of our ancestors glory--and built a sort of barricade on the very threshold,"¹⁹⁶ is clearly upset by the use of senatorial and equestrian statues from the Republic as a barricade. Although Tacitus does not give examples of specific statues used in the barricade, and does not say whether any were re-erected, he does say that following the Vitellian assault on the Capitol, it was burnt to the ground.¹⁹⁷ While there is no record of whether any of the statues that were torn down survived the fire, Sabinus' use of statues as a blockade coupled with the destruction of the Capitol certainly

¹⁹² Tac. *Hist.* 3.13.

¹⁹³ Tac. *Hist.* 3.85.

¹⁹⁴ Tac. *Hist.* 2.55.

¹⁹⁵ This was the single carriage road that led up to the Capitol. For Sabinus using the statues on the Capitol as a blockade: Tac. *Hist.* 3.71.

¹⁹⁶ "...ambustasque Capitolii fores penetrassent in Sabinus revulsas undique statuas, decora maiorum, in ipso auditu vici muri obiecisset" (Tac. *Hist.* 3.71).

¹⁹⁷ Tac. *Hist.* 3.71.3.

decreased the number of senatorial and equestrian statues remaining on the Capitoline hill.

Following the successful overthrow of Vitellius, Vespasian, the father of Domitian, was proclaimed emperor. Although Vespasian was born to an equestrian family, he achieved senatorial rank via familial connections, service to the state, and the favor of the emperor.¹⁹⁸ Suetonius explains that after the death of Nero and Galba, Vespasian had begun to remember his “imperial ambitions”¹⁹⁹ and campaigned for political support among his legions in the East and his fellow senators. After he was proclaimed emperor by the eastern troops and determined to be the only suitable candidate by the senate, Vespasian remained in the East, and waited for his son, brother, and Vitellius’ former lieutenants to overthrow Vitellius and secure Flavian rule. As Suetonius says, “the family of the Flavians at last brought stable government to the empire,” and in order to signify Vespasian’s supremacy and stability, statues of the new emperor were erected on the spots where the statues of Vitellius had briefly stood.²⁰⁰

The condemnation of the images of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius followed the precedents of *damnatio memoriae* set by Caligula and Nero.²⁰¹ Romans in the city and the provinces alike erected and tore down statues of each emperor to signify his ascension to, or removal from, the position of *princeps*. The destruction of these statues symbolized each leader’s fall from grace, and his removal from posterity. The destruction of the statues of these three men demonstrates the power that statues still held within Roman

¹⁹⁸ Suet. *Vesp.* 2.2: “...he put off his candidature for the broad purple stripe of senatorial rank...and in the end it was his mother who drove him to take this step.”

¹⁹⁹ Suet. *Vesp.* 5.1.

²⁰⁰ Tac. *Hist.* 3.13; Dio 64.10.3. One such statue that was reported to have been erected in the Campus Martius, is now in Copenhagen at the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (655a). The Campus Martius had previously been the training ground for the Roman army, but by this time had become filled with funeral steles, statues and trophies. The statue may have been erected here to commemorate Vitellius’ extensive military victories. See Zanker (1981) 346, 349; Varner (2004) 109; H. Meyer (2000) 63. Another statue of Vitellius was found in the Tiber river in Rome (Mlasowsky (1992) 86-93; Varner (2004) fig.105a-b).

²⁰¹ Varner (2004) 110.

culture to indicate power, loyalty, and dominance. As Stewart says, “the destruction of statues by crowds, and more importantly the loud, spectacular, and ritualized abuse of the toppled statue offered a symbolic clarification of an uncertain political situation.”²⁰² This certainly held true in the period of time between Nero’s death and Vespasian’s seizure of the emperorship. In this time of political turmoil, statue erection and destruction were indicators of political change and elucidated the political situation of the Roman Empire.

An examination of the statues of these four emperors reveals a resurfacing of Roman *ambitio*. Roman senators once again vied for the supreme position and used statues to communicate their authority. Although it cannot be stated definitively that statues of senators and equestrians were not erected in Rome during the so-called “year of four emperors,” it can be said that there is no epigraphic evidence to support the notion that statues were once again freely put up in the city. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius dominated Rome’s “other populace” and utilized visual communication during their short reigns just as the Julio-Claudians had. This brief revival of intense senatorial competition is conveyed through the erection and destruction of the statues of these four emperors, and reveals that the Roman desire for honor and power was not dispelled, it simply waited for the opportunity to arise.

During the principate of Vespasian beginning in A.D. 69, there is little epigraphical evidence that there were any statues of these senators and equestrians erected within Rome. One statue inscription does survive in the epigraphical record, dedicated to Lucius Baebius, but this is a rare exception.²⁰³ Almost every statue decreed

²⁰² Stewart (2003) 271.

²⁰³ *CIL* 6.1339 (*ILS* 1378): an inscription found in Rome, probably inscribed on a statue base, which is dedicated to Lucius Baebius, a former proconsul of the province of Lusitania. Baebius was an imperial legate under Vespasian and was then appointed to the province of Lusitania. For statues of the emperor and his family erected in Rome in this time period, see *ILS* 246 and *ILS* 258 (in the forum).

by the senate in Rome was of a member of the imperial family.²⁰⁴ Although Vespasian is not known to have outlawed the erection of senatorial and equestrian statues within Rome officially, the precedent set by Caligula, Claudius, and Nero of limiting senatorial and equestrian statues in the city was seemingly perpetuated. Rome had become the showcase of the emperor, and as was the case under the Julio-Claudians, the emperor realized the importance of dominating the visual landscape in order to project his own authority.

Vespasian's public buildings within Rome took on a colossal scale that projected a message very different from that of Augustus. Vespasian could not return to the myth of the Republic that Augustus had tried to perpetuate visually, nor did he wish to fabricate a divine lineage in order to link himself to the Julio-Claudians, as Galba had done.

Vespasian instead used monumental architecture and the visual commemoration of military achievements to communicate his power and military success to the populace of Rome. Just as Pompey had celebrated his victories in the east by building his theater on the Campus Martius, and Augustus had celebrated his victory at Philippi by building the temple of Mars Ultor, Vespasian commemorated his son's victories in Judaea with the massive Flavian Amphitheater (erected *ex manubiis* of the Judean war),²⁰⁵ the Arch of Titus, and the Temple of Peace.²⁰⁶ These buildings were imposing structures in the urban landscape of Rome and massive reminders of the power and military might of the Flavians.

By the time that Titus came to power in A.D. 79, public order had been restored to the empire, a new aristocracy had been created in order to perpetuate the Flavian

²⁰⁴ Of the estimated thirty-eight senatorial and equestrian statuary inscriptions dated to the Flavian time period recorded in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, only one inscription is from an honorary statue set up in Rome: *CIL* 6.1339.

²⁰⁵ Today the Flavian Amphitheater is popularly known as the "Colosseum" because of the colossal statue of Nero (transformed into the sun god, Helios) which is said to have been placed in front of the amphitheater.

²⁰⁶ Packer (2003) 170.

dynasty, and a new visual iconography had begun to emerge. Since Titus only reigned for two years, he had little time to add to the visual language that Vespasian had begun to formulate. Although he was able to finish the amphitheater in A.D. 80, he died shortly after beginning work on a large public bath structure on the slopes of the Oppian Hill.²⁰⁷ It was Domitian, the final Flavian heir, who would finish the projects embarked upon by his father and brother, and significantly affect what remained of the “other populace” of Rome.

Epigraphical evidence does not attest to any large-scale building in Rome by individual senators and equestrians at this time, nor are there any indications of a resurgence of senatorial and equestrian statues in Rome during the reigns of either Titus or Domitian. The statues that were erected by the Senate were voted either to Titus, Domitian, Domitia, or other imperial family members. Although it too is an imperial statue, the statue dedicated by Domitian to his uncle, Flavius Sabinus, is noteworthy for its placement within the forum of Augustus.²⁰⁸ Sabinus had been a man of senatorial rank and prefect of the city when he was killed in the revolt against Vitellius. Domitian’s erection of a statue of Sabinus in the forum of Augustus may have been an attempt by Domitian to associate his uncle with the *summi viri* housed in the *exedrae* of the Augustan Forum, and an effort to communicate the eminence of the Flavian *gens* to the populace of Rome. Domitian’s erection of a statue for his uncle is certainly similar to Augustus’ placement of a statue for his great-uncle-by-adoption, Marius, in the same forum. Although inscriptions and iconography do not suggest that Domitian tried to associate himself with the Julio-Claudians *gens*, he certainly attempted to show the

²⁰⁷ Suet. *Tit.* 7.3; Dio 66.25.1.

²⁰⁸ *ILS.* 984: [---leg. divi. Clau]di pro pr. Provin[c. Moesiae cur. census] Gallici praef. urb[i iterum. Huic] senatus auctor[e imp. Caes. Vesp]asiano fratre [clu]peum po]suit vadimon[is honoris cau]sa dilates [funus censorium] censuit sta[tuam in for]o Augusti [ponendam decrevit]. The statue was erected during Flavian rule, and the phrase “*funus censorium*” provides a terminus post quem since Sabinus was not given a funeral at public expense until the reign of Domitian (Tac. *Hist.* 4.47).

prominence of the Flavian *gens* in its own right, and used images of prominent senators of the Flavian line in order to express this.

Domitian's numerous building projects within Rome demonstrated little regard for the senators and equestrians who had originally erected the buildings which he restored. Suetonius remarks that "he restored a great many important buildings that were now gutted ruins, including the Capitol, which had now been burned down again but allowed no names to be inscribed on them, except his own--not even the original builder's."²⁰⁹ The burning of the Capitol and its statues significantly affected the "other populace" of Rome, which had already been decreased by the fire of A.D. 64, the destruction of the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the demolition of the statues used by Sabinus to blockade the *Clivus Capitolinus*, and the Vitellian assault on the Capitol. The fact that Domitian rebuilt the Capitol without any inscriptions attributed to others besides himself leaves little hope that very many of the senatorial and equestrian statues erected on the Capitol in the republican era still stood.²¹⁰ Instead of re-erecting republican statues, Domitian adorned his newly restored Capitol with statues of himself,²¹¹ and issued a decree that images dedicated to him on the Capitol had to be of either silver or gold.²¹²

Domitian made his love for statues made from precious metals well known, and as a result,

He was voted so many honors of this kind that virtually the whole world under his rule was filled with his likenesses and

²⁰⁹ Suet. *Dom.* 5. Also see Eutrop. 7.23.2; Oros. 7.10.2. The fire on the Capitol was during the reign of Titus, in A.D. 80. It should be kept in mind that it was considered disrespectful not at least to acknowledge the previous builder of a building that one restored. When Hadrian rebuilt the Pantheon, he was noted for not putting his name along with Marcus Agrippa's as builders of the temple (*CIL.* 6.896; 31196).

²¹⁰ In A.D. 71 Vespasian rebuilt the Capitol (Tac. *Hist.* 4.4; 4.9; 4.53; Dio 66.10; Hier. *Chron.* 2089 (trans. Donalson)). Titus began only a small part of the rebuilding following the fire of A.D. 80 (Suet. *Tit.* 8; *CIL.* 6.2059), and then Domitian completed the project (Mart. 6.10; *CIL.* 6.2059; Stat. 1.6.102; Suet. *Dom.* 5). See Bourne (1941) 54-69 for more on Flavian building projects.

²¹¹ A.D. 91 (Hier. *Chron.* 2107).

²¹² Suet. *Dom.* 13.2.

statues made of silver and gold.²¹³

Rome became saturated with statues of the self-proclaimed “*dominus et deus*”²¹⁴ of the Roman world. Domitian’s statues and numerous building projects quickly, however, became objects of mockery and contempt. The Roman poet Statius remarked on imposing buildings and statues of Domitian, and commented on the massive statue of Domitian placed on the Capitol overlooking the Forum: saying, “what mass, redoubled by the colossus placed above it, stands embracing the Latin forum?”²¹⁵ Through gilded statues and colossal buildings, Domitian changed the visual language of Rome, yet the senators of Rome did not readily accept Domitian’s vain attempts at projecting his own power. As with Nero and Caligula, the oppression of the aristocracy and superfluous accolades provoked rebellion, and the actions of Domitian conjured this revolutionary sentiment once again.

Domitian was assassinated in A.D. 96 and quickly voted a *damnatio memoriae* by the senate.²¹⁶ The senate had enjoyed great freedom during the years A.D. 68 and 69, and had been esteemed during the reign of Vespasian and Titus, but Domitian’s despotic behavior left the senate feeling as though they once again lived under the tyrannical thumb of Nero.²¹⁷ The senate had already fully realized its ability to alter the course of the principate in the years 68 and 69, and Domitian’s actions towards the new aristocracy

²¹³ Dio 67.8.1.

²¹⁴ “Master and god” (Suet. *Dom.* 1.3; Dio 67.4.7).

²¹⁵ Stat. *Silv.* 1.1.87-8. trans. Baehrens.

²¹⁶ Suet. *Dom.* 23.

²¹⁷ Varner (2004) 111: “As a result of his despotic behavior and ruthless persecution of the senatorial aristocracy, Domitian was assassinated on 18 September 96. On Domitian’s oppressive acts towards the senate, see Jones (1979). Domitian also held the title of perpetual censor, which allowed him to revise the senatorial roll and expel anyone he wished from the order (*ILS* 269). Suetonius comments that Domitian enacted strenuous treason laws on the aristocracy so that he could fund his building program: “The new building program, added to his entertainments and the rise in army pay, exhausted Domitian’s resources; so he decided to reduce his expenditure by cutting down the military establishment. But then realizing that this would expose his frontiers to barbarian attack without appreciably easing the financial situation, he resorted unhesitatingly to every form of extortion. Any charge... might result in the confiscation of a man’s property, even if he were already dead” (Suet. *Dom.* 12).

gave them cause to again depose the current ruler in favor of a more agreeable emperor.²¹⁸

Pliny the Younger, a senator during the reign of Domitian, later recounted the public response to the senatorial decree of Domitian's *damnatio memoriae*.

However his countless golden statues, in a heap of rubble and ruin, were offered as fitting sacrifice to the public joy. It was a delight to smash those arrogant faces to pieces in the dust, to threaten them with the sword, and savagely attack them with axes, as if blood and pain would follow every single blow. No one controlled their joy and long-awaited happiness, when vengeance was taken in beholding his likenesses hacked into mutilated limbs and pieces, and above all, in seeing his savage and hideous portraits hurled into the flames and burned up, in order that they might be transformed from things of such terror and menace into something useful and pleasing.²¹⁹

Pliny's vivid image of the mutilation and burning of Domitian's statues illustrates the political fervor of the moment and again anthropomorphizes statues. Domitian was neither the first nor the last emperor to place numerous statues of himself within the city, but as Pliny shows, their abundance could still be a source of contempt. Imperial domination of the "other populace" of statues within Rome had become commonplace by the late first century A.D.,²²⁰ and although the "wisdom and restraint"²²¹ of Domitian's successors would again increase influence of the senate, senatorial and equestrian statues never again flourished within the city of Rome. By A.D. 96 Rome had become the showcase for imperial power, and the emperor its only patron.

The Rome of A.D. 96 would have been unrecognizable to a Roman Republican from the second century B.C. Statues on the Capitol of prominent Republican heroes such as Scipio Africanus and Aemilius Paullus had been removed, and statues of the

²¹⁸ Suetonius makes it clear that it was the senatorial class who instigated the coup and desired the assassination of Domitian the most. While the soldiers cried for his deification, the senate sent for ladders in order to tear his statues from their pedestals (Suet. *Dom.* 23).

²¹⁹ Plin. *Pan.* 52.4-5 (trans. Radice).

²²⁰ Stewart (2003) 158.

²²¹ Suet. *Dom.* 23.

imperial family stood in their place. Three new forums now flanked the old *Forum Romanum* and were dominated by gilded and bronze statues of the emperors and their families. Permanent theaters, such as the theater of Marcellus and the theater of Pompey, now stood adorned with statues of the imperial family and favored magistrates. Temples such as the Temple of the Divine Julius and the Temple of Peace now dominated the Roman Forum and in the middle stood emperors, depicted as Gods. The city was no longer filled with a vast number of statues of senators and equestrians; it was now saturated with imperial statues, some gold, some silver, but all outshining the marble senators and equestrians of the Republic.

The visual language of Rome had completely changed in a little less than 300 years. The population of statues that had once been representative of the *populus* of Rome was now a reflection of the supremacy of the imperial family. Senators and equestrians who had communicated their candidacy for office, commemorated their ancestors, or advertised their accomplishments with statues were silenced. The rulers of Rome saw statues as a powerful and evocative means of communication that could be both harnessed, to project the power of the emperor, and controlled, to limit others from rivaling this power. As a result senators and equestrians became totally dependent on the emperor for recognition and statuary commemoration in the public areas of the city of Rome. The restrictions on the erection of statues reflect the oppressive tactics of the emperor, but also reveal the significance and power of statues in Roman society.

Even though the emperor dominated and controlled statue erection within Rome, control of senatorial and equestrian statues did not usually extend out to the provinces. Although the imperial decree issued by Caligula, which stated that no statues would be erected for anyone other than the emperor, must have had an effect on statue erection,

this is the only known instance of a formal decree applying to the entire empire that prohibited statue erection. Since provincials were free to erect statues of whomever they wished, a provincial outlet was created for the *ambitio* of the Roman nobility. Roman senators and in some cases, equestrians who could not compete with the emperor in Rome, now competed amongst themselves for promagisterial positions in the provinces, and found new clients in the provinces that would satiate their hunger for accolades. Zanker's observation that senators and equestrians no longer strove for honors simply because the emperor controlled them, did not take into account the opportunity for honor that the provinces provided.²²²

Although there was an inexorable decrease in the number of senatorial and equestrian statues within Rome following the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., the number of senatorial and equestrian statues within the provinces began to increase. This shift of senatorial and equestrian statues, from primarily within the city of Rome to predominantly in provincial towns, is in direct response to the political shift from senatorial to monarchic rule brought about by the principate of Augustus. Augustus established himself as the ruler of the Roman Empire relegated the senators and equestrians to Italian and provincial cities. The *princeps* was the supreme patron, but indirect rule encouraged patron-client relationships between provincial towns and their Roman promagistrates or notables, relationships that were then expressed visually through statues.²²³ When Augustus dominated the visual landscape of Rome, Roman elite

²²² Zanker (1998) 291.

²²³ Tanner (2000) 18-50; Gelzer (1969) 87: "The evidence permits us to conclude that virtually every governor acquired positions of patronage in the province under his control."

redirected their *ambitio* into the *provinciae*.²²⁴ Roman *ambitio* was never quelled under the empire; it was simply rerouted.

While senatorial and equestrian statues within Rome became--as had been true in the early Republic--only the rarest of honorific rewards, statues outside Rome were utilized much in the way that late Republican statues had been: as visual proclamations of power that could also establish or fortify social and political relationships. Statues were mutually beneficial to both the patron and the client, and senators and equestrians were especially receptive to statues as a display of gratitude from the provinces since they so rarely received them from the emperor or Roman senate.²²⁵

As has been demonstrated before, the prestige of these statues was amplified by its placement in a prominent area. Verres' statue in the Syracusan senate house showed his importance within the Syracusan community, and his insistence that the people of Tyndaris erect his statue beside the statues of the city's patrons, the Marcelli, also reveals the importance of a statue's placement in portraying its message. Tanner claims that the location of a statue indicated the esteem which the city held for the person honored, and says that the "precise location of the statue inflected the level of honor."²²⁶ Dio also emphasized the importance of the *locus* of a statue when he commented that Marcus Nonius Balbus was awarded an equestrian statue '*celeberrimo loco*' for his patronage to Herculaneum.²²⁷ The place where a statue was erected was part of the honor. A senatorial statue placed in the middle of a forum or in the senate house of a provincial or Italian

²²⁴ Stewart (2003) 158; "...outside the capital the social spectrum of potential honorands was somewhat extended." This opportunity is attested to by the sheer number of elite statues, mostly senatorial, that have been found all over the provinces. Most of these statues are dedicated specifically to the town's patron, see *IGRR* 6. 902; *ILS* 9484; *ILS* 8816; *SIG* 811; *ILS* 273. These are all statuary inscriptions for a patron of a provincial town during the reigns of Caligula, Claudius, or Nero: imperial rulers who restricted statue erection in Rome.

²²⁵ For the receptiveness of Roman senators to statues in the provinces see Tanner (2000) 31-48.

²²⁶ Tanner (2000) 32.

²²⁷ "in the busiest place" (Dio 50.2.3). Also see Stewart's assessment of Balbus and his statue (Stewart (2003) 160).

town was a status symbol for the Roman represented and also allowed these towns to announce their loyalty to their patron or benefactor and to Rome.

Statues such as the one of Verres erected in the Syracusan senate-house were an important means of promoting the relationship of certain provincial cities and provincial elites with Roman patrons. Although the statues functioned as a way of adding to the prestige of a patron, provincial statues served a more important purpose in the Republic and early empire of Rome: they solidified the relationship between the patron and the client while advertising the protection of a Roman senator over a province or a city.²²⁸

The patron-client relationship was a well-defined social relationship in Roman culture that established a *quid pro quo* relationship between two socially unequal parties. A patron provided legal services for his clients, spoke on their behalf in political matters, and came to their defense if threatened. In return, a client was expected to be loyal to his patron, following him to the Senate house in the morning with the rest of his clients and rallying support for him during elections.²²⁹ As mentioned before, clients often erected statues for their patron that further advertised the relationship between the two men, added to the prestige of the patron, and curried favor with the patron for the client.²³⁰

Although the public honors that a client bestowed on his patron advertised the relationship between the client and his patron, the relationship was reinforced by the physical presence of the client with the patron. The client's physical support daily

²²⁸ Although there are a few cases of prominent equestrians having statues voted to them by provincial cities for their handsome benefactions, private clients within the provinces were normally the only ones who erected statues for equestrians in the provinces. It was in a city or province's best interests, especially in the Republic, to befriend a senator who could represent their interests in the senate, rather than an equestrian, who did not carry much political clout. The imperial exception is of course the prefect of the province of Egypt who was always an equestrian from the time of Augustus on (Tac. *Ann.* 2.59). These imperial magistrates also established patron-client bonds with their Egyptian subjects. For statues of prefects in Egypt see: *CIL* 11. 5382; *ILS* 1335.

²²⁹ cf. Juv. *Sat.* 1.96-139; 5.

²³⁰ For more examples of clients dedicating statues to their patrons in Rome, see Plin. *NH* 34.17; *CIL* 6.4374; 4377; 4741; 4779; 8604. Also see Gardner and Wiedemann (1991) 149-183.

reinforced the social bond of patron and client. But as prominent senators and equestrians began to increase their influence in Italian towns and patronize clients from all over Italy, the physical presence of the client was not always possible. Furthermore, powerful patrons began to gain not only individual clients from Italian municipalities, and *coloniae*, but whole towns as clients.

When Rome emerged as the superpower of the Mediterranean following the conclusion of the First Punic War in 241 B.C., it became increasingly vital for Mediterranean and Italian cities to ally themselves with Roman senators, who could then represent their interests in the Senate, defend them if they were ever threatened by an outside force, and advocate their cause in court. Since these provincial cities could not reinforce the patron-client relationship with a physical presence in Rome, the awarding of statues was used as a form of mediation between the client and the patron in order to convey loyalty and *referre gratiam*,²³¹ thus solidifying the social contract.²³² Tanner notes that statues were also used as a way of creating a moral obligation of a patron to repay the honor that a provincial town bestowed.²³³ A statue of a Roman patron communicated a patron's power and protection from its pedestal to the retinue of clients below.

²³¹ "To return thanks," although the idiom of *gratiam agere* is commonly used to represent "giving thanks," the term *gratiam referre* is a technical term used by the Romans specifically to denote a response to the giving of *beneficia* (benefits) by a patron or by the gods: cf. *CIL* 9.5417; Tac. *Ann.* 11.15; Cic. *Ad Fam.* 1.9.19; Cicero comments that Vatinius *reditus in gratiam per Pompeium*. Also, Gelzer (1969) 75-77; Saller (1982) 23-25.

²³² See Tanner (2000) 36; Badian (1958) 148-51.

²³³ Tanner (2000) 28. Also see Seneca's *On Benefits*, which lays out the rules of friendship, patron and client relationships, and receiving *beneficia* quite well. "So I must be selective with regard to the man from whom I am to receive a benefit; we must certainly be more careful in our choice of a person to who we are to owe a benefit than to one whom we are to owe money. I have to give back to a creditor to whom I owe money what I received from him; when I have given it back, I am released and free from any obligation. But I have to give to someone whom I owe a benefit back even more than I received, and even when I have repaid my gratitude, we still remain bound to one another..." (Sen. *De Ben.* 2.18.5 trans. Stewart).

Evidence for statues dedicated by a province or Italian town to its patron begins in the second century B.C. and goes well through the era of the Flavians.²³⁴ Quintus Marcius Philippus, the consul of 169 B.C., had a statue dedicated to him by the Achaians,²³⁵ and Gnaeus Octavius received a statue from the city of Eleans for his patronal support.²³⁶ The patronage of a city soon became an honor almost exclusively reserved for the Roman senatorial aristocracy, a logical progression since Italian and provincial towns needed someone who could represent their interests in the senate. Tanner comments that

By the end of the second century and the beginning of the first century B.C., the title of patron on such statue bases is regularly attested...this term [patron] is used in effect exclusively for Rome promagistrates or envoys, that is to say members of the governing senatorial elite in Rome.²³⁷

Cicero writes that the Capuans awarded him a gilded statue upon his acceptance of their request to establish him as patron of their town,²³⁸ and Cicero also attests to the fact that there were numerous statues awarded to Verres, the governor and patron of Sicily.²³⁹ Lucius Tullius was awarded a statue by the Delphians in 62 B.C. for his patronage,²⁴⁰ Lucius Calpurnius Piso (cos. 58) was awarded six statues for his patronage to various towns,²⁴¹ and Pompeius Magnus (cos. 70) received numerous statues from his vast number of clients.²⁴² *Summi viri* of the Republic gained prestige by adding to their lists of clients, and statues within the provincial towns and Italian cities denoted the protection of

²³⁴ Stewart (2003) 160-171. e.g. *ILS* 1085: an honorific inscription for Quintus Servilius, the patron of Bisicae, circa A.D. 161: *Q. Servilio Pudenti, Q. Servili Pudentis procos. filio, patrono municipii, d. p. p.*; *ILS* 1097 (circa reign of Trajan); *ILS* 1122 (circa 186).

²³⁵ *SIG* 649.

²³⁶ *IG* 7.3490.

²³⁷ Tanner (2000) 37.

²³⁸ Cic. *In Pis.* 25.

²³⁹ Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.154-160.

²⁴⁰ *CIG* 1.1695.

²⁴¹ Eilers (2002) C2; C28; C29; C57; C147; C121.

²⁴² Eilers (2002) C146: from Side, "[The people honoured] with godlike [Gnaeus Pompeius] Magnus, son of [Gnaeus], [imperator...], their patron [and benefactor];" Colophon (C92); Ilium (C66); Miletus (C95), and Pompeiopolis (C149).

a powerful Roman patron. In the late Republic, this protection was especially essential because of the constant shifts in political power among the senatorial aristocracy.

The provinces were far from the central imperial government in Rome, and most were without the rights such as suffrage that Roman citizens had. However, the *coloniae* of the empire and the Italian cities, which were connected to the Rome through ties of citizenship and ancestry present a liminal area between the imperial monopolization of the “other populace” in Rome and the less imperially-centered provinces, which tended to favor statues of their Roman promagistrates in order to create or solidify patron-client relationships. Since the Italian cities and the *coloniae* of the empire interacted more closely with Rome and its citizens could vote in the assemblies at Rome, imperial influence came more directly to them and affected the “other populaces” inhabiting colonial and Italian cities.

The colonies of Rome had originally been settlements for retired Roman veterans. These men were Roman citizens who were granted a high degree of self-governance in their own towns, but who could also vote within the city of Rome. The Italian allies, consisting of the towns within Italy that were not Roman colonies, received full citizenship following the Social War (91-89 B.C.).²⁴³ The *Lex Plautia Papiria* transformed Italy into a confederation of municipal states, and allowed many of the prominent aristocracy of the *municipia* into the senate.²⁴⁴ Other cities such as Italica and Saguntum were also eventually granted municipal status. These colonies and municipalities came to be firmly tied to Rome, and as full Roman citizens had more rights and privileges than any provincial city.

²⁴³ App. BC 1.231; Vell. Pat. 11.17.1.

²⁴⁴ Asc. In *Piso*. 3.

There were many senators from Roman municipalities and colonies in the senate by the first century B.C., including Marius, who was from the municipality of Arpinum. The municipalities and colonies within Italy had become almost synonymous by the time of the principate, and consisted of Romans who, while maintaining strong ties with Rome, were allowed their own local self-governance. Using honorific statues to communicate more directly with the emperor, while also using honorific statues to honor their local elite.

In *Attic Nights*, Aulus Geilius commented that, “colonies seem to be miniatures, as it were, and in a way copies.”²⁴⁵ By the end of the Augustan era this had indeed become true. Many of the Italian cities and Roman *coloniae* that had, during the Republic, been filled with statues of local elite as well as a few prominent senators, became saturated with imperial monuments following the establishment of the principate, just like Rome. Through the Julio-Claudian and into the Flavian era, these “miniatures” of Rome reflected a dissemination of imperial iconography from Rome to the closely knit towns surrounding her.

The statues of the colony of Pompeii reflect this change in Roman *coloniae* and *municipia* from late Republic to the early Empire, and since Pompeii remains frozen in the year A.D. 79, it provides a pristine picture of the “other populace” within it at that time. During the Republic Pompeii was filled primarily with statues of the local elite. Although there are occasional statues to prominent Roman senators, such as the founder of the colony, Publius Sulla, Pompeii honored the local elite of the city with statues much more frequently. These statues filled the porticoes enclosing the forum, marked the corners of highly trafficked streets, and spoke their accomplishments to passersby.²⁴⁶ Yet

²⁴⁵ Aul. Gell. *Att. Nig.* 16.14.2.

²⁴⁶ Zanker (1998) 102.

with the founding of the principate, Pompeii's visual landscape was profoundly changed. The strong influence of the emperor was evident throughout the city, as statues of one-time patrons and local magistrates were moved in order to make way for the supreme *patronus*, Augustus.

There are only four known patrons of the city: Publius Sulla, a nephew of Sulla who was charged with establishing the colony,²⁴⁷ Marcus Holconius Rufus, a local elite who was patron during the late Augustan era,²⁴⁸ Marcellus, Augustus' nephew and son-in-law,²⁴⁹ and a local man of unknown rank, Quintus Sallustius.²⁵⁰ Although there is no known statue of Publius, all of the other three patrons had statues erected for them by the town councilors of Pompeii.²⁵¹

With the establishment of the principate, the town councilors moved the statues of the local elite in order to make room for an arch with a *quadriga* on top of it, which resembled the *quadriga* in the forum of Augustus.²⁵² The remaining statues were then arranged between the columns in the porticoes around the forum, and looked much like the *summi viri* of in the *exedrae* of the *Forum Augustum*. Later, two more *quadrigae* were added, as well as a large, bronze, equestrian statue of Augustus in the center of the forum. Augustus' new monuments dominated the forum of Pompeii and filled the area with imperial iconography. The Pompeian forum, which had once reflected the autonomy and self-sufficiency of the colony in its erection of statues of the local elite, now reflected the strong influence of the emperor in Pompeian society.

²⁴⁷ Cic. *Pro Sul.* 62.

²⁴⁸ Cooley (2004) 128: "...being selected as one of the few men known to have been the colony's patron." Attested to by *CIL* 10.830.

²⁴⁹ *CIL* 10.832.

²⁵⁰ *CIL* 10.792.

²⁵¹ Rufus : a statue erected near the Stabian baths on one of main streets of the city (*CIL* 10.830).

Marcellus : a statue was erected for him opposite the main entrance to the triangular forum, also a highly prominent place (*CIL* 10.832). Sallustius: His statue was set up in the forum of Pompeii (*CIL* 10.792).

²⁵² *Ibid.* 102-103.

Zanker remarks that “the overall effect in creating the new monuments--which doubtless honored members of the imperial family--was to marginalize the town’s most illustrious citizens; their lesser significance was also reflected in the figure’s relative size.” These huge imperial monuments overshadowed the statues of the local elite along the steps of the portico, and the statues of local elite were again diminished in prominence toward the end of the Augustan age, when even more colossal imperial monuments were erected on the north end of the forum.

Zanker proposes that it was during this building in the forum that the town magistrates took the opportunity to remove many statues of local magistrates and reassemble them in the *chalcidium* of Eumachia.²⁵³ The imperial statues of Augustus spoke of the power and prestige of the emperor from their bronze horses, and dominated the significant spatial areas of the city such as the forum. Just as Gellius had said, the colony of Pompeii became a miniature of Rome, and emanated the power of the emperor just as eagerly it did.

Because of their full citizenship within the empire, the *coloniae* and *municipia* in Italy did not have to pursue Roman senators as patrons as relentlessly as the provinces did.²⁵⁴ This is not to say that patrons of colonial or municipal cities did not exist, but since senators from these cities already had strong ties to Rome, the establishment of such a bond was not as imperative as it was in the provinces. During the imperial age these cities began to resemble Rome, and to erect numerous statues of the emperor. Stewart comments that “..statues of Roman towns collapse the distance between the emperor and the local nobility, collectively embodying but also telescoping the social and

²⁵³ Zanker (1998) 104.

²⁵⁴ See Jones (1979) 98-145 for a list of all the senators and their birthplaces in the time of Domitian.

political hierarchy of the Empire.”²⁵⁵ Statues of senators and equestrians were in fact more numerous in the provinces than anywhere else,²⁵⁶ and this phenomenon shows the need for an aristocratic mediator in places without the benefit of Roman citizenship, and without the geographic, political, and social ties to Rome that the Italian colonies and municipalities had.

Quid Pro Quo: Statues in Provincial Society

Although the Italian colonies and municipalities could more easily reach the emperor without a senatorial or equestrian mediator, the provinces of the empire, which were without suffrage and political representation, had the need for a middle-man. The number of *patronus-et-clientes* relationships involving towns increased as the empire expanded, and as Claude Eilers says, the *patrocinium* of provincial towns began to flourish in the late Republic because it was “advantageous for a provincial city to have a senatorial patron in Rome to defend its interests before his peers.”²⁵⁷

With the establishment of the principate, the provincials of the Roman Empire had to adopt two patrons: the emperor and their governor. Indeed, provincial cities visually recognized the patronage of the supreme patron, Augustus, but accepted and honored the new promagistrates sent out by Augustus to govern the provinces as more direct patrons.²⁵⁸ Although Eilers correctly identifies the need for patrons in the Republic, he unjustifiably argues that patronage became unnecessary following the establishment of

²⁵⁵ Stewart (2003)159.

²⁵⁶ See *EJ* 192: a commemorative dedication on a statue base given by a wife to her husband, the senator Gnaeus Baebius Tampilus, during the Augustan age. The inscription was found outside of Rome. *EJ* 198: A statue erected by the Claudenses of the Claudian prefecture for their patron, senator Gnaeus Pullius Pollio. *EJ* 217: A statue erected by a client for his patron, Lucius Cassius Longinus, 31 B.C. in Ruscino. Small. 233: A statue erected by the daughter of Titus Helvius Basila in Atina (Latium) where the family was from.

²⁵⁷ Eilers (2002) 180.

²⁵⁸ Saller (1982) 147-151. Saller uses a study of the Roman province of North Africa as to attest to the importance of Roman governors as patrons.

the principate.²⁵⁹ As we will see, the principate did not obviate the need for patronage within the empire, in fact, the provincial magistracies during the imperial age encouraged the formation of patron-client relationships.

The governors of a province had four spheres of influence within a provincial city--municipal elections and honors, finance, military control and building--and within each sphere there exists literary and epigraphical evidence of patronage.²⁶⁰ Gubernatorial letters of recommendation and *statuae* speak both to the influence of the governor, and to the necessity of patronal support in the Roman administrative system.²⁶¹ Because a governor had such vast authority over magisterial positions, legal matters, and honors, he acted in many ways as the *princeps* of his province. Likewise, provincial cities appeased the governor in the same way as the Roman senate appeased the *princeps*, by conferring numerous honors upon him. Provincial cities recognized that it was imperative to utilize the Roman system of patronage as a means of advancement and protection. In the *Moralia*, Plutarch tells a young, fellow Greek politician that

Not only is it necessary for a statesman to keep himself and his home city blameless towards the rulers, but also always to have some friend in the circles of the most powerful as a firm support for the city. For the Romans themselves are best disposed towards the civic exertions of friends. And it is good that those who enjoy benefits from friendship with the powerful use it for the prosperity of the city,²⁶²

Provincial notables and cities established patronal bonds with their governors, governors who had already established a patronal bond with the emperor, each using honors to

²⁵⁹ Eilers (2002) 181.

²⁶⁰ Saller (1982) 155.

²⁶¹ This necessity for patronal support in political mobility is evident in *commendationes* (letters of recommendation) written by governors for *amici* and *clientela*. See Plin. *Ep.* 4.15.1-2; 2.13; 7.22; Cic. *Ad Fam.* 13.6a; 13.6b. Inscriptions on statues also attest to the great benefactions of a gubernatorial patron towards his city. Patronal relationships could help a city to flourish and a benefactor for public building was always in high demand. See Small. (1967) 265 for an inscription from Iconium that proclaims Lucius Pupius Praesens the "benefactor and founder" of the city. Levick claims that the word "founder" in Greek inscriptions specifically implies substantial building or rebuilding within a city (Levick (1985) 149).

²⁶² Plut. *Mor.* 814c.

solidify this relationship. This socially dynamic network of empire-wide patronage and cohesion through honors helped to make the Roman Empire a cohesive unit.

The issue of the importance of patron-client relationships in the early empire is a heavily debated subject. Claude Eilers argues that the establishment of the principate meant a diminution of the importance of patron-client relationships: "the very existence of the emperor, combined with the ease with which provincial cities could approach him with their problems, undercut the cities' needs for senatorial patrons."²⁶³ Yet the establishment of the principate did not obviate the need for an aristocracy nor did it reduce that aristocracy's desire for honors. Honorific inscriptions on statue bases are evidence of the importance of the patron-client relationship between senatorial promagistrates and their provincial *clientes* during the empire, and make clear that the Roman nobility still welcomed the honor of a statue.

Hundreds of statues erected in the provinces during the early empire attest to the significance of a senatorial patron to a provincial community.²⁶⁴ Statues visually articulated the inherent patron-client relationship between provincial governors and their subjects,²⁶⁵ solidified their social bond, and were above all used as a way to appease the governor. The governors of a province were the immediate source of Roman authority

²⁶³ Eilers (2002) 181.

²⁶⁴ e.g., *EJ* 198: an Augustan-era statue set up in the Forum Clodii in Etruria, dedicated to the town's patron, Gnaeus Pullius Pollio; *EJ* 378b: a statue inscription dedicated by the Callatians during the Augustan era to Publius Vinicius, the patron and benefactor of Callatia; *EJ* 204: a statue dedicated to Publius Silius, a *propraetorian* legate who was the patron of New Carthage during the Augustan age; *EJ* 205: a dedicatory inscription to Quintus Varius Geminus, a man of senatorial rank during the Augustan era, and the first man from Superaequum to reach senatorial rank. On becoming part of the senatorial order, he became patron to his native city, and was decreed this statue by the Superaequian senate. *EJ* 213: an inscription from Samnium during the reign of Tiberius that is dedicated to the city's patron, a man of senatorial rank who had served as *propraetor* under Augustus; *ILG* 633: a Tiberian age inscription dedicated to Publius Memmius Regulus, a man of senatorial rank who was patron to Ruscino. See Saller (1982) 195-199 for patronal inscriptions from North Africa. Harmand (1957) 120-200 lists numerous honorific statues erected for patrons in the early Empire. Also see *ILS* 989, *CIL* 3.335, and *ILS* 1005, further examples of statues erected during the Flavian era for senatorial patrons.

²⁶⁵ "The evidence permits us to conclude that virtually every governor acquired positions of patronage in the province under his control" (Gelzer (1969) 87).

within a province, and contrary to the claim of Eilers, the emperor was not easily accessible to most provincials.²⁶⁶ It was therefore a Roman promagistrate's job to mediate between the two.²⁶⁷ Provincial governors were given great powers to govern their provinces, and it was in the best interests of provincials to gain the favor of the Roman magistrate in charge of the province. Statues immediately established a social bond between the erector of the statue and the person depicted, and this bond helped to develop social cohesion between Rome and her empire.²⁶⁸

Saller is correct in saying that "for patronage to have disappeared, the entire nature of Roman society (not just politics) would have had to undergo a radical transformation."²⁶⁹ As statue inscriptions show, the establishment of the principate did not obviate the need for the nobility and while statues of Roman senators erected in the provinces indicate that imperial men dominated the "other populace" of Rome, the provinces had a strong senatorial population in residence.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁶ See Epictetus' use of his admission to Caesar's court as a symbol of his ascendancy into political high-society and imperial favor (Epic. *Diss.* 1.10.2-6). The emperor only personally read letters from high-ranking Roman magistrates and personal *amici* (Millar (1977) 469) and was only available for a short period of time in the morning, known as the daily *salutatio* (Pliny *Ep.* 3.5.9). Dinner parties with the emperor were by personal invitation only (e.g. Suet. *Vesp.* 2.3), and only senators could attend senate meetings where the emperor presided. Pliny claimed that the preferred way to request something from the emperor was through face-to-face communication (*Ep.* 10.94), but the emperor was clearly off-limits to the common man. Because of this, Roman governors became the mediators between emperor and subject.

²⁶⁷ For provincial governors as mediators, see Saller (1982) 167-185.

²⁶⁸ "...to give a portrait statue in return for beneficia received and in expectation of those to come was tantamount to entering into a relationship of clientela with the recipient as patron" (Tanner (2000) 31).

²⁶⁹ Saller (1982) 120. Also note Saller's comment that "...when the selection of magistrates and the passage of legislation were effectively taken out of the hands of the assemblies, it has been thought by some that patronage should have disappeared." Saller then goes on to dispute this view.

²⁷⁰ For example, there are fifty-three surviving dedicatory patronage inscriptions from the province of North Africa alone (Saller (1982) 195-199). It must be noted that there were still many imperial statues within the temples and *fora* of the provinces and Italian municipalities, but since the emperor did not limit senatorial and equestrian statues in these areas, their numbers were free to grow unless torn down by order of the town's senate or political leader. The exception to this rule is found during the reign of Caligula whom, Suetonius claims, decreed that "no statue or bust of any living person anywhere could be set up without his permission" (Suet. *Cal.* 34). Something else to be noted about imperial statues is that although they were also prevalent in provincial towns, statues of the supreme patron (i.e., the emperor) were often housed in temples because "the perceived gifts of royal patronage were literally god-like. To all intents and purposes the ruler could be seen as occupying the same social position as a deity" (Stewart (2003) 170),

Although every province contains some epigraphical evidence of senatorial statues, some provincial cities were more committed to using honorific statues as a means of signifying and cementing social relationships. This is particularly true of the cities of the eastern provinces, where most of the honorific statues for Roman senators are found. The East spoke the language of statuary honors fluently long before their assimilation into the Roman Empire, so that when Roman domination began to spread into the East, these provinces simply began to speak to Roman patrons.²⁷¹ Lycurgus revealed the Greek penchant for honorific statues as early as the fourth century B.C. when he commented that "...you will find that at other cities statues of athletes are set up in the agoras, at Athens statues of good generals and of the Tyrannicides."²⁷² Epigraphical remains attest to the fact that honorific statues were erected in stoas, agoras, and other public places within the eastern cities for their benefactors and patrons long before Roman subjugation; therefore it is not a surprise that when Greece and the other eastern areas came under the rule of the Roman Empire, they quickly began to erect statues for their new patrons.

Kos, a Greek island in the Aegean Sea, is an excellent example of this pattern of burgeoning senatorial statues following the East's assimilation into the Roman Empire. The number of senatorial statues in Kos grew following the establishment of Roman rule, and increased further with the establishment of the principate. Kos exemplifies how Greeks used statues to establish social bonds with their new Roman rulers. Titus Quinctius Flamininus was the first Roman to have a statue awarded to him on the island of Kos,²⁷³ and was so honored for his victory over Philip V in the Second Macedonian

²⁷¹ Concerning honorific statues erected by Easterners before being conquered by Rome, see Veyne (1962) 49-67; Gauthier (1985).

²⁷² Lyc. *Leoc.* 51.

²⁷³ *IGRR* 4.1049.

War, a war in which the Romans were allied with the Koans.²⁷⁴ Although Flaminius is not hailed as patron of the city, roman influence had been introduced to the East, and it would only be a few decades before the Roman Empire would expand to the point where Kos deemed it beneficial to formally adopt a Roman patron.

In the second and early first centuries B.C., two more honorific statues were awarded to two other Roman senators, Marcus Popillius Laenas²⁷⁵ and Q. Mucius Scaevola,²⁷⁶ on Kos. The statue erected for Laenas was awarded to him because of his benefactions to, and protection of, the city of Kos (a city on the island) as a propraetorian legate in 174 B.C., but was probably not erected until his consulship in the following year. This can perhaps be viewed as an attempt by the Koans to remind Laenas, then holding the highly influential office of consul, of the loyalty of the Koans to their former legate. The statue is, however, most significant for its announcement of Laenas as patron of Kos. Laenas is the first recorded patron of the city. The second statue also hails Scaevola as patron during his proconsulship of Asia in 94 B.C., and confirms the continued need of the Koans for a Roman patron and communicates their gratitude for his beneficence.

In the years 70-31 B.C., more Romans than Koans were honored with statues. One of those honored with a statue was Lucius Balbus, a consular legate to the province of Asia.²⁷⁷ The statue was situated near the main temple on the northern terrace of the temple of Asklepieion, and addresses Balbus as *πατρώνα*- patron. The number of senatorial statues increased during this time period and gives evidence of greater ties with Rome than any other preceding period. In the mid to late first century B.C., it was

²⁷⁴ For Flaminius' command of the Roman army in Greece, see Paus. 7.7.9; triumph: Liv. *AUC* 34.52.4-5.

²⁷⁵ Hoghammer (1993) no. 76.

²⁷⁶ Hoghammer (1993) nos. 46&156. Patriarca (1932) no.4.

²⁷⁷ Patriarca (1932) no.2.

especially necessary to have Roman patrons, since the high threat of piracy in the Aegean was high—this forced Greeks to look to a stronger power for aid and to reach out to individual senators for protection against the pirates.²⁷⁸ Kos used these honorific statues to solidify a relationship with a powerful Roman senator and to assure their protection from any foreign threat.

The battle of Actium in 31 B.C. again marks a turning point in the habits of statue erecting on Kos. Hoghammer comments that at the “advent of the rule of Augustus marks a dividing line... honorary statues suddenly increase to more than double that of the preceding period.”²⁷⁹ Hoghammer believes that this is a consequence of Kos’ need for benefactors following numerous severe earthquakes from 26 to 6 B.C.²⁸⁰ Titus Statilius Taurus, a Roman senator under Augustus, was honored for his patronage with a statue,²⁸¹ as was Aulus Didius Postumus, a proconsul of Cyprus during the age of Augustus. Postumus’ statue was placed in the eastern stoa of Asklepeion.²⁸² Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, the governor of Asia in the late 20s A.D.,²⁸³ and patron of both Myra²⁸⁴ and Uxama,²⁸⁵ also had a statue erected for him by the demos of Kos for his patronage.

Although senatorial statues dominated the visual landscape of the provinces, some prominent equestrians also received statuary honors in the East.²⁸⁶ One especially significant example also comes from the island of Kos, and is dedicated to Gaius Stertinius Xenophon, a man who was promoted to equestrian rank by Augustus, and who

²⁷⁸ Hoghammer (1993) 27.

²⁷⁹ Hoghammer (1993) 88.

²⁸⁰ Dio 54.30.3; Hier. 2.145.

²⁸¹ Hoghammer (1993) no. 55.

²⁸² Ibid. no. 56.

²⁸³ Thommason (1984) 210.

²⁸⁴ Eilers (2002) C40.

²⁸⁵ *CIL* 2.2820.

²⁸⁶ Also see: Smallwood for another example of an equestrian statue erected in the Roman east.

was also the personal physician to the Julio-Claudians.²⁸⁷ The Koans recognized Xenophon as a benefactor of the city, and also commemorated his election to the tribunate and subsequent role as prefect of engineers. The Koans had much to thank Xenophon for. It was on account of his career as physician to the imperial household that Claudius decided to grant immunity from taxation to the Koans.²⁸⁸ Although the provincials often utilized men of senatorial rank in order to catch the ear of the emperor, there were a few select Greeks and provincials of equestrian status who also had access to the emperor. While statues of senatorial promagistrates are more numerous, the existence of equestrian statues in the provinces shows that provincial towns did honor with statues their prominent equestrian benefactors, when they had them, and courted those equestrians who had access to the emperor.

After Claudius' grant of immunity to the Koans in A.D. 54 there is evidently only two statues dedicated to any Roman. The first statue is dedicated to Publius Sallustius Sempronius Victor, a praetor of Pontus-Bithynia between A.D. 222 to A.D. 238,²⁸⁹ and the second statue is dedicated to Diocletian, a third century Roman emperor, and does not address the emperor as either patron or benefactor.²⁹⁰ Perhaps this could have been expected, since, as Pliny would later write to Trajan, "you have forfeited so many chances of showing himself a benefactor, so many opportunities for gaining credit and putting his subjects in his debt."²⁹¹ by granting immunity to Roman citizens from an

²⁸⁷ *IGRR* 4.1086. On Xenophon's work as physician to the Julio-Claudians, see Tac. *Ann.* 12.67.2-3.

²⁸⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 12.61.1-2: "Indeed he even said that Xenophon, of whose lore he himself took advantage, was sprung from the same family and that, in response to his pleas, it should be conceded that the Coans, free of all taxation for posterity, should tend their island as a sacred place which ministered only to its god... Claudius did not use any extraneous aids to veil the concession which, with his customary complaisance, he had granted to an individual."

²⁸⁹ *IGRR*. 1058.

²⁹⁰ *IVCos-EV* 258: '[I]mp(erator) Caes(ar) M(arcus) [Aurelius Valerius] / [Di]oclet[ianus Augustus]'

²⁹¹ Pliny *Pan.* 39.3. trans. Radice: "Nor was he satisfied with removing the tax from the first degree of kinship; he also exempted the second degree...here is clear proof of his imagination and his

inheritance tax. By severing the major tie of taxation between Kos and Rome, Claudius essentially removed a major reason for the islanders to continue to keep up a strong patron-client relationship with their senatorial governors and indeed even with the emperor. Without any need for imperial or senatorial patronage, Kos was free to do as Claudius had said, and "tend their island as a sacred place which ministered only to its god."²⁹²

Because of Kos' special immunity from taxation, honorific statues were no longer needed to mediate between patron and client. But elsewhere in the empire, provinces continued to erect statues for their governor in order to win their favor. The province of Hispania Citerior provides numerous examples of honorific statues used as a way to communicate with and solidify the patron-client relationship between a provincial governor and his subjects.²⁹³ One good example is Tarraco, a large provincial capital, which contains over one hundred inscriptions that accompanied statues. Of these inscriptions, the majority were dedicated to Roman magistrates and the imperial family.²⁹⁴

The statues in the provincial capital of Tarraco illustrate the desire to recognize the imperial patron as well as the senatorial patron, and within the city, statues of imperial and senatorial men were often placed beside each other.²⁹⁵ Stewart comments that

The participation of various social groups in the creation of statuary honors for senators or members of the imperial family, and the resulting symbolic presence of both these recipients in the civic and religious center of the city served to make Tarraco the literal embodiment of relations between Rome and her empire.

benevolence...in short to deny himself *so many chances of showing himself a benefactor, so many opportunities for gaining credit and putting his subjects in his debt.*"

²⁹² Tac. Ann. 12.61.2.

²⁹³ Stewart (2003) 179; Alföldy (1979) 177-275.

²⁹⁴ Stewart (2003) 181.

²⁹⁵ Mierse (1999) 234-8.

In Tarraco, there were statues from all the aristocratic social strata. The statues of the city honored the local elite (e.g., the *flamines*, the *seviri augustales*, and the local senators), the senatorial promagistrates of the province, and the imperial family. Alföldy and Stewart recreate the “other populace” within the city of Tarraco and both argue that the placement of the statues within the city plan reflected the social hierarchy.²⁹⁶

The inclusion of Roman senators in the *fora* of Tarraco showcases the prominence of Roman senators within the city, and their close proximity to statues of the emperors also reflects their dignified status. While most of the statues of local elite stood in less frequented parts of the forum, senators were further exalted by their placement in a significant space. The hierarchy of the empire was reflected in many of these provincial forums, where statues of the emperor stood in the most frequented and prominent areas, surrounded by his entourage of senatorial magistrates, and they by their local *clientes*.

The provinces within North Africa also exemplify the provincial use of statues by towns and individual clients in order to signify and solidify patron-client relationships with their Roman magistrates. The analysis of the statues of North Africa provides an illustration of how *municipia*, *coloniae*, and *provinciae* within the same area all used statues of Roman senators and equestrians to varying degrees in order to communicate with their patrons. North Africa also reveals that the erection of statues to local elite increased with the incorporation of African provincials from the colonies and municipalities of the province into the senate, and this signified a decrease in the importance of the provincial governor as a patron. North Africa’s shift from a provincial area, to an area with numerous Roman *coloniae* and *municipia* again suggests that the

²⁹⁶ Alföldy (1979) 179-194; 235-270.

political status of a city, and its need for a patron, directly affected the “other populace” of a city.

Beginning with Julius Caesar and ending with the Flavians, North Africa went through a period of great political flux. In this time period, dozens of colonies and municipalities were founded, and the ties between Africa and Rome became stronger and more direct. Saller comments that:

Roman municipal institutions came to dominate the old Punic system... In short, African municipal life grew to resemble that of Romanized cities in other provinces: we find in Africa the familiar competition between individuals as well as cities for honors.²⁹⁷

Africa was annexed following the defeat of Carthage in 146 B.C., with Numidia going to Massinissa, seven cities granted *civitas immunis et libera*, and the rest being put under the governance of Roman proconsul.²⁹⁸ Although the Romans had little impact on North Africa for the century following its annexation, after his victory in North Africa in 46 B.C., Julius Caesar introduced numerous political changes to the province.²⁹⁹ In 44 B.C. Julius Caesar ordered the establishment of a colony at Carthage, and other *coloniae* were also founded along the African coast.³⁰⁰ Around 35 B.C., Africa Vetus, Africa Nova, and Cirta were combined into the province of Africa proconsularis, and Augustus then declared Utica a *municipium* and founded more colonies on the coast of Mauretania.³⁰¹

Caligula and Claudius also made changes to the area of North Africa. Caligula made a propraetorian legate *de facto* governor of Numidia, and Claudius annexed Mauretania and separated it into two provinces, Caesariensis and Tingitana, which were

²⁹⁷ Saller (1982) 149.

²⁹⁸ Picard (1959) 22; Saller (1982) 147.

²⁹⁹ Saller (1982) 147.

³⁰⁰ Brunt (1971) 593-97.

³⁰¹ Fishwick and Shaw (1977) 369-80.

ruled by an equestrian rather than senatorial governor.³⁰² Other prominent equestrians also held *imperium* within North Africa, such as the provincial procurator, and were given honorific statues in return for their patronage.³⁰³ The political stability of the Flavian era revealed a new visual landscape in North Africa that had not been there in the second century B.C. Rome had taken over the rich, grain-growing lands of North Africa and had assimilated many members of the local aristocracy into the senatorial order.³⁰⁴

A second-century B.C statue erected for the patrons of Sala in the Salians' Forum reveals the beginnings of North African patronage in the second century B.C.³⁰⁵ The statue is dated right at the time of North Africa's annexation in 146 B.C., and was dedicated to the praetorian legate, Marcus Sulpicius, and his men as a show of *gratia* for liberating the city from Carthaginian rule. Another statue erected for a patron is found in Bisica in Mauretania, and is yet another example of the patronal ties that North Africans had with Roman magistrates. The statue was erected for Marcus Cornelius Octavianus, the praetorian prefect of Bisica, and was apparently erected by order of the senate of the municipality.³⁰⁶

As the cities of North Africa earned the status of Roman *municipiae* and *coloniae*, the aristocrats of these cities began to enter the Roman senate. They came to serve as patrons of their own cities and provinces, and the statuary focus on patronage between the governor and the provinces in these areas was weakened.³⁰⁷ But it must be stated that patronal ties with the governor were never severed; the network of patronage just broadened to include local individuals. An example of this is the adoption of C. Julius

³⁰² Gascou (1972) 27; Saller (1982) 149.

³⁰³ e.g., *CIL* 8.9002; *CIL* 8.61; *AE* (1934) 26.

³⁰⁴ Saller (1982) 191.

³⁰⁵ *AE* (1931) 36b and 38b.

³⁰⁶ *CIL* 8.12296.

³⁰⁷ Saller (1982) 201-203.

Crescens Didius Crescentianus as benefactor and patron of Cirta. Crescens held magistracies within the city of Cirta in the second century A.D. and then went on to be tribune at Rome.³⁰⁸ As a result, he was honored as the city's patron, an honor extended to the rest of his family for many years to come. Crescens (it must be thought) provided a more direct line to the emperor, and was ideal since he was of local origin.

Unlike the *municipia* and *coloniae* of Italy, the *municipiae* and *coloniae* of North Africa continued to have a Roman governor who had control over taxation, the law courts, magisterial appointments, and even grants of citizenship, making it always necessary to have some patronal ties to the governor. But as the aristocracy of Africa began to enter the Roman senate in the first century A.D., the need for strong patronal ties to the governor as the mediator between the emperor and the provinces was weakened. By the end of the Flavians, and certainly well into the Severan age, patronal ties to African governors had weakened substantially. Saller comments that,

In the first and early second centuries governors were probably the most prominent of the few available patronal links to Rome. But as the second century progressed and more and more towns placed leading citizens in the aristocratic circles at Rome, gubernatorial patronage became relatively less important.³⁰⁹

This shift from the patronage of the Roman aristocracy to the patronage of a local aristocracy that had been promoted to senatorial rank in Rome is reflected in the population of statues within the cities of North Africa. As Africa became more closely knit with Rome, the need for a middle-man increasingly less imperative.

North Africa represents a trend in the empire: as the ranks of the senate grew to incorporate more provincial elite, patronal ties between provincial governors and their subjects began to weaken. As a result, few statues are erected for these Roman senators

³⁰⁸ *CIL* 8.8318.

³⁰⁹ Saller (1982) 180.

and equestrians, who were beginning to be brought closer into the central political power of Rome.

During the Julio-Claudian and Flavian time periods, epigraphical remains suggest that statues of prominent senators are still found in large numbers throughout the provinces of the Roman Empire. In the East, on islands such as Kos, senators were decreed patrons as were prominent local equestrians who aided the island. Epigraphical remains in the provincial capital of Tarraco also reveal that numerous statues of Roman senators were erected, as do the numerous inscriptions found in the provinces of North Africa which often address provincial governors and equestrian magistrates as patron.

Prominent senators such as Memmius Regulus, the suffect consul of A.D. 31, and later proconsul of Moesia, Achaëa, Macedonia, and Asia, were awarded statues during their promagisterial positions.³¹⁰ Regulus had been a prominent man in the East, and Tacitus comments that his

authority, steadfastness, and reputation made him (insofar as is allowed by the Commander's overshadowing eminence) brilliant--so much so that Nero, in ill health and with sycophants all around him who said that the end of the empire was close if his suffering should prove fatal, replied that the state had a reinforcement; and to their subsequent question "Wherein particularly?" he added "In Memmius Regulus."³¹¹

Even though the emperor was the supreme ruler, Memmius Regulus received magistracies, honors, and prestige within the competitive aristocratic arena. Senators such as Memmius Regulus, Pliny the Elder, Pliny the Younger, and indeed the entire nobility were, as Nero said, the "reinforcement[s]" of the principate. By allowing senatorial and equestrian statues in the provinces, the emperor enabled senators and to a certain extent equestrians to strengthen the ties of patronage and thus create a more cohesive and

³¹⁰ *ILS* 8815; *IG* II-III³ 4174-9. On Regulus (cos. 31) and his career see Tac. *Ann.* 5.11.1; 14.47.1. For the career of his son, Memmius Regulus (cos. A.D. 63), see Tac. *Ann.* 15.23.1.

³¹¹ Tac. *Ann.* 14.47.1.

peaceable empire.

The political status of imperial cities was reflected in the “other population” within it. The proximity of a city to Rome, the citizenship of its inhabitants, and connection to the senatorial aristocracy all determined its need for patronage and affected the population of statues within the city. As we have seen in areas such as Kos, Tarraco, and North Africa, provincial cities in the late Republic and early Empire erected numerous statues for their Roman governors and promagistrates and used these statues to create a social tie to Roman power. But what should be recognized here is that statues were a functional part of society. The provinces sought people who could give *beneficia* and imperial favor to their city and those who could not were not received as patrons. From the late Republic to early empire the provinces provided an outlet for the *ambitio* of the senators and equestrians of Rome, but this outlet was only available because of the provincial promagistrates’ ability to grant honors and favors.

Conclusion

Statues had many specialized functions within Roman society, and had the powerful ability to advertise a person’s deeds and perpetuate his memory in posterity. Although statues within Roman society had originally served a commemorative purpose, in the middle of the Republican era, statues were utilized as a means of advertisement for an individual rather than as commemorations. As clients within Rome began to erect statues to solidify the social bonds between themselves and their noble patrons, statues took on an important new function in Rome as facilitators of social cohesion. As the Roman Empire expanded, patrons gained clients not only from Rome, but also from the provinces, and expanded the network of patronage into the empire. Statues of senators and equestrians filled the city of Rome, vied for prominent positions within it, and

demonstrated the power of the Roman elite. But when Rome shifted from senatorial rule to imperial supremacy following the battle of Actium in 31 B.C., Augustus established the imperial precedent of limiting statues that might rival his own communication of power.

As Rome entered the imperial age, statues of Roman senators and equestrians were limited within the imperially dominated city of Rome, and the nobility's ambition for honor and statues in order to advertise its own eminence had to be diverted elsewhere. The provinces provided an outlet for this ambition and allowed the Roman nobility to promote themselves while also providing the opportunity for provincial cities to create and solidify patron-client relationships. Statues communicated the loyalty of a client for his patron, and strengthened the patronal bond. In this way, statues helped to make the Roman empire a more cohesive unit, and strengthened the social hierarchy.

As Cicero walked into the senate-house in Syracuse he encountered a statue of Verres that told him about the power, patronage, and political status of the city of Syracuse. Likewise, the study of the population of senatorial and equestrian statues in Rome, Italy, and the provinces also communicates many facets of Roman society. The change in senatorial and equestrian statue populations in Rome, Italy, and the provinces between the Republic and Flavian periods is indicative of the political shift from senatorial to imperial power, illustrates one of the means by which social connections were reified and solidified, and demonstrates how statues improved connections between the center and the periphery under the empire.

Bibliography

- Alexander, S. (1999) *The Satires and Odes*. Horace. Princeton.
- Alföldy, G. (1975) *Die Römischen Inschriften von Tarraco*. Berlin.
- Alföldy, G. (1979) "Bildprogramme in den römischen Städten des Conventus Tarraconensis: das Zeugnis der Statuenpostamenta," *Homenaje a Garcia y Bellido*. Madrid. 4;177-275.
- AE = L'Année épigraphique; revue des publications épigraphiques relatives a l'antiquité romaine*. (1888-) Paris.
- Badian, E. (1985) *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*. Oxford.
- Baehrens, A. (1876) *P. Papinius Statius*. Papinius Statius. Leipzig.
- Barnish, S.J.B (1992) *Variae*. Cassiodorus. Liverpool.
- Bauman, R. (1967) *The Crimen Maiestatis in the Roman Republic and Augustan Principate*. Johannesburg.
- Bergmann, M. and Zanker, P. (1981) " 'Damnatio Memoriae' Umgearbeitete Nero- und Domitiansportrats. Zur Ikonographie der flavischen Kaiser und des Nerva," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*. 96; 32.
- Bodel, J. (2001) *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions*. London and New York.
- Boeckh, A. (1828-77) *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*. Berlin.
- Bourne, F. (1941) *The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians*. Princeton.
- Boyle, A.J. and Woodard, R.D. (2000) *Fasti*. Ovid. New York and London.
- Braund, D. (1957) *Augustus to Nero*. London.
- Braund, S. (2004) *Juvenal and Persius*. Juvenal and Persius. Cambridge.
- Brunt, P.A. (1970) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Augustus Caesar. New York and Oxford.
- Brunt, P.A. (1971) *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.-A.D. 14*. Oxford.
- Burt, J. (1962) *Lycurgus: Minor Attic Orators in Two Volumes*. Lycurgus. Cambridge.
- Calza, R. (1964) *Scavi di Ostia. I ritratti, parte I*. Rome.
- Carter, J. (1996) *Civil Wars*. Appianus of Alexandria. New York and London.

- Cary, E (1937) *The Roman Antiquities*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus. London.
- Cary, E. (1914) *Dio's Roman History*. Cassius Dio Cocceianus. London.
- Cooley, A and M.G. (2003) *Pompeii: A Sourcebook*. London and New York.
- Cooley, M.G. (2003) *The Age of Augustus*. London.
- Deferrari, R. (1964) *The Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*. Paulus Orosius. Washington. D.C.
- Dessau, H. (1892) *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*. Berlin.
- Donalson, M.D. (1996) *Chronicon*. St. Jerome (Hieronymus). Lewiston.
- Dudley, D. (1967) *Urbs Roma*. Aberdeen.
- Eck, W. (1984) 'Senatorial Self-Representaion: Developments in the Augustan Period,' In F. Millar and E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects*. Oxford.
- Edwards, H.J. (1994) *De Bello Gallico*. Julius Caesar. Cambridge.
- Ehrenberg, V. and Jones, A.H. (1949) *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*. Oxford.
- Eilers, C. (2002) *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*. Oxford.
- Elsner, J. and Masters, J. (1994) *Reflections of Nero: Culture History and Representation*. Chapel Hill.
- Einarson, B. (1967) *Plutarch's Moralia*. Plutarch. Cambridge.
- Fishwick, D. and Shaw, B. (1977) "The Formation of Africa Proconsularis," *Hermes* 105: 369-80.
- Flower, H. (1996) *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- Favro, D. (1996) *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome*. Cambridge.
- Favro, D. (1992) "Pater Urbis: Augustus as City Father of Rome," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historian* 51: 61-84.
- Flory, M. (1993) "Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 123: 287-308.
- Freedberg, D. (1989) *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago.
- Fyfe, W.H. (1999) *The Histories*. Tacitus. Oxford; New York.

- Gardner, J. and Wiedemann, T. (1991) *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*. London and New York.
- Gascou, J. (1972) *La Politique Municipale de l'Empire Romain en Afrique Proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime-Sévère*. Rome.
- Gauthier, P. (1985) *Les Cites grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs: Contribution à l'histoire des institutions*. Athens and Paris.
- Gelzer, M. (1969) *The Roman Nobility*. trans. R. Seager. Oxford.
- Gordon, A. (1983) *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Grant, M. (1970) *The Roman Forum*. New York.
- Graves, R (1957) *The Twelve Caesars*. Suetonius. London and New York.
- Hamilton, W. (1986) *The Later Roman Empire*. Ammianus Marcellinus. London.
- Harmand, L. (1957) *Un Aspect Social et Politique du Monde Romain*. Paris.
- Harries, Jill (1994) *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome*. Sidonius Apollinaris. Oxford.
- Hoghammer, K. (1993) *Sculpture and Society: A Study of the Connection Between the Free-Standing Sculpture and Society on Kos in the Hellenistic and Augustan Periods*. Uppsala.
- ID = Inscriptiones de Delos* (1926-50) Paris.
- IG = Inscriptiones Graecae* (1873-) 1-7. ed. Reiner and De Gruyter. Berlin.
- IGRR = Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes* (1906-27) 1-4. ed. Leroux. Paris.
- ILGR = Inscriptiones Latinae in Graecia Repertae* (1979) ed. M. Kos. Faenza.
- Jones, B.W. (1979) *Domitian and the Senatorial Order: A Prosopographical Study of Domitian's Relationship with the Senate, A.D. 81-96*. Philadelphia.
- Lahusen, G. (1983) *Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatuen in Rom: literarische und epigraphische Zeugnisse*. Roma.
- Leutsch, E.L. and Schneidewin, F.G. (1958) *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*. Hildesheim.

- Levick, B. (1985) *The Government of the Roman Empire: A Sourcebook*. London and Sydney.
- May, M. and Wisse, J. (2001) *De Oratore*. Cicero. New York and Oxford.
- Meyer, H. (2000) *Prunkkameen und Staatsdenkmaler romischer Kaiser: Neue Perspektiven zur Kunst der fruhen Prinzipatszeit*. Munich.
- McCrum, M. and Woodhead, A. (1961) *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors Including the Year of Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Mierse, W. (1999) *Temples and Towns in Roman Iberia: The Social and Architectural Dynamics of Sanctuary Designs from the Third Century B.C. to the Third Century A.D.* Berkeley.
- Millar, F. (1977) *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 B.C.- A.D. 337)*. London.
- Mlasowsky, A. (1992) *Herrscher und Mensch. Romische Marmorbildnisse in Hannover*. Hannover.
- Mommsen, T. (1856) *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin.
- Musumeci, F. (1978) "Statuae in Publico Positae," *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris*. 44: 191-203.
- North, T. (1898) *Plutarch's Lives*. Plutarch. London.
- Oldfather, W. (1925) *Epictetus: Discourses Books I and II*. Epictetus. Cambridge.
- Packer, J. (2003) "Plurima et Amplissima Opera: Parsing Flavian Rome," in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Leiden and Boston. 167-198.
- Patriarca, G. (1932) "Iscrizione dell'Asclepieio di Coe," *Bollettino del Museo dell'Impero Romano*. 3: 3-34.
- Pecke, T. (1994) *Parnassi Puerperium: Martial de Spectaculis, or concerning Rarities to be seen in Rome*. Martial. Cambridge.
<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/cpd/engpoAnon.browse.html/#1.1751>
- Picard, G. (1959) *La Civilisation de l'Afrique Romaine*. Paris.
- Rackham, H. (1995) *The Natural History*. Pliny. Cambridge and London.
- Raubitschek, A. (1954) "Epigraphical Notes on Julius Caesar," *Journal of Roman Studies* 44: 65-75.
- Radice, B. (1989) *Letters and Panegyricus*. Pliny. Cambridge.
- Ramsey, J.T. (1984) *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*. Sallust. Chicago.

- Reynolds, J. (1971) "Roman Inscriptions 1966-1970," *Journal of Roman Studies* 61: 136-52. London.
- Richardson, L. (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore and London.
- Rivington, C and J.F. (1785) *Historiae Romanae Breviarium*. Eutropius. London.
- Rodocanachi, E. (1906) *The Roman Capitol in Ancient and Modern Times*. London.
- Rolfe, J. (1927) *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*. Aulus Gellius. London and New York.
- Rowell, H.T. (1962) *Rome in the Augustan Age*. Norman.
- Rudd, N. (1991) *The Satires*. Juvenal. Oxford and New York.
- Saller, R. (1982) *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. New York and Cambridge.
- Scott-Kilvert, I. (1979) *Historiae*. Polybius. New York.
- Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (1999) *Ad Atticum*. Cicero. Cambridge.
- Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (1977) *Epistulae ad Familiares*. New York.
- Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. (1986) *Philippicae*. Cicero. Chapel Hill.
- Shipley, F. (1924) *Historiae Romanae ad Marcum Vinicium*. Velleius Paterculus. Cambridge.
- Smallwood, E.M. (1967) *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius Claudius and Nero*. Cambridge.
- Spillan, D (1896) *Ad Urbe Condita*. Titus Livius. New York.
- Squire, S. (1990) *Commentaries on Five Speeches of Cicero*. Quintus Asconius Pedianus. Bristol and Wauconda.
- Stewart, A. (1912) *On Benefits : addressed to Aebutius Liberalis*. Lucius Annaeus Seneca. London.
- Stewart, P. (2003) *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response*. Oxford and New York.
- Stoppe, E. (1999) *Maxims and Reflections*. Von Goethe. New York.

SIG = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (1977) ed. W. Dittenberger. Hildesheim and New York.

Syme, R. (1958) *Tacitus 1-2*. Oxford.

Tanner, J. (2000) "Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic," *Journal of Roman Studies* 90: 18-50.

Thomasson, B. (1984) *Laterculi Praesidium*. Goteborg.

Tomei, M. (1997) *Museo Palatino*. Milan.

Toynbee, J.M. (1971) *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. Ithaca.

Varner, E. (2004) *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. Leiden and Boston.

Veyne, P. (1990) *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. trans. B. Pearce. London.

Walker, H.J. (2004) *Memorable Deeds and Sayings*. Valerius Maximus. Indianapolis.

Warner, Rex (1958) *Plutarch: Fall of the Roman Republic*. Plutarch. London and New York.

Winstedt, E.O. (1912) *Ad Atticum*. v. III. Marcus Tullius Cicero. New York.

Woodman, A.J. (2004) *The Annals*. Tacitus. Indianapolis.

Wright, J. (1993) *Curculio*. Plautus. Norman.

Jones, W. (1992) *Pausanias: Description of Greece Books 6-8*. Pausanias. Cambridge.

Yonge, C.D. (1903) *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*. Marcus Tullius Cicero. London.

Zanker, P. (1981) "Das Bildnis des M. Holconius Rufus," *Archäologischer Anzeiger*. 349-61.

Zanker, P. (1988) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro. Ann Arbor.

Zanker, P. (1998) *Pompeii: Public and Private Life*, trans. D. Schneider. Cambridge.