REVIEW–DISCUSSION

PERFORMANCE, COMMUNICATION, AND GODS IN LATE REPUBLICAN ROME

Trevor S. Luke, *Ushering in a New Republic: Theologies of Arrival at Rome in the First Century BCE*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014. Pp. i + 328. Hardcover, $50.00. ISBN 978-0-472-07222-4.

Leaving and returning to Rome was a moment of heightened expectation. Cicero was downcast to discover, on his return from Sicily, that no-one had noticed he had gone. Crassus left Rome with the execrations of a tribune, Ateius Capito, ringing in his ears, and never returned. Flaminius found that the people ignored his return with glorious spoils because he had ignored them; Pompey had to linger outside the city; Sulla claimed that he did not sleep the night he entered Rome. Luke takes the accounts of return to the city in the late Republic and early empire as his theme, and argues that the manipulation of ceremonial was part of the religious context of political power, and that the gradual development of this ran alongside the heightened language around deification.

The introduction combines two ideas: the pervasive ideological connection between power and religion at a state level, and the capacity for individuals to construct 'personal political theologies' from the components of the religious world. The first idea is well worn, but the second is a little more challenging, and the two taken together produce an interesting theoretical base to support the rest of the work. This concept of personal theology is then applied systematically to a series of case studies on arrival and departure. Before turning to these, it is worth reflecting on the methodological consequences of this standpoint.

The way that religion and power co-exist still requires some thinking through. The argument has to go further than simply saying that religion and politics were one and the same thing, or that politics was suffused with the religious. Insofar as religion is a communicative system, any interpenetration has to be externally comprehensible.[1] Yet that does not mean that Rome

[1] See G. Binder and K. Ehlich, edd., *Religiöse Kommunikation—Formen und Praxis vor der Neuzeit* (Bochum, 1997); J. Rüpke, *Religion in Republican Rome: Rationalization and Ritual Change* (Philadelphia, 2012) 24–34. Anna Clark, in an excellent paper 'Ciceronian Correspondences? Gods as elements of social communication (*Att.* 1.13, 1.16, 1.18)' (https://www.academia.edu/4805230/Ciceronian_Correspondences_Gods_as_elements_of_social_communication_Att._1.13_1.16_1.18_), has urged that we should not start from

 Copyright © 2015 Smith

was in any straightforward sense a theocracy. So this opens up the sort of interpretation which sees religion as a mechanism which provided opportunities for competitive display. The spectacle of arrival and departure is overlain with religious aura, which adds to solemnity and underlines the importance of the actors, without actually being necessarily strongly sacral. The most consistent interpreter of the value of spectacle in the construction of power has perhaps been Karl Hölkeskamp.[2] By now we are attuned to the significance of these narratives. Yet speaking of them as personal theologies is somewhat novel. Luke argues that he does not intend to imply stable theologies, in other words, he does not need to assume consistency and intention. Instead he allows for personal choices in the Roman marketplace of religion, a term we owe to Andreas Bendlin.[3]

Arrival and departure are obvious moments to choose in discussing the spectacle of Roman power; the gods drew closer at one's comings-in and goings-out. For the most part this is strongly connected to military activity. The general on his way to his province, or returning to a triumph were inevitably moments highly imbued with potential for display. Seldom if ever could the gods have been said to smile more on a Roman than when he came back in celebration of victory. The late Republic sees a growth in the stage management of such events, perhaps one of the reasons why the triumph was not entirely stable as a ritual.[4] We have little information over how such an event was co-ordinated and what relationships were with city officials to ensure that all went off reasonably smoothly. It may not have been a free-for-all, but it did permit choice and individualism, and this is perhaps a good model for the interaction of civic religion on the one hand and personal interpretation and innovation on the other.

---

the distinct categories, but look instead at their combinations; and I am very grateful to her for a discussion of some of this material.

[2] K.-J. Hölkeskamp, 'Hierarchie und Konsens. Pompae in der politischen Kultur der römischen Republik', in A. H. Arweiler and B. M. Gauly, edd., *Machtfragen: zur kulturellen Repräsentation und Konstruktion von Macht in Antike, Mittelalter und Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 2008) 79–126 and 'The Roman Republic as Theatre of Power: The Consuls as Leading Actors', in H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne and F. Pina Polo, edd., *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge, 2011) 161–81 are two examples of a consistent theme; see also A. Bell, *Spectacular Power in the Greek and Roman City* (Oxford, 2004) and E. Flaig, *Ritualisierte Politik. Zeichen, Gesten und Herrschaft im Alten Rom. Historische Semantik Band 1* (Göttingen, 2003).

[3] A. Bendlin, 'Looking Beyond the Civic Compromise: Religious Pluralism in Late Republican Rome', in E. Bispham and C. Smith, edd., *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome: Evidence and Experience* (Edinburgh, 2000) 115–35.

[4] M. Beard, *The Roman Triumph* (Cambridge, Mass., 2007); see now C. H. Lange and F. Vervaet, edd., *The Roman Republican Triumph: Beyond the Spectacle* (Rome, 2013).

The way in which this was 'theological' is perhaps another matter.[5] Roman religion is not a religion of the book, and therefore the extent to which it could dogmatic was highly limited, and if religion was only just becoming an object of analysis in the late Republic, the idea of a theology is perhaps premature. Even if we take a fairly broad view of the term, if the theology was meant to be understood by others, the nature of the mechanisms of communication meant that it needed to be basic and broad of brush. One of the useful aspects of the volume is that looking at rather practical and spectacular moments means looking at moments where abstraction is made concrete and visible.

It is no surprise that Luke concentrates on the best known stories from Marius and Sulla on. Another obvious methodological problem is left unaddressed. A great deal of the relevant information comes from Plutarch, and part of Plutarch's goal is to manage his material into formally satisfying narratives. We may choose to believe that beneath the Plutarchan shapes lie the deliberate patterning of a Sulla, for instance, and it seems highly likely that the Republican autobiography tended to culminate in the triumph, but that still would not resolve the question of whether we are seeing reality or its representation.[6] For Luke, one supposes, this might not matter, but there is something underexplored in the claim that narrative shape and theology can be identified with each other. It is not immediately clear in what way Sulla, who fairly clearly used omens and self-identification with the divine as a key mechanism within his narrative, ever intended to explain the ways of god to man. To make that argument would be to engage in a somewhat different kind of account of the way religion worked in late Republican texts.[7]

[5] Luke's concept of theology seems rather different from that of C. Ando in Ando, ed., *Roman Religion* (Edinburgh, 2003) 141–6 and Ando, *The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire* (California, 2008) 16–18 and 106–7. Luke's theologies are highly individual, but communicative, whereas Ando distinguishes between a theology of praxis and theological speculation. There is much of relevance in I. Gildenhard, *Creative Eloquence: The Construction of Reality in Cicero's Speeches* (Oxford, 2011). In some ways, Gildenhard comes close to arguing for Cicero as having a unique theology, defined (2) as 'the ability and willingness to operate with concepts and categories, figures of thought, normative patterns, or, indeed, idiosyncratic visions about the human, society and the world that are profound, substantial, and distinctive'. However, as some reviewers have noted, Gildenhard's Cicero has few contemporary interlocutors, and we certainly could not assume that Marius operated in the same way.

[6] C. Pelling, 'Was there an Ancient Genre of "Autobiography"? Or did Augustus Know what he was Doing?', in C. Smith and A. Powell, edd., *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography* (Swansea, 2009) 41–64.

[7] For an enduringly useful account see D. Feeney, *Literature and Religion at Rome: Cultures, Contexts and Beliefs* (Cambridge, 1998).

Anecdote therefore makes a rather critical contribution. When Pompey replies to the censor's request as to whether he has performed the necessary military service, and he replies 'Yes and under my own command' (Plut. *Pomp*. 22.6), we learn a good deal about the ways in which Pompey planned a highly public event. The question appears formulaic, so one would not imagine that Pompey came up with the reply off the cuff.[8] However we are a long way from theology here, and I am not sure that the idea of a theological persona is sufficiently theorised to be of use. The striking speech acts as a component in self-presentation, and the apparent ancient appetite for the successful bon mot, which to an extent passes into common parlance, is one thing; 'godspeak' is another.

Sulla is obviously important for Luke's case. His autobiography was known to be full of omens, and some of them were clearly related to his assumption of military power, or his entry into the city. The omen at Laverna is an example. He was on his way to join his army when a chasm opens up and fire spits out. The haruspices declare that a good man of striking appearance would take control. For Luke, they were pointing at the golden haired Sulla, but there are some caveats. Luke assumes that because the passage is near Plutarch's account of the dedication to Lucullus, it must have come from the beginning of the work. However that is not certain; Plutarch is pulling together some key passages about Sulla's claims for himself. Whether they formed a programmatic opening is less certain. Second, Sulla may have been looking out for an opportunity, and was certainly swift to grab the one that was offered him, but it would be bold to assume that he stage managed it. Finally, Luke wants to tie this up with a Sullan announcement of a new *saeculum*, and I do not see where the text gives us license to do that.[9]

In this rather negative analysis I am not so much taking Luke to task (nothing he says is impossible, and what he says is said well) as worrying at the relationship between the representation of divine favour after the event and the claim for it at the time. At least one way of imagining these critical moments of entrance and exit is that they were contested and chaotic, with competing claims, and many different stories. Was Sulla the only person to

[8] It is another question what Pompey actually said. A direct translation would indicate that Pompey said he had done so as his own *imperator*. It would have been useful to Luke's argument if we could be sure that Pompey had claimed to have operated under his own auspices.

[9] *FRHist* 22 L. Cornelius Sulla, esp. F 15. The fire at Laverna is datable to 90 BC; the change of *saeculum* to 88 BC. On the latter, see J. M. Turfa, *Divining the Etruscan World: The* Brontoscopic Calendar *and Religious Practice* (Cambridge, 2012) 29–31, assuming Sullan manipulation; more circumspect; J. A. North, 'Prophet and Text in the Third Century BC', in E. Bispham and C. Smith, edd., *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome: Evidence and Experience* (Edinburgh, 2000) 92–107; F. Santangelo, *Divination, Prediction and the End of the Roman Republic* (Cambridge, 2013) 89–98.

have declared himself good and exceptional at the time of the Laverna omen? If he had not successfully navigated the campaigns, might someone else have been the person identified—or might the omen have gone quite unnoticed?

Arguably, such an account might be taken to suggest that this sort of language was common, and Luke's reading of the joint triumph of Pompey and Crassus follows on this line. Eschewing the normal reading of intense rivalry between the two, Luke suggests that both chose to make something of the connection with Hercules, and that in both instances this to a degree reflected an attempt to make a more inclusive statement, utilising a popular Italic deity. Whilst Sulla had used Hercules to emphasise Roman hegemony (the evidence for this is an alleged temple of Hercules Sullanus on the Esquiline), Crassus offers a tithe (as in fact Sulla had done) and a public banquet, and Pompey a tithe and games. Luke supposes that 'hundreds of thousands' of Italians, in Rome for the census, benefitted from this generosity, and we do know from Cicero at *Verrines* 1.54 that a great crowd had gathered.

However, Hercules Sullanus is only known through a single mention in the Regionary Catalogue, and it is difficult to read past the uniform view in the sources that Pompey and Crassus were persistently at odds.[10] Moreover, as Marzano argues, Hercules was important to the triumphal ritual in various ways, and both Pompey and Crassus were therefore putting their own spin on Hercules, the one making a connection with Spain through the Hercules of the Ara Maxima, who had led back the cattle of Geryon, and the other trumping it with an enormous banquet.[11]

In this heated atmosphere, the two acts which stuck in the memory were the people forcing Crassus and Pompey to make-up early in 70 BC (when Crassus was quicker off the mark than Pompey) and Pompey's clever appearance before the censors. Certainly Pompey had learnt to avoid some of Marius' errors, and he was always able to call on strong Italian support, especially from his own area of Picenum, but he was riding high in 70—high enough to be able to take a step back and let Rome come to him.

A few years later and it was Cicero's turn to leave Rome, this time in disgrace, only to return later in triumph. The stakes were getting higher, however, and Cicero had to work hard for his return to be regarded as triumphal. The key claim is that in the pre-exile poem *de consulatu suo* and the post-exile *de temporibus suis*, Cicero 'theologises' his fate. There was a poetic description of a council of the gods which discussed his fate in *de temporibus suis*,

[10] D. Palombi, 'Hercules Sullanus', *LTUR* III.21–2; Sall. *Hist.* 4.44, 56 (McGushin); Suet. *Iul.* 19.2; Plut. *Crass.* 12.2–3; *Pomp.* 23.1–2; App. *BC* 1.121.

[11] A. Marzano, 'Hercules and the Triumphal Feast for the Roman People', in I. B. Antela-Bernardez and T. Naco del Hoyo, edd., *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empires* (BAR Int. Series 1986; Oxford, 2009) 83–97.

and the dead Marius appeared to Cicero in a dream he recounts after the events.[12] Spencer Cole has recently led us to take seriously the language, and indeed the conceptual reality, of deification in the late Republic, and Cicero was an important figure in this shift.[13] The relation between Cicero in exile and a wounded cast-out personification of *Res Publica*, and their conjoint return in 59 BC is well-discussed. Certainly Cicero does his best to make as much capital as he can out of the return, but the audiences for a poem and for the rather visible ascent of the Capitoline to give thanks to Jupiter, which might have been intended to evoke a triumph, were rather different.

Indeed the problem—as always—is how to judge most effectively the register of the language (verbal or visual) being used. Is this theology, or is it language which is adapting to a whole range of cultural and social effects which are bringing some individuals closer to worlds in which deification was more normal, and some few individuals closer to the stature that elsewhere in the ancient Mediterranean would prompt the claim? Being godlike was becoming more of an issue in the late Republic. Of all the case studies so far treated, Cicero is the one which is perhaps most likely to produce a highly thought through theological version—but what he gives us most evidently seems to be poetry. Now poetry can of course be theological but it is also, in the classical context, likely substantially to conflate any theological content with generic conventions. Does a Council of the Gods make one believe that Cicero was of such significance that the gods were looking out for him, or that at a given point in any epic, action is driven by a Council of the Gods? These are not mutually exclusive, but the question perhaps points up a challenge for Luke's argument, which is how deep the religious colour needs to be for these pageants to be more than simply part and parcel of the persistent spectacle of the late Republic. It is not that I want to empty out the religious content—rather that it seems important to try to understand what is the nature of the religious argument. For it is not only in coming in and going out that Romans are brought up against the gods—even if those are sharply defined and easily stage managed affairs. It is the whole range of action from election to court case to funeral to games, and daily life as well. On the one hand, Cicero may have been unusual in the way he combined the various societal elements and resources which were to hand, including references to

[12] M. Tullius Cicero 5a (*FLP* Courtney), and *Div.* 1.28.59. Note that Quintilian (11.1.24) explicitly says that Cicero was following Greek practice in introducing the Council and there is abundant evidence for the unpopularity of this passage.

[13] S. Cole, *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome* (Cambridge, 2013). See also M. Koortbojian, *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus: Precedents, Consequences, Implications* (Cambridge, 2013) for a very important account; both were published too late for Luke to take them into account.

the gods, but on the other hand, he may have been simply Roman in his capacity to see a full and complex world.

Cicero's letter to Atticus on his return (4.1), which Luke discusses, combines many themes. It starts with a tortuous attempt to acknowledge Atticus' later friendship and indicate that he had rather failed him at the outset. What appears to matter most to Cicero is his recovery of his *splendorem nostrum illum forensem et in senatu auctoritatem et apud viros bonos gratiam*, which he follows with a pointed complaint about his financial difficulties, which he comes back to at 4.1.8, alongside a hint that all was not well in his marriage. Luke is strong on Cicero's account of the return to Rome, with the nice combination of his arrival 'by chance' (*casu*) at Brundisium on Tullia's birthday and the foundation date of the colony at Brundisium, and feast day of Salus, whose temple on the Quirinal was close to Atticus' house. Whereas Anna Clark noted that Cicero attributes the association to the Brindisines, Luke suggests that Salus was particularly associated with the censorship, an office Cicero may have wanted (*Att.* 4.2.6). However, this seems a stretch; the temple was dedicated as a result of Junius Brutus Bubulcus' victory over the Samnites, decorated by Fabius Pictor, presumably with scenes of battle, and as well as the statue of Cato the Elder which did indeed refer to his censorship, there were also gilded statues set up at a time of plague in 180 BC. The emphasis was surely more on protection and health than on the censorship.[14]

Luke argues that Cicero presents the passage of the bill in favour of Pompey's command to secure the grain supply as influenced by his glorious return, but the letter is explicit about the opposition view (that Cicero had caused a grain shortage) and the atmosphere of fear and intimidation, which was to come up again (Cic. *Dom.* 10). His brief reference to the problem of the temple of Libertas is entirely mercenary—he is looking forward to compensation under any pontifical decision. His second life had begun snared in resentment and jealousy. Where Luke sees a fairly consistent ring composi-

[14] Interestingly, Fraccaro had argued that a statue to a living person was highly improbable, and whilst Luke says that the senate set it up, Plutarch *Cato Mai.* 19.3 (our only source) attributes the statue to the people. Is it possible that the statue was much later than Plutarch thought? P. Fraccaro, *Opuscula* (Pavia, 1956–7) I.435; A. E. Astin, *Cato the Censor* (Oxford, 1978) 103. M. Sehlmeyer, *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit: Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewusstseins* (Historia Einzelschriften 130; Stuttgart, 1999) 146–7 has a good discussion and puts the statue into the Gracchan period or even later. A dedication more contemporary with Cicero's time might actually strengthen Luke's argument but the context remains obscure. For the temple of Salus see F. Coarelli, *LTUR* (2014) IV.229–30; id. *Collis: Il Quirinale e il Viminale nell'antichità* (Rome, 2014) 164–6; for Salus see A. Clark, *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 2007) 177, 253–4.

tion centred on the *reditus*, another reader might see a combination of themes, drawing on the resources of family, friends, the state, and the gods.[15]

Luke then turns his attention to the events around the Feriae Latinae of 44 BC. This is an event which has attracted more attention of late, with various efforts to try to understand how it fits into the civic, military, and religious landscape. Luke's suggestion is that Caesar partly re-enacts the arrival of the Julii in Rome at the very beginning of Roman history, as a justification of his position within the state apparatus. This tends to push the more civic line— that Caesar in part accepts the praise in Cicero's *pro Marcello*, shows how entitled he is, but ultimately, also that he tries to show his civic virtues. One might also suggest that this was another example of a pageant which did not quite work. Just as Marius managed to offend more than persuade by marching from triumph to consulship without a break, so Caesar's playing with the tropes of victory and legitimate authority became confused and confusing, and perhaps the more so over time, since Luke emphasises how hard it is to penetrate the later criticism overlaying the original event. For a parallel, might one think of the overly complicated and allegorical pageants of the French Republic under Robespierre and after? We are seeing spectacle used in new and strained ways, which can go beyond the capacity of the viewer to understand them. Old Roman spectacle was easier, a straightforward zero sum game by which the *triumphator* rose as the defeated enemy fell, but Caesar's weaving of so many strands was more challenging.

In 36 BC, Octavian seems to have overloaded his return, too, but with a more straightforward message; Octavian was returning with the blessing of the gods to save the state and his family was worthy to dine in the presence of Jupiter. Luke's interesting picture of Octavian demonstrates the extravagance of the time—Octavian's statue, and the array of honours, push further than Caesar had done. There is an argument here for the extremism of the mid-30s, an extremism which Luke uses to argue for a rather forced identification of Apollo and Veiovis underlying the exegesis of the striking of Octavian's house with a thunderbolt. That argument aside, there is no doubt that Octavian's return was dramatic and a major play in the politics of the time. The *adventus* and the triumph were becoming conflated.

The last section of the book looks at ways in which Augustus' *Res Gestae* (*RG*) plays into this discourse. First, the physical monument is compared to other examples, such as the silver tablets recording Caesar's honours laid at Jupiter's feet, or the bronze tablet in the grave of Capys discovered at Capua and proclaiming misery as a result of Caesar's assassination.[16] Luke argues that the similarity between the documents was deliberate, and that each ratcheted up further an association with divinity.

[15] I have found Clark's article (n. 1) very helpful here.

[16] Dio 44.4–7; Suet. *Iul.* 81.1.

Chapter 7 looks at ways in which the early chapters of the *RG* may have hinted at the early history of Rome. Two slightly separate arguments seem to be running at the same time; one about the idea that there is a spatial progression within the text of the *RG*, with the *reditus* of 13 BC and the vow of the Ara Pacis as a key turning point, and one that there is a temporal progression too. The spatial progression relies on a sort of imaginary journey down the Via Flaminia to the Ara Pacis past the Mausoleum, but there are other arrivals and departures in the text; at *RG* 11, Augustus also describes arriving at the Porta Capena, and at 20.5 he refers to the Via Flaminia leaving Rome. We are directed to make much of the returns in 19 and 13 BC in chapters 11 and 12; but rather less of the senators going out to meet Augustus in Campania in 12.1.

Although the Ara Pacis obviously does refer to the Roman historical narrative, the *RG* does not, so the discovery of Romulus in chapters 1 and 2 depends on verbal parallels with Livy. As the argument progresses we find that the reference to the Ara Pacis at *RG* 12 followed by that to Janus in *RG* 13 is said to hint at a progression from Romulus to Numa. Luke is exercised by the omission of the Secular Games in chapters 7–13, although this assumes a chronological rather than thematic organisation of the material; when they appear in chapter 22 they fit with accounts of other games. For Luke there is a deferral caused by the disappointment of the death of Gaius and Lucius Caesar, so that the theme of renewal is introduced by the censorships and then brought back later, whilst the assumption of the role of *pontifex maximus* in chapter 10 is regarded as suggesting a comparison with, but also a superseding of Caesar's precedent.

Chapter 8 looks in more detail at the ways in which Augustus reflected the reign of Numa. This depends heavily on Rehak's argument that the bearded figure on the southwest panel of the Ara Pacis is Numa.[17] This has always been both tempting and difficult. One of the major obstacles is how anyone would have recognised Numa, and Luke's argument brings out all the Numan connections to begin to demonstrate ways in which Numa was sufficiently known and elaborated. The connection with Janus is clearly an important one, since both refer to peace.

Ultimately, I found the suggestion that the *Res Gestae* can be read as a sort of celebratory *adventus* with a historical reference to Augustus' ancestry unconvincing. There are several reasons:

i. The comparison with the other tablets is forced. None are as substantial as the *Res Gestae*, as far as we can tell, and they are a very disparate set.

[17] P. Rehak, 'Aeneas or Numa: Rethinking the meaning of the Ara Pacis Augustae', *The Art Bulletin* 83 (2001): 190–208.

ii. The reading of the *Res Gestae* as referring to Romulus in chapters 1 and 2 depends on some fairly loose parallels, often with Livy, and it is not clear who would have had those in mind. Does *a dominatione factionis … vindicavi* actually reference *a crudelitate regia vindicant*? The only thing the phrases share in common is a fairly well-used verb.

iii. Luke makes heavy weather of both the censorship and the secular games. It is not clear that they are misplaced in the text for deliberate meaning, as opposed to the various categorisations of material.

iv. Even accepting the identification of the figure on the Ara Pacis as Numa, there remains the challenge of how Augustus got past Numa as the hydromantic seer with the convenient nymph Egeria (the Varronian picture) to something more sober—and when. Numa is not mentioned directly in the *RG*, although the incautious reader might be surprised by that after reading Luke's account.

v. Augustus' interest in Janus is well brought out, but this seems to me to bear more on calendrical interests. We have moved a long way from arrivals and departures, even symbolically. Certainly the calendars do possess a sort of bipolarity, which Varro has already noted, with their references to festivals for gods and for men, and these are complex texts, which Luke might have done more with.[18]

In his conclusion, Luke picks up Strocka's argument that the *quadriga* which was used as a throne in St Mark's at Rome, and is now in the Vatican, actually stood empty, as a symbol of apotheosis, in the Augustan forum.[19] This ingenious argument has not been picked up, and little weight can be placed on it; even Strocka admits that the evidence is purely circumstantial. The Medinaceli frieze might have been another choice to demonstrate the departure of Augustus. It is a fascinating monument and if one of the panels does represent the *tensa* which was used to carry the gods into the Circus

[18] See now R. Paris, *S. Bruni, M. Roghi, Augusto: L'imperatore che riscrisse il tempo e la città* (Rome, 2014).

[19] M. V. Strocka, 'Die Quadriga auf dem Augustusforum in Rom', *MDAI(R)* (2009) 115: 21–55, with *RG* 35; see also J. W. Rich, 'Augustus' Parthian Honours , the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum', *PBSR* (1998) 66: 71–128, esp. 115–25. Using numismatic evidence, Rich speculates that the chariot 'may have had a pedimental front surmounted by four galloping horses', which does not seem to me easily to fit with Strocka's attempt to identify the chariot as the one from St Mark's.

Maximus, including a representation of Augustus, then this might have been a useful addition to Luke's argument.[20]

Overall, this is an intriguing book. It is wide-ranging, ambitious, and touches on highly significant debates. There are a number of points where readers may find themselves in disagreement, but the theme is topical and important. It is clear that the leading Romans made specific and significant reference to the key moments of departure from, and return to Rome. As with all the most significant moments of their spectacular lives, they heightened the drama with reference to the gods. Whether this is best described as theological is an interesting question, but this is a useful and provocative gathering of the evidence.

CHRISTOPHER SMITH
British School at Rome/University of St Andrews director@bsrome.it

[20] E. La Rocca, ed., *Augusto* (Rome, 2013) 322–3.