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INTRODUCTION

The face of no person in classical history is better preserved to the present day than that of Gaius Julius Caesar Octavianus Augustus. His features are recognized on approximately 250 portrait sculptures, as well as on numerous coins and smaller items, and these objects have been found widely scattered throughout the Roman world. It is clear that wherever Rome’s domination spread, the strength and power of the empire was neatly personified in the image of this confident and capable man.

Modern historians, although overwhelmed by this enormous amount of material, still cannot be certain that any of these objects represent the actual physiognomy of Rome’s first emperor. The images of him are so numerous and so widely scattered that it is unthinkable he could have sat for all of them. Clearly some means of copying his image developed, and in this way the presence of Rome’s first citizen was able to be felt all over the Roman world.

One of the biggest difficulties in dealing with Augustan portraiture is the problem of identifying images of him. As will be seen in this paper, all the members
of the Julio-Claudian line, especially the intended heirs of Augustus, look very much alike. Not only do they have similar features, but they also are rendered in a retrospective manner which obscures most of the criteria which could precisely date them on the basis of style. Thus, the only way to be certain a sculpture is indeed Augustus is either that it was found in a context which positively identifies it, or it closely resembles such a portrait. In the second case, the issue can become extraordinarily subjective. In an effort to standardize the criteria and establish an iconography which would allow portraits to be more confidently identified, scholars have often studied the portraits of Augustus. Usually scholarship has centered on attempts to organize these representations into categories, and then establish a chronology. Rarely have the images been considered in relation to their archaeological contexts, and then most often as single pieces rather than as part of a regional study. This paper will attempt to look at Augustan portraiture in a new light, not typologically but rather geographically. The areas to be scrutinized are Roman Greece and Asia Minor, and the major focus of this paper will be on the context of the sculptures and the way it influences their appearance.
The portraits included in this paper are those which are generally accepted as Augustus or have been reasonably identified as such. A few controversial pieces are included because the evidence is such that they cannot altogether be dismissed. Still, this survey makes no attempt to be comprehensive. The portraits selected are those which were set up in major cities in Roman Greece and Asia Minor, and therefore they can provide a clear picture of Roman policy about how portraits in Greece were intended to look and be used.

The earliest serious study of Augustan portraiture was published by J. J. Bernoulli in the late nineteenth century. It was an attempt to identify iconographic features of various Romans, including Augustus. Bernoulli tried to identify the different stages of Augustan portraiture by determining the chronological sequence of the types of images by looking at securely dated coins. He then compared the sculptured portraits to those coin types to see which of them the images most closely resembled.¹ It was an admirable start to a difficult project, complicated by the mutilated nature of much of the evidence and the close resemblance of all the members of the Julio-Claudian line so that often the images can
not be distinguished from one another and certain identification becomes hazardous indeed.

But it was Otto Brendel, in his dissertation of 1928, that really applied this method over a significant number of extant portraits to establish firm categories. He divided the representations into three major groups, which roughly corresponded to three stages in the career of the Princeps; his first rise to prominence in the years after Caesar’s death, as triumvir and then Antony’s rival; a second period (the largest group) the representations after 27 B.C. which show him as the sole and undisputed ruler of Rome, in full possession of his new office and title; and lastly, a type which emerges in his later years and emphasizes his role as pater patriae and civilibus servateis.²

These categories roughly stood until 1954, when German Hafner identified another type of portrait, which he recognized by reclassifying images previously identified as Marcellus. This type he believed predated the Primaporta type.³ He created this new division based on combinations of previously identified sculptural features, not on coin representations, and most of the examples he selects to illustrate it do not readily conform
to the recognized appearance of Augustus,\(^4\) casting doubt on this entire group.

Paul Zanker has reclassified, renamed, and fine-tuned Brendel's study, taking into consideration portraits which combine features of several categories and insisting that the lines not be firmly drawn. He allows for inter-relationships between the groups, local and artistic variation, and he dismisses rigid timeframes for the use of each type.\(^5\)

As evidenced by his portraits on coins, Augustus used several different types of images for himself at the start of his career. His earliest portraits appear on them in 43 B.C.\(^6\) Much variation occurs on these, especially in the first year, but eventually a single type of image becomes dominant, and lasts until about 36 B.C. Few images in sculpture reflect this type,\(^7\) which is characterized by a slim face, youthful features, and the presence of a beard, signifying mourning for his adoptive father. Indeed, even to identify this youthful portrait as Augustus is difficult without a context, since the similarity in the appearance of the young Augustus to his grandsons is so marked that they cannot be securely separated on the basis of features or style. In a recent
study of the portraits of the grandsons, John Pollini has reclassified as Gaius or dismissed every image which had previously been identified as the young Augustus, thereby negating the entire category.⁸

Throughout the decade of the thirties Augustus continued his rise to power and his own prominence was growing. His connection to Caesar was no longer his major asset, and in the last half of the decade, a new image of him was introduced which was less emphatic of that connection.⁹ This image, the so-called Actium type, is exemplified in the portrait from Majorca now in a private collection¹⁰ and in the head in the Capitoline Museum in Rome.¹¹ It can most easily be identified by a characteristic arrangement of the hair on the forehead. The locks fork in opposite directions above the left eye but then appear casually brushed across the forehead in three curls which repeat the same curvature to the right temple [Fig. 1]. This image also borrows from the iconography of Hellenistic monarchs such features as a twisted neck and frown between the brows, meant to suggest the dynamic energy and tension present in this remarkable man. This is especially evident on the coins themselves, where the head is frequently shown in profile against a completely empty background, in the Hellenistic tradition, rather
than with the legends and titles which were customarily used in Rome. Additional features seem more individualized; the long neck, small narrow-lipped mouth, and somewhat aquiline nose.

When the Principate was established in 27 B.C. and Augustus assumed his role as the first citizen of the state, a new portrait type was created which did away with the more obvious Hellenistic features. Augustus chose to connect his reign with the style of fifth century Athens instead of the oriental monarchies of the Hellenistic world. As has been often noted, his new image relies heavily on Polykleitan forms,¹² and the style evokes that of the Golden Age of Athens, with all its connotations of democracy, civic pride, philosophy, and justice, and suggests that Augustus could bring that kind of nobility to Rome.

The images of Augustus which fall into this new category, called the Prima porta type after its best-known exemplar, are by far the largest surviving group of his portrait types, and they reflect the highest degree of solemnity and idealism. Without a context it is usually impossible to determine a date of creation of one of the Prima porta type portraits, or the emperor's age at the
time, which would be useful in determining a date. The hair is arranged in a characteristic manner; that is, it is divided in the front along the forehead into three distinctive locks of hair, forming an arrangement which is diagnostic of this category of portrait. This involves two curls curving towards each other to form a pincer or crab claw, and flanked by the third curl curving away from the other two. The locks to the proper right of this central motif fall into overlapping, mannered disarray, while the locks to the left tend to fall in a more even line across the forehead [Fig. 2]. This arrangement occurs so frequently on portraits of Augustus and so rarely on anyone else that it may be considered one of his only definite attributes. Indeed, identification of this hair arrangement on a portrait almost certainly guarantees that the person being depicted is Augustus himself. In addition to the hair, a sharp, linear rendering of the eyebrows as an even ridge above the eyes is one of the features which contributes most markedly to the severe classicism so apparent in nearly every portrait of the Princeps, especially those of the Primaporta type.¹³ Other characteristics are the ears, which are usually quite prominent and protrude markedly outward from the head, and a smooth and generalized modeling of the face.
The statue of Augustus from Prima porta, the archetypal sculpture from this category, was probably not the first work to depict the emperor in this particular style with these particular iconographic features. But this sculpture, which was found at the villa of Livia, Augustus' wife, may be a marble copy of a bronze original,\textsuperscript{14} although probably a very early or even contemporary copy. The event depicted on his cuirass, the return of the Parthian standards,\textsuperscript{15} is dated to 20 B.C., and it is likely that the original sculpture was created to honor this event slightly afterwards. The statue conforms to the type of image put forth from Rome in the early years of the Principate, that is, after 27 B.C. Besides this unusually specific dating, the Prima porta statue also bears another remarkable trait; it exhibits a high level of artistic quality and technical skill. The portrait was clearly created by an artist of great ability, possibly a court sculptor who was familiar with the actual appearance of the emperor. Although the portrait is greatly idealized and designed mostly as a symbol of Roman virtues, and the general treatment is smooth and classicizing, the cold marble features still betray a strong and forceful sense of character. The stern expressionless face reveals little passion or
warmth or personality, yet the attitude and appearance of the sculpture here suggests a loftiness of mind and nobility of spirit which was clearly intended to demonstrate why Augustus was the Princeps, the first citizen of Rome.

The last major category of Augustan portrait, Brendel's Type D, Hausmann's *Civibius Servateis*, and Zanker's "Nebentypus," is an image that is difficult to date, but is generally agreed to be later than the Primaporta type, and created to commemorate his role as father of the Roman state, a title he officially received in 2 B.C. The image was in use long before that, however, as it is the same type used on the Ara Pacis, a monument which can be dated to 13-9 B.C. This image is exemplified by a bust in the Capitoline Museum in Rome. It is characterized by a more restrained hairstyle; along the forehead the locks appear as if casually brushed to the right in an even line. There is no forking or crab-claw [Fig. 3]. Otherwise, the hair on the back, sides, and top of the head is much the same as on the other images, treated in a manner which is patterned and linear and highly classicizing. The facial features, at least in the best preserved examples, are close to the other images, but the proportions of the face are more slender
and less Polykleitan than the Prima Porta type. Often he is shown wearing the corona civica, an oak leaf crown which symbolized the paternal relationship that Augustus wished to emphasize in regards to Rome in his later years.

Besides these images which were circulated throughout the empire during Augustus' lifetime, another type of representation was introduced after his death and deification, an image of the god Divus Augustus. Often colossal in size and showing him in heroic nudity or semi-nudity, or with attributes or poses of the Olympian gods (especially Zeus), these images still retain the standard head types of the earlier portraits. They were most often set up by his successors in attempt to refer to their own rule as a continuation of his, or as a patriotic symbol of the Roman state.17

Not surprisingly, the archetypal examples of each of the major categories of portrait groups come from Italy, in or near Rome. As will be seen in this paper, the Greek images show a great deal of variation, and often only the arrangement of the forelock remains consistent with the Roman types. Poses, proportions, surfaces, and even handling of the facial features can be treated in
almost unlimited ways, sometimes suggesting a combination of categories, sometimes using a standard forelock motif but few other characteristics of that particular type.

None of these sculptures which have been found in the Greek world betray any real innovation or originality, with the possible exception of the works which are too badly damaged to determine their actual appearance in antiquity. It is likely that every one of them was created as a symbolic image, not as a real representation of a human being. In the Greek world, as elsewhere in the Roman empire, portraits of Augustus were set up for what they represent rather than for who they represent. The images do not generally suggest that artists of great skill created them, but rather that they were copied, either freehand or mechanically, from a prototype of some sort, with variations easily accountable by local craftsman, local materials, and local tradition.18
NOTES


4. For example, the portrait from Sardis now in the Ny Glyptothek in Copenhagen, *Ibid.*, pp. 38-9, MK 15.


9. Hausmann, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 526-35. Hausmann questions this date, pointing out that most extant portraits of this type date to his later years, and suggests instead that this image was created in the late Augustan era to be reminiscent of his youth and so draw an analogy with his young grandsons.


14. This is a notoriously difficult problem when dealing with this statue. Because the bare feet imply divinity and the drapery is an attribute of Divus Julius that likewise implies the divine status of its wearer, many scholars believe that this statue must have been made after the death of Augustus. But the event depicted on his breastplate occurred almost thirty-five years prior to his death and did not have a long life in Augustan propaganda, therefore a statue featuring it should have been made shortly after the event. To reconcile this problem many scholars believe that this statue is a copy and that the copyist added the attributes of divinity to the original. Of course, it is suspicious that no other statues like it exist. For further discussion of this issue and a survey of opinions of it, see Frank Brommer, "Zur Datierung des Augustus von Primaporta," *Fikones: Studien zum Griechischen und Römischen Bildnis. Festschrift Hans Jucker* (Bern: Antike Kunst Beiheft 12, 1980), pp. 78-80.

15. This interpretation was first proposed by G. Henzen when he published the statue in the *BdI* (1863), pp. 71-8; and was further analyzed by Harald Ingholt, "The Prima Porta Statue of Augustus, Pt. 1: The Interpretation of the Breastplate," *Archaeology* 22 (1969), pp. 177-87.


17. For example, the semi-nude figure of Augustus from the imperial portrait group in the Metron at Olympia was probably holding a thunderbolt. It has been convincingly argued to be of Flavian date by Shelly Stone, "The Imperial Sculptural Group in the Metron at Olympia," *AthMitt* 100 (1985), pp. 377-91.

18. The actual mechanism by which images were sent out from Rome in the Augustan era is unclear. For further discussion see Emerson H. Swift, "Imagines in Imperial Portraiture," *AJA* 27 (1923), pp. 286-301; and Meriwether Stuart, "How Were Imperial Portraits Distributed throughout the Roman Empire?" *AJA* 43 (1939), 601-17.
THE RULER CULT

When evaluating this material it is important not to be prejudiced by Judaeo-Christian ideas of religion, which had no place in the world of pagan Rome. Modern scholars, conditioned by the idea that religion is an emotional experience, one which is heartfelt, often allow this conception to cloud their view of the imperial cult. Even after careful evaluation of the evidence, many scholars are still wondering how ancient Romans, who were so much like ourselves in so many ways, could believe in the divinity of their very human emperor. Arthur Darby Nock, the distinguished expert who spent his lifetime studying ancient religion, followed by many other scholars, throughout their writings feel compelled to show that these cults were used as a means to honor the emperor, or as an excessive form of flattery to him, or for their diplomatic or propagandistic values, but that the sensible and practical Romans did not really believe the emperor was divine. While this view is not precisely wrong, it does impose an attitude about religion on the people of the ancient world which (except for the followers of the Jewish religion) they did not have until the Christian era. The emperor was a fact. They would no more think about believing or disbelieving in his
divinity than they would question their belief in thunderstorms or other natural phenomena. To them, religion was not a mystical or emotional experience, it was a recognition of the natural order of the world.\(^5\)

Therefore, this study does not set out to determine whether or not the people of the ancient world really believed the emperor was divine. Rather it is an attempt to investigate the ways they expressed their recognition of his position as supreme leader of the civilized world, a position which was so special and so important that they were certain no one could have achieved it without being an extraordinary man whose destiny had been decreed by the powers of the universe.

The foundations for the connection of political and religious authority which ultimately led to the emergence of a cult of the Roman emperor had been in place for thousands of years in the east. In ancient Mesopotamia, for example, from the dawn of recorded civilization, the rulers of the various kingdoms of the ancient Near East had traditionally been the highest priests of the major divinity of the community.\(^6\) As the highest religious authority the ruler had an intimate connection with the gods and possessed vital knowledge about the workings of
deities which ordinary people did not. He could therefore influence the gods to look favorably upon the city, to ensure prosperity, and, in their harsh and cruel environment, to appease the forces of nature. The religious authority of the high priest gave him political authority as well. Ordinary men dared not oppose him without risking serious consequences; the stakes were too high. The community willingly sacrificed their freedom in exchange for the security of the gods' favor, and in fact probably did not even realize that such an exchange was taking place. Anything less than total servility to the gods' representative on earth was unthinkable.

As the Mesopotamian kingdoms gave way to the huge empire of the Persians, this same conception of the ruler as the single most important representative of the gods on earth was likewise passed along, as was the philosophy of absolutism. The Persian king could claim such divine majesty that when he appeared before them, his subjects were required to kneel at his feet in obeisance and kiss the ground. This act was called proskynesis by the Greeks,7 and they mistakenly believed that it signified worship of the person before whom it was performed. It did not. The Persian king was not worshiped as a god by his people, but rather accorded due homage for his
position as high-priest. By virtue of his role he commanded absolute authority over all matters of politics and religion. To defy him was to defy the natural order of the universe.

In Egypt, however, the situation was somewhat different. The Egyptian pharaoh was considered the earthly incarnation of the sun-god Ra, and therefore was a divinity himself. He was regarded by his subjects with the mixture of awe and fear that only such a characterization can inspire. The pharaoh was a god, and as such could control the forces of nature and the welfare of the state. The average subject would not disobey him or even disagree with him lightly, and willingly suppressed his own needs to serve him. A divine being among ordinary men could command absolute respect and absolute power, and represented the ultimate authority in all matters on earth.

But even closer to Roman emperor worship was Alexander. Although Greek by birth, in the course of his conquests he became familiarized with the East. It is clear that he was influenced by the treatment of rulers in the Persian and Egyptian worlds, and perhaps even Greek tradition as well. For even in Greek history a
precedent had been set for mortals to become immortal. While the rulers were customarily not looked upon as having any kind of divine mandate and were thus easily disposed of or disagreed with, there was nonetheless a tradition of interchange between gods and men. Greek gods were fully anthropomorphic from a very early date, with all the lusts and unhappiness and character flaws which beset their mortal subjects. In fact, despite their greater powers, which were nonetheless limited, often only their immortality seems to separate them from ordinary men. Otherwise they are so like humankind that they could freely have congress among them and even mate with them to produce quasi-divine offspring. Men, too, could aspire to godliness. In Homeric stories Hector and Achilles are both characterized not only as heroes but also as "godlike." Moreover, myths of Herakles, Dionysos, Asklepios, and the Dioscuri lent credence to the notion that a worthy life on earth could lead to immortality, at least for someone fortunate to have been born the son of a god.

Although these familiar myths do not include examples of political authority based on religious authority, ancient sources reveal other precedents of human beings who, in one way or another, maintained their political
position by virtue of their religious superiority. While it is true that these cases are unusual in Greek history, their very uniqueness might have further fueled the legends and helped to influence the young Alexander. In his writings, Aristotle discusses the case of Pythagoras, the philosopher from Samos who established himself in Magna Graecia in the mid to late sixth century.\textsuperscript{11} He controlled the government and was hailed as a god among men.\textsuperscript{12} Although it is not clear if Pythagoras himself claimed divinity in his own time, certainly Aristotle believed he had, and may have shared this belief with his famous pupil.

At the end of the fifth century B.C., Lysander, the Spartan general and victor of the Peloponnesian War, was granted divinity by the people of Samos. So related Plutarch, who based this information on the account of Duris in his \textit{Chronicles of Samos}. This homage consisted of altars built to him, sacrifices carried out on them, the renaming of the games dedicated to the Samian Hera to the Lysandreia, and the singing of paeans to him.\textsuperscript{13} These are all rituals indicative of godliness, and his example may have encouraged Alexander.
But an even closer precedent was the young Macedonian's own father, Philip II. This dynamic ruler may have promoted his own worship. Although the evidence is fragmentary and controversial, it does suggest some attempt at self-deification. The most compelling piece of evidence is the Philippeion at Olympia, a round building in which were displayed statues of Philip, his parents, Alexander, and Olympias. The statues were created by the Athenian Leochares and were of ivory and gold. Because of the preciousness of the materials, chryselephantine statues had previously been reserved for use as cult statues of gods. The use of this material for the group in the Philippeion gives witness not only to the great wealth of the patron but also suggests divine aspirations, especially given the location so near the famous gold and ivory statue of Pheidias' Olympion Zeus. Another piece of evidence which suggests that Philip intended to proclaim himself as a god comes from Diodoros. In 336 B.C., at the wedding celebration of his daughter at Aigai, Philip had a statue of himself exhibited in the theater among the statues of the twelve Olympian gods. His assassination just after this event prevents any conclusions about his ultimate aims, but his plans may have been known to his son, if not directly, than at least through his example.
Alexander himself was worshiped in Egypt. When he took possession of the land, true to ancient tradition, he became god and pharaoh, and as the hieroglyphic records reveal, acquired all the names appropriate to his new position as son of Ra. These honors may not have had much impact on the Greek world, but there were more to come. Strabo and Plutarch both record the even more significant event (in Greek eyes, at least) which occurred at the oracle of Zeus-Ammon in the Libyan desert.\textsuperscript{17} Their accounts are based on that of Kallisthenes, Alexander’s official historian, and relate that the oracle spoke to Alexander in private and revealed that he was the son of god, and probably that he was invincible on earth. This, at least, was the official story put about, with the added information that this revelation had been confirmed at the same time by the oracle at Branchidae in Ionia,\textsuperscript{18} which had been silent since it had been defiled by Xerxes in the fifth century B.C. This oracle was moved to prophesy again by the potency of its revelation, and it coincided with the timing of Alexander’s message in the Sahara.

Of course, to be truly worshiped by the Greeks Alexander needed more than the words of an oracle. He
required cult, with priests, sacrifices, and rituals. These needed to be approved by each city individually. And although the issue was debated and at times furiously opposed, within three years (according to Arrian) ambassadors came to Alexander in Babylon and crowned him as a god. The number of cities which accorded him such worship has been variously estimated at between 20 and 70, but whatever the number at that time, it is clear that after his early death, the legends of his godliness continued to grow and spread. The basis of power for his immediate successors depended on their association with him, and in their hands his memory continued to be divine.

The ultimate intentions of Alexander himself are unknown. He died before he had a chance to fulfill his ambition. But perhaps he believed, as did his teacher, Aristotle, in the possibility of the superiority of certain special men. In a passage in the Politics, probably addressed to Alexander, Aristotle says, "If, however, there be some one person...whose virtue is so pre-eminent that the virtues or political capacity of all the rest admit of no comparison with his, he can no longer be regarded as part of a state; for justice will not be done to the superior, if he is reckoned only as
the equal of those who are so far inferior to him in virtue and political capacity. Such a one may truly be deemed a god among men...Any one would be ridiculous who attempted to make laws for them..."22

The political advantages of Alexander's divinity were widely recognized by his successors after his death. In the past, despite the few relatively insignificant exceptions previously discussed, Greek leaders, even powerfully influential ones like Solon or Pericles or Demosthenes, did not claim any divine authority or Olympian mandate to justify their leadership. But after Alexander had done so, Hellenistic kings continued to legitimize their own rule by various forms of ruler cult. Traditionally scholars have believed that these cults were more closely associated with hero worship than with divine worship, and that it is a misunderstanding of later authors which has confused the two,23 but an examination of the rituals and purposes of the two kinds of cults reveals instead that the cults of the Hellenistic kings more closely resemble those of the Olympian gods than those of heroes.24

For example, heroic cults usually performed their rituals at night, at the tomb of the hero, and used black
sacrificial victims. The *enhagisma*, the sacrificial slaughter, was performed, but the meat of the animal was not eaten but burned or otherwise destroyed. The hero was assumed to require the entire victim for his own nourishment. In contrast, the cult of an Olympian god most often performed their rituals at a temple and used white victims. Their sacrifice, the *thysia*, was then consumed by the participants, which represented the notion of sharing a meal with the god, for whom the idea of appetite was somewhat incongruous. It is probably not merely an accident of preservation that no examples of heroic ritual can be connected with Hellenistic kings. Hero worship was too closely allied with mortality; Greek heroes were dead heroes, and the darkness of the rituals intended to honor them only emphasized this fact. A Hellenistic king could not be accorded heroic honors without acknowledging the fact of his own eventual demise, and, by extension, the temporary nature of his reign. The accordance of divine honors avoided this problem, and allowed the king to connect his rule with that of the gods. Therefore, although his appearance on earth was temporary, his rule was permanent. Death did not signify an end, only a change.
Alexander's generals or their successors, with the exception of the Antigonids, based their right to rule on the claims of their own divinity. Athenaeus [253D] quotes a hymn sung to Demetrius Poliorcetes in Athens which clearly demonstrates the advantage of such a claim: "The other gods are far away or do not have ears or do not exist or do not pay any attention at all to us, but you we see present, not of wood or stone but real." To a people who believed that the ruler was a god present among them, the ruler was in a position of absolute power.

Great pains were taken to ensure that in the minds of his subjects the image of the ruler was constantly connected with the image of divinity. This was done with the sculptural portraits, of course, those in marble and those in the probably more common but less long-lived material of bronze, precious gems and cameos, glass, and the most pervasive of all, images on coins. Alexander and his successors were the first Greeks to be faced with the dilemma: How can a portrait of a man invoke the same sense of awe and reverence as the portrait of a god? Alexander clearly decided to have an image of himself created which somehow suggested his superiority over all other men. Our sources explicitly tell us that he
allowed only three artists to make his image, Lysippos in sculpture, Apelles in painting, and Pyrgoteles in miniature relief for gems and probably coins. This reveals more about Alexander's desire for consistency in his official image than it does about his taste in art. Unfortunately, none of the portraits of Alexander created by his court artists have survived. Plutarch describes the characteristics of the portrait Lysippos created for Alexander in sufficient detail so that it is possible to recognize these features on several later images and thereby have some understanding of what Lysippos' portraits of him looked like. The main features were an upward twist of the neck, eyes gazing heavenward, and an expression of heroic passion which did not detract in any way from his masculine vigor. Plutarch uses the word "leonine" when describing a quality of Alexander, and sculptors often give expression of it in thick locks of curly hair, one of which arches upward over his brow in the familiar anastole, but this does not necessarily reflect the original Lysippan image.

Features of Alexander's portraits continued in the images of Hellenistic rulers, and became part of the inheritance of the Romans. Like Alexander, Augustus desired an unchanging official portrait which emphasized
his leadership capabilities and somehow suggested the inevitability of his rule. And in the same way as the Hellenistic kings used Alexander's image, Augustus depicted his own chosen heirs in the same style and with many of the same features as his own portrait.

In Rome, the situation was different. Ruled by a large body of senators and consuls whose power was limited temporally, they had had no tradition of absolute rule since the Etruscan kings had been overthrown in 509 B.C. Only a single example of a god-king occurs in Roman legend, and that was Romulus. In a foundation legend remarkably similar to those of Greek cities, Romulus had been born the son of a god, and after his sojourn on earth as leader of Rome, he took his place among the other deities. But in Roman history up to the time of the late Republic no one else had attained such distinction. Cicero probably voiced traditional Roman sentiment when he opposed divine honors for Caesar by saying, "I could not be induced to associate any dead man with the religion of the immortal gods, so that a public thanksgiving should be made for him while a tomb existed anywhere at which funeral offerings could be made."
Despite the lack of deified men in Roman history, there did exist in Roman religion the potential for such an idea. A virtual cult of the dead existed in Rome in their unique form of ancestor worship. These were private, family cults, and so no more than a precursor to the official state cult of the deified emperor, but in them can be detected the acceptance of the idea that men could be immortal. Pliny [NH XXXV, 6-7] discusses the display of portraits of the dead ancestors in the houses of noble families. Bronze or wax images were kept in the atria or on the lintels of the doorways outside the houses. Polybius [VI, 53] describes the uses of ancestral portraits in funerary rituals and reveals that living members of the deceased family would wear these images in the ceremonial procession. None of these bronze or wax images have survived, but we have Polybius’ word that they were a close likeness of the individual, and the images are probably reflected in the 200 or so veristic marble portraits of old Roman men which have survived that seem to date to the late Republican or early imperial period.

Lares, the deified spirits of dead ancestors, were also worshiped in special shrines in every house in Rome, and they were referred to as di manes or di parentes.32
The lares were somewhat different from the dead ancestors in the atria, they were actually deified spirits who served as protectors of the household. They were physically represented as well, by small statuettes kept in the lararium of each house. Besides the lares, Roman private worship included that of the genius of the pater familias, that is, worship of the vital essence or living spirit of the head of the household. This homage was intended to ensure prosperity, fertility, and continuity of the family, and by nature it suggested a spirituality present in the father which would live on after him and could be affected by the favor of the gods. This worship consisted of libations and prayers to the gods on behalf of the pater familias, but, as far as can be determined, prayers were not directed to the genius of the man himself. Still, in this ritual can be detected a sense of ambiguity about the differences between mankind and divinity and a belief that some part of mankind could be immortal, rather like the Christian belief in an everlasting soul.

It is against this background in Rome that Caesar arose. The scholarship on Caesar’s claims to kingship and divinity is enormous, and that in itself is indicative that the evidence is conflicting and controversial.
Caesar's assassination at age 56, when he was at the peak of his power, precludes any definitive statements about his plans for Rome and his own ultimate role in the future government. What is certain, however, is that Caesar had received enormous honors decreed by the Senate; honors which traditionally conferred attributes designating monarchy or even divinity to the recipient. Also known are Caesar's short-range plans: he intended to lead an expedition against the Parthians on the north-eastern frontier. What has sometimes been explained as megalomania, senility or even psychosis on the part of Caesar, or proof of his monarchical ambition, can also be seen as an attempt to make his presence felt in Rome during his planned absence in the east. For a ruler who could not be everywhere at once, the symbolism of an empty throne in the theaters and an ivory statue in the Circus in his capital city probably seemed an attractive way to assert his continued authority when he was not there to enforce it himself.

Whatever Caesar's plans about divinity for himself, his successors had plans of their own. Antony and Octavian each had his own agenda regarding the immortality of their mentor. Whether or not they were motivated by outrage and grief (as Octavian claimed),
it was certainly to their political advantage to make Caesar’s memory as glowing as possible and then play up their connections to him. The claims of divinity which were for the most part covert and subtle during Caesar’s lifetime became overt and blatant in the hands of Antony and Octavian. Although, as with Greek cities, it was up to the Senate to consecrate the new god, it was Antony who spoke in Caesar’s defense before the Senate on 17 March 44 to obtain permission for Caesar’s burial and their acknowledgement of the beneficial effects of his leadership on Rome. This was the first step. But it was probably Octavian who addressed the Senate on 1 January 42, when they officially confirmed Caesar’s apotheosis and deification. What this meant is not at all clear. Little evidence exists for these first years after the decree was passed, but it seems mostly to have restored the honors voted to Caesar when he was alive that had been largely denied to him since his death. After the defeat of Caesar’s assassins at Philippi, Octavian and Antony both seem to have begun the serious business of promoting and organizing the new cult. At Ephesos, in 41 B.C., Antony established a priesthood and games, and during this period he probably set up the cults at Smyrna, Sparta, and Thessaloniki. In Rome itself, Octavian began the construction of a temple to Divus Julius, and
started officially calling himself "Divi Filius."
Although the sources do not document this period fairly or well,\textsuperscript{40} it seems evident that both of the triumvirs had in mind a divinely sanctioned rule, in which they each saw themselves as Caesar’s successor, and each tried to promote and glorify his memory to make their own positions more secure. Probably they both had some Romanized form of a Hellenistic monarchy in mind for themselves,\textsuperscript{41} but it was Antony in the east who had the easier task of making it happen. The long tradition of deified and/or religiously authorized rulers in the eastern parts of the empire contributed to his ready assumption of the role, his hearty personality allowed him to play it with gusto, and his collaboration with Cleopatra not only provided him with valuable resources but encouraged him to even greater extravagances.

Antony was styling himself as the New Dionysos in the east, but Octavian was connecting himself with the god Apollo in Italy. Again, the details are unclear and the sources about the activities of both of these men during this period cannot be trusted, but it seems evident that both men were trying to gain the strongest possible position and, in these early years, both men were claiming special patronage from a particular god.
Octavian issued a series of coins (probably in 37) with Apollo’s symbols, the tripod and wreath, on them, and it was also around this time that he began the work on the grand marble temple dedicated to Apollo on the Palatine, beside which the city gave him a house so he could live next to his patron deity. Antony even accuses him of dressing up as Apollo and appearing at a banquet. Whether or not this was true, rumors of Antony’s own outrageous behavior in the east were coming back to Rome and gave Octavian the fuel he needed to gain an edge over his rival. Octavian dwelled not so much on Antony’s behavior as an oriental monarch or even as the incarnation of Dionysos as he did on Antony’s flagrant disregard for Roman law and Roman tradition. However accurate the rumors about Antony’s behavior were, Octavian used them to characterize the triumvir as a man who, bewitched by a foreign queen, wanted to do away with Roman religion and government, move the capital to Alexandria, and give Roman territories to his Egyptian family to rule. From here on Octavian styled himself as the defender of Roman tradition and let go of most of his propaganda about Apollo; it was the role of conservative Roman that garnered him the most support in the west; so much that the entire Italian citizenry vowed an oath of allegiance to Octavian, which he took as a personal mandate to
engage Antony and Cleopatra in war.\textsuperscript{44}

Because Octavian had to drop whatever plans he had for himself to be a divine monarch so that he could use that charge against with Antony, in the early years after Actium Octavian had to continue his role as the exemplar of Roman tradition, at least in the capital city itself. He had to be careful not to be seen as in any way resembling some kind of oriental monarch, against whom he had just fought a bitter war. Thus, he denied most of the honors offered to him by the Senate and from the east, and took care to behave with a respect for Roman customs and institutions in Rome itself.\textsuperscript{45} This was a role which came easily to him, and one that he played for the rest of his life.

But he still faced the problem of securing the loyalty of the east, which, after all, had been Antony’s arena, and was also an area accustomed to divine rulers. Octavian had to reconcile the eastern expectation of a monarch with the Roman idea of a temporally limited, human \textit{dux} or \textit{imperator}. With an astute grasp of this situation, Octavian carefully managed to balance the varying conceptions of imperial behavior, and to maintain that balance until his position was so secure there was
no longer anything he could do which was unacceptable in
the eyes of Rome. Only then, as an aging emperor inter-
ested in establishing an heir, did he allow himself the
indulgences which he had denied himself after Actium. At
first, Octavian did allow temples to be built to himself
in the East, but only provided that his worship was
shared with the goddess Roma,\textsuperscript{46} and that these temples
were for the use of the native population, not the Romans
living in the regions,\textsuperscript{47} but he carefully avoided dis-
plays of his own divinity in Rome. By the honors he did
permit, however, he created a potential for deification,
following Caesar’s precedent. However, he allowed and
maybe even encouraged eastern cities to have local and
municipal cults to himself alone, with a full complement
of priests, temple, sacrifices, and games.\textsuperscript{48} These cults
were probably spontaneous on the part of the individual
cities. In any case they were not officially sanctioned
by Augustus, which is supported by the fact that there
are no examples of cults to Augustus alone in major
sanctuaries in the east during his lifetime, where his
imperial policy would likely have been directed. When
temples in important Greek shrines do appear, such as on
the Acropolis in Athens, his worship is shared with the
goddess Roma.
However, in Rome the distinction between divinity and potential divinity was carefully maintained, but the potential continued to be emphasized. In 27 B.C. his new title was awarded by the Senate, which suggested a recognition of his superior nature (or at least his superior position), and also many other honors as well. One of the most significant was that the genius of Augustus was recognized as the embodiment of the vitality of all of Rome, and a libation was ordered to be poured to it before all banquets. 49 When he returned from the East, Augustus set about doing what he had promised, at least in terms of religion. He focused on the traditional Roman cults, and, with a decidedly conservative attitude, he began the repairs of temples, the revival of priesthoods, and the renewal of rituals, all of which were intended to symbolize the continuity of Augustus' rule with the old ways of Rome. Of course, all the while he was also forging ahead with something entirely new; the permanent consolidation of power into the hands of a single figure: himself. Yet this was done quietly, almost covertly, and the great public operations of temple building and temple restoration going on all over Rome must have attracted the attention of the people, particularly the lower classes, far more than his subtle manipulation of Roman political offices and power.
After his acceptance of the title Pontifex Maximus in 12 B.C., Augustus turned his attention to the lower classes in Rome. Perhaps realizing that toasts to his genius before banquets would only be useful to those who had such extravagant meals, that is, the upper classes, he chose to institute a cult suggesting his divine potential for the lower classes. Therefore, Augustus revived the old cult of the gods of the crossroads, the Lares Compitales, changed them to the Lares Augusti, the spirits of his own house, and made the priesthoods accessible to the plebeian class. This cult implied worship of his family and expressed the wish for its continuity more than they implied divinity of Augustus himself.  

And still in the East the cults and honors to Augustus continued to increase. There are many examples. One of the most telling is the plan which several of the client kings developed, probably after 12 B.C. to complete the temple of the Olympian Zeus in Athens and dedicate it to the genius of Augustus [Suetonius, Augustus 60]. The variety of ways this worship was expressed suggested that the impetus was local; there could have been no official policy from the center to account for so many different manifestations. By 9 B.C. a spirit of competi-
tion even arose in Asia; a contest was held to see who could suggest the highest honor to Augustus [OGIS 458]. The prize was enthusiastically awarded to the Roman governor, who had proposed that the year should begin on the birthday of Augustus, an honor hitherto unthought of by the Greeks. The city of Tralles was so grateful for his aid after an earthquake that they changed the name of the city to Caesareia [Strabo, XII, 579]. Another contest occurred, this time in Kos, which awarded a prize to the person who could compose the most lavish speech in his honor.52

Therefore, during the Principate, the cult of Augustus and the issue of his divinity were treated differently in Rome and in the provinces. He allowed and perhaps unofficially encouraged the flourishing of a regular cult in the provinces, similar to those of Hellenistic monarchs, but his official position in regard to his own worship in the east was that it must be shared with Dea Roma, and that this cult was only for people accustomed to ruler worship. But for Rome and Romans living abroad, he kept those ideas in check, awaiting apotheosis as his reward for a virtuous life. He did not wait in vain. Less than a month after his death, on 17 September A.D. 14, he was formally consecrated as Divus
Augustus and enrolled in the Pantheon of Roman gods. Henceforth his successors were free to allow all forms of divine worship to himself alone in all parts of the empire, including Rome. No longer did he share a cult with the goddess Roma. Major Greek sanctuaries likewise received temples and priesthods; at Olympia, for example, the imperial cult had taken over the Metroon by the second half of the first century A.D., probably in the early years of the Flavian dynasty (after A.D. 69). This group included a central cult statue of Divus Augustus flanked by three later emperors and members of their families. The imperial cult was also established at Delphi. Although the date of its appearance is unknown, the building in which it was housed was probably used for another purpose and then, as at Olympia, was taken over by the ruler cult.

The formal official worship of Divus Augustus continued in various degrees throughout the imperial period. Later emperors recognized the propagandistic value of connecting their own reigns to his, and paid homage to him as the founder of imperial Rome. Thus, Tiberius was anxious to promote the cult of Divus Augustus. He began the construction of a temple to him on the Palatine, a shrine in Nola (where Augustus had died), and in
Tarraco, Spain, he formally sanctioned a Temple to Divus Augustus, which Tacitus tells us was intended to set a precedent for the other provinces. Other emperors, while further removed from Augustus, were nonetheless interested in invoking his image to sanction their own reigns, thus statues of Divus Augustus could be included among or even as the focus of structures dedicated to the imperial cult. In the aforementioned Metroon at Olympia, for example, Vespasian, in an effort to emphasize the continuity of Roman tradition and the legitimacy of the new dynasty he was beginning, installed a sculptural group into the building which had a central cult statue of Augustus, flanked by Claudius, himself, and his son Titus and their wives. Thus the image of Augustus, recorded in sculpture and in legend, continued to be the object of honor long after his death.
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CONTEXTS OF THE SCULPTURES

Athens  Nos. 1 and 2

Both of these portraits can be connected with the Roman Agora in Athens, and, although neither has an absolutely certain provenance, quite plausible and even likely suggestions can be formulated.

The Roman Agora, or the Market of Caesar and Augustus, is a large marble paved area which lies adjacent to the agora of the classical city, behind and slightly east of the Stoa of Attalos. Most of the area cannot be specifically dated, but the large propylon on the west side of the court bears an inscription [IG II 3175] which precisely places it in the late first century B.C. The text of the inscription records that the gate was begun by Caesar and completed by Augustus. The inauguration of the project by Caesar is believed to have occurred during his visit to Athens in 47 B.C., but it was not until Augustus supplied more funds that the work was completed, and in 11/10 or 10/9 B.C., during the archonship of Nikias, the gate was dedicated to Athena Archegetis.¹

47
The west propylon itself is a tetrastyle Doric building, and it is placed off the axis of the Ionic peristyle which surrounds the paved court, suggesting that it may have been earlier than the rest. The peristyle must have been squeezed into the available space around it. What is remarkable about the building itself is the purely Greek architectural vocabulary which was chosen for this structure. Here, in the spiritual capital of the Hellenic world, in a propylon commissioned by Roman patrons, the Italian preference for arched entranceways was completely submerged. Likewise, the favored Corinthian order has yielded to the more austere and purely Greek antiquarian forms of the Doric, suggesting a link between the builders of this structure and the noble democrats and thinkers responsible for the splendid ancient buildings on the Acropolis directly above them. And, to make the point even clearer, the propylon is constructed of the same fine white Pentelic marble, rather than the less expensive materials frequently seen in Roman buildings, and especially often used at this time in economically depressed Athens. Thus, this building, which was built with Roman funds and whose construction was supervised by the highest Roman leaders, is one of the formal, official projects sanctioned by Rome. It
provides clear example of the Augustan intention to connect his rule with the classical past.

When the Englishmen Stuart and Revett visited Athens in the 18th century they noted and carefully copied a now lost inscription from a statue base resting on the central akroterion of the pediment which records the presence of a statue of Lucius Caesar, grandson and adopted son of Augustus, who died in A.D. 2. From the size of the base they concluded that the statue was probably equestrian. Scholars have frequently noted that a statue of Lucius Caesar, the younger and less distinguished of the two princes, would hardly have existed apart from his brother Gaius, especially in an eastern city such as Athens, where Gaius' activities and presence were more significantly felt. Therefore, it has been plausibly suggested that a similar statue of the elder brother would likely have been erected nearby, possibly over the inner facade of the same gate. In any case, wherever the statue of Gaius was located, the presence of Lucius and the dedication of the gate from the gifts of Caesar and Augustus suggest that the Roman Agora may have been used as a Kaisereion, an area in which the imperial cult was worshiped. This is especially possible since the Roman Agora in Athens followed the form of Kaisereia
in the east, that is, a quadriporticus with a paved central court. An analogy can be drawn with similar structures in other parts of the empire, notably the Kaisereion in Alexandria. Although little of it remains visible and it has not been excavated, the chronology of the building can be reconstructed from literary sources. It was probably begun by Caesar when he was in Egypt in 48/47 B.C. as a monument to himself, and it was considerably elaborated by Augustus, who erected two obelisks in 13/12 B.C. and probably added much of the other decoration. The structure was described by Philo around A.D. 40. "huge and conspicuous, fitted on a scale not found elsewhere, with dedicated offerings, around it a girdle of pictures and statues in silver and gold, forming a precinct of vast breadth, embellished with porticoes, libraries, chambers, groves, gateways, and wide open courts and everything which lavish expenditure could produce to beautify it." Here and elsewhere Philo uses the word "temenos" to describe the courtyard, requiring that an altar or shrine was located somewhere, probably in the center.

The Kaisereion in Alexandria was not the only such structure begun by Caesar in the Roman world. Antioch, which Caesar visited in 47 B.C., also received a large
paved central courtyard surrounded by porticos and called a Kaisereion. In later times it too was used to worship the imperial cult. The fact that the construction of such architecturally similar structures which had such similar purposes in Alexandria, Antioch, and Athens were begun by Caesar at nearly the same time can hardly be coincidental, and it is not impossible that Augustus, so soon after making improvements in the Alexandrian Kaisereion might want to complete a similar area in the heart of Greece’s most important city. It is reasonable to assume that at least one statue of Augustus would have been associated with the marketplace in some way, perhaps on the interior of the propylon, or even in the open courtyard of the Agora.

Evidence for the worship of the imperial cult in the older part of the marketplace, the Athenian Agora, also exists. The Stoa of Zeus in the northwest corner, below the Kolonos Agoraios, contained a pair of shrines, one of which was probably used for the worship of Augustus and his family. The shrines are located in an annex to the main stoa, and date to somewhere in the first century after Christ. Although no sculpture was found there, in the north chamber are the remains of a statue base of which one of the marble blocks of the top course remains.
In it are cuttings for the foot of a greater than life-size bronze sculpture, with room for two other figures of similar scale. The south chamber likewise contained explicit evidence for a monument base of similar dimensions in the arrangement of the paving blocks which were found in situ. Only fragments of inscriptions which do not provide explicit evidence have been found, but it is quite likely that the shrines were used to honor a god who would not be offensive to Zeus Eleutherios, who was already being worshiped in the main stoa. It is difficult to identify any cult which would satisfy this requirement other than that of the emperor himself and his immediate family. And if worship of a god was carried on here, as evidenced by the altar-like structure in front of the stoa, an image of him of some sort must have been associated with this building, perhaps on one of the statue bases on the interior. It would be interesting to compare the projected sizes of the statues from where these heads came to see if one could have fit onto the statue base in the south chamber.

But even if this stoa was not used for the worship of the imperial cult, it is clear that Augustus had officially allowed his worship in Athens during his lifetime. The Temple of Augustus and Roma on the Athenian Acropolis
is a clear testimony to this worship. The fact that this temple was combined with Roma shows that it was built in accordance with his official policy, and was probably formally sanctioned by him. Built in the Ionic order and entirely of Pentelic marble, this monopteral temple was placed directly beside the single most important monument of the classical age, the Parthenon. It is another example that in Athens the Romans desired to use Greek forms and symbolism and translate them into a Roman idiom. Even the columns are direct copies of those on the Erechtheum.\textsuperscript{11} The materials, architectural order, location, and even the idea of building a temple to the new ruler may all have been Hellenistic, but the final result was a structure which was clearly evocative of the glories of the classical past and intended to suggest a connection between that earlier era and the new Roman one. The well-preserved inscription from a block of the epistyle [IG II2 3173] uses the title Sebastos and therefore the building must date to after 27 B.C., but probably only shortly after that.\textsuperscript{12}

In addition to the cult on the Acropolis, Augustus was separately worshiped in the lower part of the city. Thirteen altars dedicated to him and dating to his reign have been found, all but one of which were discovered in
or around the Athenian or Roman Agora. These altars were clearly large public monuments, and sacrifices to the emperor would have been made on them. Quite likely statues of the emperor would have been placed in the vicinity of some of them. Known, too, are other examples which might signify worship of his heirs. In the middle years of the Principate, a Temple to Ares, originally built in the fifth century B.C. was dismantled in its original location, probably at Acharnai, and re-erected in the Athenian Agora. Ares was an especially meaningful god to Augustus, who lavished considerable resources on the creation of the Temple of Mars Ultor as the centerpiece of his Forum in Rome. Mars, and Ares, his Greek counterpart, symbolized the role of Avenger which Augustus himself took on after the murder of Caesar. When the Temple of Ares was moved to Athens the cult which tended it was probably expanded to include worship with Gaius Caesar as well, as evidenced by a statue base dated to A.D. 2, with an inscription proclaiming him as the "New Ares" [IG2 3250].

In conclusion, the evidence for imperial worship in Athens during the Augustan Principate is plentiful, and can be confirmed both by analysis of the archaeological remains and examination of the literary sources. Here,
in the very heart of the Greek world, is probably the best opportunity of examining Augustan imperial policy regarding his worship and also the form the images honoring him would take. Although the surviving bona fide examples of portraits which represent the Princeps are so few, it can be taken as nearly certain that in the late first century B.C. and especially in the early first century A.D. many images of Augustus would have adorned the temples, shrines, and public monuments of the city. It would be expected that these images, located quite near each other geographically and dating within decades of each other, would have likewise shared common features in representing the emperor. They would probably have had similar facial characteristics and have been carved in a similar style, perhaps even by the same artists or workshops, and they would certainly have been created as images with similar goals in mind. Therefore, it is surprising to note that the only two plausible portraits of Augustus extant seem so different from each other. Although one of the images is not of high artistic quality and the other quite battered, the images suggest different styles and traditions, which is perhaps reflective of the eclectic climate of Graeco-Roman art at this time, and shows a tolerance for inconsistent representations of the same individual.
Within the confines of the so-called Julian Basilica in Ancient Corinth was found a rich collection of sculpture that has been reconstructed to represent various members of the domus Augusti and later imperial rulers. These sculptures probably originally stood in or on the Julian Basilica, and were found lying largely undisturbed after an earthquake in the late imperial period\(^1^7\) caused them to be thrown violently to the ground and covered them with the debris of the building. The figure of Augustus was thoroughly published and discussed shortly after its discovery in 1915.\(^1^8\) It was found against the southwest wall of the Julian Basilica, where it had lain seemingly undisturbed for more than 1500 years. Unfortunately, the Julian Basilica was not fully published until almost four decades after the sculpture, in 1960, so many assumptions have arisen regarding the dating of these figures.

Now it is clear that the building could not have been built in Augustus' lifetime. The inscriptions connected with the basilica can date to no earlier than Caligula's reign,\(^1^9\) and a coin of Claudius' dated to A.D.
41-54 found in the fill of the toichobate\textsuperscript{20} furthur con-

firms a date of A.D. 41 at the earliest. Therefore, 

although the date of the sculpture cannot be determined, 

its placement in this building must have certainly post-
dated the life of Augustus.

But what about the two statues of Gaius and Lucius 

likewise found in the debris of the building? It is dif-
ficult to imagine that anyone in the reigns of Caligula 
or Claudius or any subsequent emperor would have commis-
sioned sculptured images of the long dead and, in 

retrospect, undistinguished princes. For this reason it 

has been suggested that the three statues were carved 
sometime before the death of Augustus and originally 

stood somewhere else, only later to be moved to the 
Julian Basilica.\textsuperscript{21} The main disagreement with this view 

has been the lack of finish on the backs of all three 

statues, suggesting that the sculptors were aware of 
their ultimate destination when creating them.\textsuperscript{22} Indeed, 
the figure of Gaius even has a large flaw in the back 
which probably indicates that it was carved from an 
already damaged block of marble. This argument is 
unnecessary. The Romans preferred sculpture in a niche 
or connected with architecture in some way and rarely 
ereected freestanding figures. Therefore, it is quite
likely that the group was moved from one niche to another, thereby avoiding the display of the flawed and incomplete treatment of the backs of the figures. This would allow the dating of the figures to the Augustan era, where they can most logically be explained, and prevent the complicated arguments required to push their creation down to be contemporary with the structure.\(^{23}\) Thus, they could have been originally conceived of as a group, with the Augustus figure in the center and the others flanking it on either side. This is indeed how the sculptures are currently displayed in the museum in Ancient Corinth, a clear demonstration of their coherence as a group.\(^{24}\)

In their new location they were apparently not kept together. The sculptures of the young princes were discovered near the east outer wall. Saul Weinberg, author of the definitive publication on the building, states, "...in the Julian Basilica, at least in its later period before the destruction, the Augustus must have stood far from the other two, in the southwestern part of the building."\(^{25}\) So for whatever reasons these sculptures were originally created, by the time of the destruction of the Julian Basilica, their integrity as a group was no longer respected or required. Perhaps in later times,
when memories of the young men were no longer meaningful, the sculptures became associated with new identities, probably Castor and Pollux, and were then reused in a new context.

Here in Corinth, in a Roman colony founded a few decades before by Caesar, and the main commercial center of an important Roman province, it would be expected that sculptured images of the imperial family would closely resemble the prototypes sent out from Rome. It is therefore not surprising that the image of Augustus found here corresponds to the style, iconography, and overall impression of dignity and nobility of Italian Augusti such as the Via Labicana and Prima porta, but it is more mask-like and symbolic, as befitting his divine status in Greece.

**Ephesos** Nos. 4 and 5

The two portraits of Augustus discovered in Ephesos and now in the Seljuk museum were both found in definitive contexts which make their locations in antiquity almost assured. The lifesize head, No. 4, was discovered near a small temple in the middle of the upper square at
Ephesos. A square block from the same area bears an inscription recording a list of the names of priests and referring to their cult as existing through the "the foundation of Augustus and the dedication of the sanctuary."\textsuperscript{28} This has been interpreted as evidence that the temple was dedicated to Augustus.\textsuperscript{29} The head of Augustus was likely the cult statue of that temple. The other portrait, No. 5, with the corresponding figure of Livia, was discovered in the eastern annex to the Stoa Basilike, the long stoa along the northern side of the square, and were probably set up in there or close by [Fig. 4].

The fact that this entire upper agora was used at least in part to honor the imperial family cannot be doubted. To the north, just beyond the Stoa Basilike, is a temple with two cellas dedicated to Roma and Divus Julius. And the Stoa Basilike itself, which was built in the latter part of Augustus' reign, was dedicated to Artemis—the most important Ephesian deity—Augustus, and Tiberius. Additionally, the nearby Temple to Domitian confirms that in this area the imperial cult continued to function even beyond the age of Augustus. The sculpture which has been found in the area shows that the images of various members of the imperial family were set up here.
Tiberius, Germanicus, and Agrippina have been recognized among the other portraits of Julio-Claudians.

The form of the upper agora is nearly a quadriporticus, and bears much in common with the other Kaisereia described by Sjökvist.\textsuperscript{30} It is paved, rectangular, and bounded on three sides by porticos. The fourth side, on the west, is divided into a series of small rooms that appear to have faced the open court with doorways inserted in an otherwise solid wall. If, as in Alexandria, Antioch, and probably Athens, this central courtyard was regarded as the temenos for the entire structure, it is not surprising that a temple to Augustus should be located in the middle.

The upper square at Ephesos was completely renovated during the rule of Augustus,\textsuperscript{31} and thus, this architecture was planned and built with Augustan aims and attitudes. Ephesos was the capital city of the Roman province of Asia, and the seat of Roman rule. Therefore it can provide excellent evidence for how Augustus wanted his portrait to look and how he wanted it to be used. The surviving archaeological evidence clearly shows that the upper square was elaborated and adorned with sculpture representing himself and other members of the
imperial family. The two extant portraits of him are reflective of his idealized image, and the colossal statues of Augustus (No. 5) and Livia from the Stoa Basilike in particular suggest that gesture and attitude took precedence over high artistic quality.

Samos  Nos. 6, 7, and 8

Augustus is known to have spent four winters on the island of Samos in the early years of the Principate, the first in 31 B.C. while recuperating from the battle of Actium, and again, after a brief return to Italy, in 31/30 B.C. In 21/20 and 20/19 B.C. he twice more maintained his winter headquarters there. It is therefore not surprising to find his portrait well-represented in the archaeological record. Three heads, all believed to represent the Princeps, are associated with the island. Two of them, Nos. 6 and 8, were discovered in the Kastro Tigani, and the third, although of unknown provenance, is now in the museum in the city of Samos.

The Kastro Tigani is really a conglomeration of overlapping structures dating from prehistory to the 19th century. Included among the ruins are the remains of a
structure which has been identified as a Hellenistic-Roman villa. The area has not been entirely excavated due to its important position in the modern city as the site of the large Orthodox church of the Transfiguration, with a cemetery beside it. Indeed, it was during the groundbreaking for the construction of a new schoolhouse in 1915 that some of the Julio-Claudian portraits were discovered. This led to the designation of the area as an archaeological zone, and the systematic excavation of some of the structure, including the discovery of more imperial sculpture. These early explorations turned up seven male figures identified as Claudius, Trajan, two figures of Augustus, and three Julio-Claudian princes, perhaps Tiberius and Lucius Caesar among them, as well as three women, perhaps Livia, Agrippina, and Antonia. Unfortunately the records from these early campaigns have been lost, as have the capite velato head of Augustus and all three of the female figures. The schoolhouse was never built, but it was not until the 1960's that excavation was resumed.

It is now clear that this villa occupied an important position on the hill, overlooking the ancient city of Samos on the south and the sea on the east. It was originally built in the first part of the second century
for some wealthy resident, as evidenced by its prominent location, grand scale, and the richness of the excavated remains, which includes liberal usage of fine imported marbles. It can scarcely be doubted that in the Roman period many of the well-documented visitors to the island would have stayed here, and that it was used as the residence of Roman state officials in their absence. Evidence shows that the villa was impressively enlarged in the Augustan era, but even in its original form it was the type of structure that the Romans loved as country homes, having at least two grand peristyles within it, and a lovely view of the sea.

The precise findspots of the two Augustus portraits have been lost, but it is nearly certain that they came from within the villa itself, and may have been set up in one of the peristyle gardens. Although the discovery of such a large collection of imperial portraits in a residential context is surprising, in light of the public and political nature of much of the business that would have been transacted here, the display of this sculpture can be seen as quite regular. Such decoration would contribute to the authority and dignity of the men who were important enough to be so honored, and serve to impress the large numbers of local politicians, diplomats, and
petitioners who came to the villa seeking an audience with the emperor or his representative.

Delos No. 9

The colossal head from Delos may be connected with two inscriptions pertaining to Augustus discovered on the island. The first\textsuperscript{35} records that a statue of Octavian was erected by the Athenian and Delian peoples to honor him. The absence of the title Augustus dates this inscription prior to 27 B.C.,\textsuperscript{36} when he received the title. A second, badly damaged inscription records his new name and probably dates shortly after his adoption of that title.\textsuperscript{37}

A statue of Augustus was set up in the cella of the Temple of Apollo, the most important shrine on the island.\textsuperscript{38} A circular base near it once contained an image of Agrippa. Outside the temple but close by were portraits of Augustus' daughter Julia and her son Gaius,\textsuperscript{39} indicating that once again this was an area used to honor the imperial family, not Augustus alone.
Although the once prosperous island of Delos was twice sacked earlier in the century, and had lost most of the trade which made it the busiest port in the Aegean in the late Hellenistic period, the island was still the site of an important sanctuary in Greek tradition. Apollo had been born on Delos, and likely Artemis, too, and although the once-great Delian festivals were no longer held, and the population of the island was steadily decreasing, Augustus' desire to respect the classical age and link himself to it may have led to the installation of his portrait inside the temple and the erection of representations of his family members around it.

**Thessaloniki No. 10**

The heroically posed sculpture of Augustus now on display in the archaeological museum in Thessaloniki was discovered west of the modern Dhimarkhion and north of the ancient Sarapeion near the center of the city. Since little of Thessaloniki has been excavated and not all the results published it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the location of the sculpture in antiquity. Still, near the Augustus figure a headless statue
of Claudius was found, leading scholars to speculate that perhaps a Kaisereion was located in this vicinity.\textsuperscript{42} The partially excavated ruins of the Roman Agora are also near this area, and the Agora may even have been connected to it in antiquity, which, as in other examples, adds more credibility to this idea.

Additionally, numismatic and epigraphical evidence indicate that a cult of Augustus and perhaps even a temple to him were established in Thessaloniki shortly after the battle of Actium. A coin of the city bears his head on the obverse with the legend "Caesar Sebastos," and the reverse shows a Nike on the prow of a ship with a crown and palm branch. The reference to a naval victory make it probable that this coin was minted to commemorate Actium.\textsuperscript{43} Furthermore, two inscriptions record the presence of a priesthood of Augustus, which probably began about the same time as the coins were minted, that is, in the early 20's B.C.\textsuperscript{44} Quite likely the statue in the museum was involved in his worship in some way.

The heroic semi-nudity and the bare feet of the emperor also suggest that this may be a posthumous likeness of him, but the absence of a datable context and lack of datable features on the work itself preclude any
conclusive timeframe. The similarity of this statue to the iconography of imperial sculptures in Rome suggest a close contact with the capital city, which would be expected given the situation of Thessaloniki during the Principate. It was the largest city in Macedonia and the most important crossroads in the east. The great east-west road, the Via Egnatia, ran through it, as well as the routes to the Danube in the north and shipping points south from its excellent harbor. Although Macedonia was not an imperial province during this time, it was clearly an important city to Rome, and the ties maintained between the two cities were strong.

Pergamon No. 11

The lifesize head of Augustus from Pergamon was discovered hidden in a cistern near the sanctuary of Demeter in Pergamon. In conjunction with it were found several other sculptured heads, including a portrait of Agrippina the Elder and another image, possibly representing Germanicus. How these sculptures got into the cistern is purely a matter of speculation, and where they originally stood is likewise an unanswerable question.
What is known is that a temple to Augustus and Roma was located in Pergamon, probably in the civic center at the base of the Acropolis. Although excavation has not revealed any conclusive remains of it, Pergamene coins over the course of many years refer to it. The earliest of these coins show a hexastyle temple with central and corner akroteria placed on a five stepped podium. Later the representations of the architecture are less consistent and more schematic, but they clearly depict the cult statue of the cuirassed emperor being crowned by the goddess Roma inside. Additionally, a second century scholar named Telephus wrote a now lost treatise on the architecture of this temple, indicating not only that it existed but that it must have been sufficiently interesting to induce analysis of its features by someone other than the architect who designed it.

Tacitus and Dio Cassius both reveal that shortly after Actium, in 29 B.C., the cities of Asia and Bithynia petitioned Augustus for permission to erect temples to him. He granted one temple in each region, to be built in Nicomedia and Pergamon, both jointly dedicated to Augustus and Roma. The Pergamene temple was the seat of the Koinon of Asia, the organization of Asian cities, and the only officially sanctioned imperial temple in the
province of Asia for over fifty years. At the annual assemblies of the representatives of the Koinon, games called Romaia Sebasta were celebrated, but despite its ostensibly religious function, the Koinon and the cult played an important role in the political life of the entire province as well.51

This official state cult may not have been the only cult of Augustus at Pergamon, however. A municipal cult may also have been located there. This cult would have been a smaller one, more removed from official Roman control, yet it still seems to have been used to promote Augustus' heirs as well as himself. An inscription records a certain Cn. Otacilius Chrestus as the priest of Caesar and the agonothete of the sons of Augustus.52 The fact that no mention is made of Roma suggests a separate cult, and the inscription itself must date to after 17 B.C. when Augustus adopted his grandsons, and probably before Lucius' death in A.D. 2.53

In conclusion, the portrait head of Augustus found in Pergamon may have been associated with either the official cult of the province or the cult of the city. Its features reflect a blending of the iconography of both the Roman tradition and the Hellenistic one, as
would be expected in a city which had its own strong artistic style yet desired to honor the emperor in his own terms as well.
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PURPOSES OF THE PORTRAITS

How were these portraits used? Who commissioned them? Were they simply an attempt to make the presence of the first emperor of the Roman world felt in Greece? Or did they have an even greater significance?

To answer these questions we must first of all look at the data compiled in this report. Of the thirteen portraits considered in the catalogue something is known about the location in antiquity of eleven of them. The other two have no known provenance. Ten of those known were found in contexts which included homage to other members of Augustus' family, specifically those of his intended heirs. And all of them can be connected to public display. The two portraits from Ephesos almost certainly were used for worship as well, and the others, with the exception of the two from the Kastro Tigani in Samos, quite likely could have been. Added to these portraits which have been found are the numerous statue bases and inscriptions from the Greek world which record the presence of lost works of art dedicated to or depicting the likeness of Rome's first emperor. An even approximate total of those that existed is impossible to determine due to the uncertainty caused by damaged or
lost or yet to be discovered artifacts, or those known portraits whose features are ambiguous enough to make identification questionable; still, a survey of the current archaeological remains from Roman Greece and Asia Minor confirm that many other portraits of Augustus are known to have been in the same general types of contexts as the works included in this report. Therefore, the conclusion follows that most of the time when a portrait of Augustus was set up in the Greek world it was accompanied by portraits representing other close members of his family, and that these images were often the focus of homage and even worship as cult objects.

In the latter half of Augustus’ reign, when his position was secure and his continued rule assured, it became increasingly important to him to find and train an heir. Much of the history of his final years is devoted to discussing this issue, and it is clear that his major concern was to choose a successor from among the members of his own family and have him be accepted as the ruler of Rome by the Senate and by the army.

Augustus did not merely want to choose the best man for the job. He, in fact, wanted to begin a dynasty and have his blood relations rule Rome after him. Despite
his careful attempts to maintain the facade that he had restored the Republic, despite his insistence that he ruled not because he was legally empowered to do so but rather because his noble wisdom and divinely inspired guidance were respected above all others by reasonable men, despite his insistence on returning to the traditional values and even the religion of the Res Publica, at heart he was really an autocrat, and the future he planned for Rome was one in which he came the closest he could to ruling after his death; the appointment of his own flesh and blood to succeed him as the first citizen of Rome.

The evidence of his ambition is not at all covert. Even a cursory glance at the ancient literary sources shows the flagrant and even flamboyant forms this intention of his took. Disappointed by his inability to produce a male heir, he first turned his attention to his nephew Marcellus, whose early death in 22 B.C. thwarted Augustus' plans. At the appearance of his grandsons Gaius and Lucius he promptly focused on them, heaping upon them extravagant honors and even political offices which no amount of ability could possibly merit; this was out and out monarchy. The ancient sources tell us of Augustus' shameless attempts to mold the boys in his own
image (he even wanted their handwriting to look like his), and he personally supervised every aspect of their upbringing and kept them in his presence nearly all the time. Even the preserved sculptural images of the boys suggest a close resemblance to those various images of Augustus himself which have been previously examined. This is partially due to the heavily classicizing style of the works and the blatant idealization of all of the images, but even the more individualized features of the grandfather appear on the faces of the grandsons, such as the prominent ears which protrude far away from the head, and the somewhat hooked nose notable on some of his less idealized images which also occurs on portraits of Gaius.

This same program of dynastic ambition can be detected in the coins minted by Augustan officials in Rome in the middle years of the Principate. Themes of these coins focused on the glorification of the royal family, especially the intended heirs. While Agrippa was still alive the iconography of the coins celebrated his accomplishments, since he was planned to be regent for his children, the ultimate successors. After the death of Agrippa the propaganda on the coin images shifted to the glorification of Gaius as next in line.
The archaeological record likewise clearly shows the overt intention of the emperor to glorify his grandsons and legitimize their eventual accession to his position. In addition to the works analyzed above, the empire was filled with statues, altars, and monuments of all kinds which convey this same message and placed the exalted images of the boys in the minds of everyone in the Roman world. Through these monuments they were meant to be intimately connected with the military honor, general prosperity, and good government given to the Roman world by Augustus, that most virtuous of leaders.

It is also worth noting that Augustus' hopes for dynasty of his direct descendants did not end with the early deaths of Lucius and Gaius in A.D. 2 and 4 respectively. He simply transferred his ambition to the next generation. Due to the complex genealogy and intermarriage of the various branches of the Julian and Claudian houses, Augustus' great-nephew Germanicus was married to his grand-daughter Agrippina. This enormously popular couple had a large brood of children, including three boys. In the final years of his life when he was lacking a direct male heir, Augustus reluctantly chose Tiberius as his immediate successor, but with the proviso that he
would adopt Germanicus to succeed him rather than his own son Drusus. Thus, the empire would eventually be ruled by the children of Germanicus, and continue the direct line of Augustus.

It is obvious that, in his later years at least, the imperial cult in the Greek world was a convenient vehicle for Augustus to popularize his chosen heir and attempt to ensure the succession. Even in its early stages, Augustus chose to emphasize his family as well as himself by the imperial cult, most likely by encouraging the local and municipal cults already in existence to include the worship of his heirs. Here again Augustus showed himself to be extremely adaptable. He used institutions that were already in place and channeled them for his own purposes.

But the imperial cult was more than just a way to influence the succession or to honor his family. The many examples of spontaneous awards and honors are proof of that. Yet these awards were not just flattery or excessive praise. Neither should they be thought of as manifestations of heartfelt belief in the divinity of the Roman emperor. To the vast majority of the people living in the provinces these honors meant something else.
Honors meant celebrations, and celebrations meant festivals and ceremonies, sacrifices and games. These were more than just fun and show, they were a means to unify the vastly diverse people living under Roman rule, and a way to assert their continued membership in an empire whose leader was distant and unreal to them. Statues, temples, and rituals were what they had. These concrete manifestations provided the subjects of the empire a means to enforce the authority of the Roman governors, whose connections to the ruler were the nearest, and they helped to provide definition to each person's place in the hierarchy of the system. Besides these more elevated functions, there was a more immediately satisfying one; these festivals provided meat, wine, and entertainment to the poor who participated in them. This was an impressive benefit to a population who rarely got enough to eat, and would have strengthened their commitment to the man they were honoring. It is no wonder that Augustus did little to check the enthusiasm of the people in the east.

The portraits, too, show a lack of control by the center. Like the different manifestations of the cult throughout Greece and Asia, the portraits themselves are extremely varied. Images such as the one in Thessaloniki
or Corinth remain close to the Roman Primaporta type, although not without their distinctive differences which betray their Greek origin. But most collected here are decidedly different, not only from the archetypes in Rome but from each other. The forelock motif is the one feature reproduced with any consistency, but even that undergoes marked changes, such as in the Athens portrait (No. 1) or the bust in Pythagorian (No. 6). Nearly all these pieces show variations associated with the Hellenistic tradition, and in the cases of Ephesos (No. 4), Pergamon (No. 11), Samos (No. 6), Delos (No. 9), and Athens (No. 2), these changes dramatically influence the entire appearance, so while still recognizable, they create completely different kinds of images.

What this suggests, of course, is local origin for these works. Few, if any, of these artists would ever have seen Augustus (he did not even visit Greece or Asia Minor for the last thirty-five years of his reign, and few of the artists would have gone to Rome); to create his portrait they must have looked at other images of him. Perhaps these were small wax or terracotta or even marble statuettes sent out from the center, but if so much of the detail would have been up to the artist when he enlarged the size. Also at his disposal would have
been other portraits in other cities, some of the artists would have likely visited nearby places and seen the Augustan image. No wonder the forelock motif is so common - it is a graspable, reproducible feature, and it is an attribute of Augustus that was recognizable to the Greeks. No other feature of his portraits could be so easily sketched or so easily remembered. In any case, the control from Rome on the appearance of these images must have been minimal. Within the guidelines they set for the portrait of Augustus, all the images discussed here were created. Yet Ephesos (No. 5) and Samos (No. 8), for example, hardly seem to even represent the same individual. This did not seem to bother anyone; it was inscription and context that established the identity of the statues more than appearance. Few people who saw these portraits knew what Augustus looked like anyway. These sculptures were intended as religious and honorific objects rather than aesthetically pleasing works of art. If looks were important to them such inconsistent representations would not have been tolerable. Romans living abroad also seem not to have minded; a statue said to represent Augustus set up in a prominent place in the city was more important than verisimilitude. The image stood for the emperor, and the emperor for Rome. A grandiose setting for the portrait and an elaborate
ritual performed in front of it emphasized Rome and Roman grandeur, and provided concrete expression of Roman rule.

Thus the cults and the portraits were largely local products. At times they conflicted with Augustus' desires, such as when he wanted to popularize himself as a traditional Roman with traditional Roman values. Other times they merged with his own purposes, such as when they provided a means to popularize his family and himself and to give a solid impression of the distant yoke of Roman power, but in general his direct control over them was minimal. They conformed only in the most general ways to guidelines from Rome. The portraits, for example, used the standard hair motifs and were carved in a generally classicizing style, but otherwise show much variety, and the honors which accompanied them were likewise quite varied.

One of the products of the cults and the symbols which accompanied them was a growing fusion of the east and west. Augustus obviously encouraged and respected the institutions and traditions of the people over whom he ruled, and because of his careful balancing he was able to avoid the east/west conflict threatened during the civil war with Antony. There were even more
advantages. Because he allowed the eastern provinces to remain largely autonomous, except when their policy conflicted with Rome, he was able to manage the unwieldy size of the empire without sending out strangers from Rome to maintain order. The drain on manpower would have been enormous, and the loyalty of the provinces more difficult to secure when the people in charge were foreigners. But the cult provided a framework under which everyone could operate. It provided physical proof that each person was a member of the empire, and had a share in its fortunes. It was a joint product of two cultures, not a Latin import. Therefore, it helped to blend the cultures rather than separate them.

These purposes of the imperial cult have been excluded from Roman literature of the period and can be seen only by careful investigation of the archaeological, epigraphical, numismatic, and sculptural remains. Augustus did not make it any easier for the modern historian to discover his motives than he did for his contemporaries to do so. Like Augustus' true personality, his motives regarding his divinity are shadowy and hard to get at, and nearly two thousand years later, the evidence yields little more information than his cold and formal portrait provides about his personality.
NOTES


2. Examples include Thespiae, near the Sanctuary of the Muses, where several inscribed statue bases were found which record statues of Augustus, Agrippa, Julia, Gaius, Lucius, Agrippina, and perhaps Livia [A. Plassart, "Inscriptions de Thespies," BCH 50 (1926), pp. 447-552]; a marble group in Thasos probably consisting of Augustus, Livia, Julia, and the younger Julia; or Thera, with a group in the Stoa Basilike which included a statue of Augustus, Tiberius, and possibly Germanicus [Christine Hanson and Franklin P. Johnson, "On Certain Portrait Inscriptions," AJA 50 (1946), pp. 390-1].

3. Note, for example, Augustus’ use of the word auctoria in the Res Gestae to describe this guidance, rather than potestas, which would have been more accurate. See Res Gestae, 34.3.

4. Suetonius, Augustus 64.


7. Augustus had no constitutional or legal right to choose anybody to rule Rome; he could legally only select an heir for his private estate. Still, the army and the Senate were eager to accept his designated heir as ruler of Rome, a fact of which he was very much aware.
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CATALOGUE

1. Athens, National Museum, no. 3758

Marble

Total Height: 0.27 m

Crown to Chin: 0.20 m

This fairly well-preserved slightly over-lifesize marble head was discovered in the Roman Agora in Athens in 1933. It is awkwardly broken at the neck, and must have originally fit onto a larger statue. The upper lip and the nose have been battered and broken, and the appearance of the whole head is weathered and roughened, especially on the back where only minimal traces of carving remain. The face is rather better preserved, however, and the cheeks betray the remains of a high polishing. By the cuttings on the sides, which can be more distinctly seen, it is possible to determine the pattern of the hair, although not the original depth of the carving. The locks on the top of the head are deeper, however, and create a fuller and more three-dimensional appearance.


This is unquestionably an image of Augustus. The facial features and arrangement of the hair are closely allied to the type of portrait circulated throughout the empire after 27 B.C. and exemplified in the famous statue of Augustus found at Prima Porta in Italy. The Athens
portrait clearly bears the attribute of the hair arrangement, but it is presented somewhat differently than on the Primaporta statue. The middle lock of hair in this motif is quite thin, yet it bears no sign that it was chipped away or recut or eroded especially more than the rest of the head. The effect conveys the standard motif of Augustus, but changes it, as if the artist got this detail wrong when copying the image from whatever source he had available to him.

Other standard features of Augustan images also appear on this work, such as a broad, flat forehead and thin, linear, nearly straight eyebrows which meet in sharp ridges above the eyes. The brows are drawn together with a slight frown above the nose. The mouth is wide and immobile, with a full bottom lip and corners which are deeply inset. The ears are broken and eroded but probably once pressed close to the skull. The proportions of the face are blocky and square, and the bone structure beneath the skin is not carefully modelled or sensitively portrayed. The cheeks are full and lacking in detail. The image conveys an effect of agelessness and timelessness, but does so by appearing mask-like and cold. Augustus is indeed shown here as the permanent and perfect ruler of the vast Roman state, but this work
is lacking any attempt at individual characterization or forcefulness of personality seen in the Primaporta or other finer examples of portraits of the ruler. It is as if the artist deliberately obscured any attempt at conveying life or human feeling when creating this portrait, and it is so generalized that it does not suggest that the artist had ever studied the features of the Princeps first hand.

2. Athens, Hadrian’s Library, no. 363

Marble

Total Height: 0.37 m

Fig. 8-10

Crown to Chin: 0.17 m

This approximately lifesize, coarsely grained marble head was presumably discovered in the Roman Agora. It is very badly weathered and the entire surface is now quite battered. The facial features in general are extremely indistinct. It is broken along the left border of the neck, but appears to have only been a head in its original state. Traces of carving on the piece suggest that the treatment of the hair is similar to the heavily classicizing patterned kind of locks characteristic of Augustan portraiture, and the cuttings of the forelocks certainly suggest that it did indeed bear the same motif as the Primaporta hairstyle. The forehead is broad and narrows to a slim, rather elongated face. So little remains of the eyes, nose, mouth, and ears that nothing about their original appearance can be determined. Yet it is possible to tell that the neck was fairly long and slender, and that the head was tilted towards its own left shoulder.

If this is indeed a portrait of Augustus, it was probably loosely based on the Primaporta type, but the twist of the head and the slim elongated face suggest a reliance on Hellenistic ruler iconography as well.

3. Corinth, Museum, no. 1116 A-E.

Marble

Total Height: 2.0 m

Fig. 11-13 Height with Left Ankle Fragments: 2.25 m¹

This marble statue of a standing *capite velato* Augustus was found buried amidst the debris of a building known as the Julian Basilica at the far east end of the Roman Forum in Corinth. It is in good condition and nearly whole. It is a well over lifesize draped figure, veiled in the manner of a high priest and probably in the act of pouring a libation. The hands and the feet of the figure are gone, but otherwise it is well preserved from the head to the middle of the lower legs. Dowel cuttings are visible where the bared arms were attached as separate pieces. The drapery over the left arm is intact and extends to the wrist, where only the hand is missing, while the right drapery stops at the elbow and both hand and forearm are gone. The weight of the statue is supported on the right leg; the left leg extends slightly forward in a contrapposto position. The head is turned slightly to the right, the right shoulder droops lower than the left, and the hips are uneven, with the right slightly higher.

The back is scarcely finished, indicating that it was probably set in a niche above eye level and meant to be seen only from the front. The drapery is thick and
deeply carved with a large fold drawn over the head to create a ceremonial veil. Traces of drill marks can still be seen particularly along the deeper drapery channels. One particularly long fold, the sinus, extends from the crown of the head down the left side of the body to the knee, its border badly chipped. When the statue was first discovered traces of undercoating were clearly visible, especially on the face and the hair.  


The body beneath the drapery is slim and graceful and powerfully built, with proportions similar to the canon established by Polykleitos’ Doryphoros. This idealization creates an image of athletic youthfulness and perfection. The face is idealized and smooth, and its most distinguishing characteristic is the quality of permanence and strength that it captures. Augustus, as represented here, could be anywhere from 25 to 55 years old. Indeed, the statue has a regal and imperial sort of grandeur. He is shown here as no mere man, but an idealized immortal one, fit to govern an empire and worthy of adulation. But yet, unlike the Via Labicana statue in the Museo Nazionale in Rome, which it closely recalls, here
there is little warmth or life conveyed by this stern, slightly frowning symbol of Rome’s immense power.

The features of the face are iconographically similar to the type of image seen in the Primaporta type. The forehead is broad and smooth, with characteristically thin and frowning brows, and a noble, expressionless mouth. The hair is also arranged in the same manner as the other portraits in this category, but the locks are shown here quite long, full, and thick, and they are remarkably similar to one another in size and generalization. The eyes are not deeply set in the head, and give the appearance of being not fully open. As is usual both for portraits of Augustus and for veiled figures in general, the ears are completely exposed and protrude quite markedly in front of the veil.

The cheeks are fuller and fleshier than the Primaporta or others in this group, and although the entire head is somewhat elongated it does not have the narrowing of the mouth and chin normally seen in portraits of Augustus. The surfaces of the cheeks are mechanical and lacking in detail, suggesting that the
artist did not work from the actual physiognomy of the emperor, but rather from another image of him. In profile, the sculpture is so slim and insubstantial that it clearly was intended to be seen only from a frontal point of view.

4. Ephesos, Seljuk Museum, no. 1891
Marble
Total Height: 0.305 m
Crown to Chin: 0.2 m

This marble head of Augustus wearing the corona civica was found near a temple in the middle of the upper square at Ephesos. Parts of the head have been badly chipped, particularly around the crown of leaves and upper left side of the hair. The left eyebrow is likewise broken off, as is the end of the nose, the lips, and the chin. It is irregularly severed at the neck, and would have originally been part of a large statue with the head turned towards the right side. A small fragment has been chipped from the center of the right eyebrow, but the most conspicuous damage has been done by the incision of a cross into the forehead presumably by a zealous Christian in late antiquity. In addition, a brownish discoloration, probably vegetable matter stain, obscures much of the original surface, and gives the impression of a dark and gloomy glow. Traces of reddish paint can still be seen, however, especially on the surface of the eyes.

Although the sculpture is based on the Primaporta tradition and carries many of the same iconographic features, the image deviates greatly in overall effect due to the highly sculptural and plastic treatment of the surface planes of the face. In any light a high degree of almost baroque chiaroscuro casts deep shadows on the face and creates an extremely varied and interesting surface. The strong neoclassicism present in many of the portraits of Augustus, obviously well in keeping with how the emperor liked himself portrayed, is here not nearly so much in evidence, suggesting perhaps an unusually original local craftsman and partial adherence to a non-classicizing tradition.

Yet despite the more detailed treatment of the face, this portrait is unmistakably Augustus and of the Primaporta type. The hair arrangement is exactly the same, although the forehead locks are slightly longer, they retain the same general thickness and scheme of placement to each other. The hair on the back of the head is badly damaged, and few conclusions about its original appearance can be drawn. The forehead remains broad but with a much more fluctuating surface, the
eyebrows linear and thin with less of the characteristic frown than is generally seen. The eyes are deeply set into their sockets, with prominently carved lower lids which create the effect of tired sagging under the eyes, and wrinkle lines are present at the outer corner of the undamaged right eye, a detail which shows uncharacteristic attention to the actual appearance of a human face.

The overall shape of the face betrays a dependence on the triangular forms of the other portraits, but here the jaw is rather more square and strong, although the cheeks remain thin and somewhat sunken under their prominent cheekbones. Although the ears are broken the right is more complete, and it appears as if they would have originally protruded quite far away from the skull.

Although the facial expression retains the same sober solemnity and stern commanding presence of other representations of the Princeps, by virtue of the fluid light and shadows and the almost flickering quality of the facial surfaces, this portrait has a degree of liveliness and human feeling lacking in most other depictions of the emperor. He appears older here, tired, and perhaps even a little sad. This portrait stimulates
empathy as well as awe, and shows an unusual attempt at humanizing the generally remote and austere features of the imperial image.

5. Ephesos, Seljuk Museum, no. 1957
Marble
Total Height: 1.17 m
Fig. 16-18
Crown to Chin: 0.28 m^5

The head and torso of this colossal seated statue of Augustus was discovered in the north stoa of the upper square at Ephesos. It is carved from coarsely grained white marble which is stained with blackish gray and covered with mineral deposits. The body was restored from many fragments, and is still only partially complete, missing all four extremities and the lower torso below the hips. The face has been badly damaged, especially on the right side, where most of the carvings for the hair and eye are destroyed. Likewise the end of the nose, the entire upper lip and the tip of the chin are gone. As in the lifesize head (No. 4), also from the upper square, a cross has been incised onto the forehead.


From the pose of the remaining parts of the shoulders it is clear that the right arm was raised and was likely holding a scepter in allusion to the pose of Pheidias’ cult statue of Zeus at Olympia. The left arm
was probably resting on his lap. Although the upper torso is nude, fragments of drapery along the right side of the hip suggest that the lap was covered, again, as was Pheidias' statue. A comparably sized seated statue of Livia was discovered near this one, and it is clear the two sculptures were intended to complement one another in their original setting. Augustus is turned towards the left, Livia to the right, in order to be exhibited together as a coherent pair.

The overall style of the carving is abrupt and perfunctory. As is expected in a work of this size, little attention has been given to detail of any kind, and the statue betrays a dull, dry, and formulaic generalization. The hair is treated in the usual Augustan manner, short and close to the head with shallow channels to delineate each lock of hair. Along the forehead the hair does not follow the Primaporta type, but rather is closer to the earlier Actium type. The forehead is broad and flat and generally unlined but for the later addition of the cross carved on it. The eyebrows are sharp, straight, angular ridges and add to the all over severe appearance of the head. The eyes are cursorily treated and carved with only a minimum of lines to suggest their shape, and appear to be directed in a downward gaze. The nose was
slim but too much is missing to determine its actual appearance. The mouth is broad and deeply cut with sharp recesses at the corners. Although the tip of the chin is missing, it is possible to tell that the jaw was strong and square, creating the overall impression of facial proportions which are likewise blocky and cubistic.

The entire treatment of the statue is smooth, unlined, and with little care used in modelling the planes of the structures. The passive, immobile, expressionless face and the theatrical pose create a symbol, a statement about the powerful and godlike man represented in this work, yet the treatment is so formulaic and academic that it becomes an exceedingly dull and lifeless creation, completely devoid of any energy or passion.

6. Samos, Pythagorion Museum

Marble Total Height: 0.49 m

Fig. 19-20

This greatly over lifesize marble bust was discovered in 1915 in the Kastro Tigani on Samos. It is in good condition, made of finely grained white marble which has yellowed in places, but retains a smooth, highly polished surface. Mineral deposits are visible along the left side. The end of the nose is missing, and a large chunk of the left ear. The border of the right ear is
badly chipped, as are the finished edges of the bust. The head is turned to its own right, and the eyes fixed to a point slightly above eye level.


The hair adheres closely to the scalp but the individual locks are wavy and somewhat long, although they retain the standard shallow channels inbetween and the arrangement of a patterned, mannered disarray. The forehead motif is similar to the Prima porta in that the three characteristic locks on the forehead curl in the standard manner, but the locks are widely spaced and quite thin in appearance and crowd the other locks on the left temple so that there is no room along the forehead for more.

Additionally, the forehead is extremely high, although relatively flat and unlined. The brows are markedly arched and the edges of them are rounded, giving an almost hooded look to the deepset eyes. The eyes themselves are set close together, and the deep recesses
under the brows create spaces to capture the effects of light and shadow in a free and lively manner.

The nose, although damaged, is quite long and slender; the mouth wide with a full bottom lip and deep-set corners. Since the ears are broken, the actual effect from the frontal point of view is destroyed, but it is evident that they did not greatly protrude from the head.

One of the most unusual features of this portrait is the treatment of the eyebrows, which do not intersect in a linear, severe, even ridge above the eyeball, as in nearly every other portrait of the Princeps, and which is one of the trademarks of the severe classicizing treatment obviously preferred by Augustus in his imperial images. The frown generally seen between the brows is absent here as well.

In addition to the unique treatment of the eyes and brows this portrait owes much of its unusual appearance to the strange proportions and shape of the face. The only parallel in Augustan portraiture to these uncharacteristic features would possibly be the badly damaged head now in Hadrian’s Library in Athens or the battered
head from Delos. This portrait from Samos has the same thin, elongated head and rounded slender chin, quite out of keeping with the triangular face and pointy chin of the Primaporta.

If this sculpture is indeed Augustus, as is generally believed, it is an extremely original portrayal of the emperor, and does not readily conform to any portrait known from surviving sculpture or coin representations. On first glance it does not look like Augustus, particularly from the front. Despite the smooth, unlined face the thinning locks and shadowy eyes suggest a tired, elderly man and even its impressive size does not serve to be fully convincing that this portrait is indeed the Princeps. This unusual appearance is regularly attributed to underlying Hellenistic influences, but still it seems incongruous that this portrait should create such a strikingly different mood and feeling than either of the other two unquestionable portraits of Augustus associated with the island; one of which was also discovered in the Kastro Tigani.  

7. Samos, Vathy Museum.  
Marble Total Height: 0.27m
Fig. 21

This slightly over lifesize marble head of unknown provenance is today in good condition in the Vathy Museum. Areas which have been damaged are the ears, chin, nose, and some of the forehead above the eyes, but otherwise the head is well-preserved. It is severed at the neck in a fairly regular line and may have fit onto a statue. The head is inclined to its own left, with eyes gazing upward and to the right.


This portrait was identified as a youthful image of Augustus by Hafner and may indeed reflect an early, non-sterotypical portrait, perhaps made to commemorate one of his visits to the island in the early years of the Principate. The hair, while still treated with the same sense of restraint and order which characterizes all of his images, here falls across the head in an arrangement which is unlike the Primaporta image and closer to the Actium type. The forceps or crabclaw motif remains over the right eye, but instead of the standard forking lock beside it, are several straight strands of bangs which fall in a mannered casualness and repeat the curvature of the left curl of the forceps. The hair overall is full and divided into thick strands.
The face is square in shape and solid in appearance, and nearly expressionless, suggesting calmness and impassivity. The facial planes are generally flat and with little surface variety. The eyes themselves are sharply rendered, but a suggestion of softness is noticeable in the areas underneath them. The brows are broken and their original appearance unclear.

Although this image is generally carved in an idealized and classicizing manner, it still retains a borrowing from Hellenistic ruler iconography in the slightly twisted neck and upward gazing eyes which betray its East Greek origin.

8. Samos, Lost.
Marble
Total Height: 0.48 m
Fig. 22-23

This capite velato portrait was discovered in the Kastro Tigani in Pythagorion on Samos. Its whereabouts are now unknown. Judging from photographs, however, it is clear that the head was found in good condition and its neck and parts of the chest are preserved. It would have been exhibited as a bust in antiquity and parts of edges, although chipped, are still clear. Also missing is the nose and parts above the right eye and at the tip of the right ear sections are missing. Edges of the veil
along the sides of the head, especially on the right, are chipped as well.


This image presents the standard Primaporta type, with the handling of the hair remarkably similar to that seen in the Corinth portrait. The longer length of the forehead locks, as well as profiles of each strand of hair which are nearly exact suggest they might even be products of the same workshop.

The faces and the veils do not bear this same close resemblance, however. The veil lies flush with the top of the head, unlike the much thicker and higher cloth of the Corinth image. The proportions of the face are full and round, retaining the same high forehead but becoming broad across the jaw. The characteristic frown is present between the brows, and the overall handling of the facial planes is smooth and greatly idealized. The linear brows, narrow eyes, and straight-lipped wide mouth are depicted in the conventional fashion, and the image expressionless and impassive, conveying the traditional Roman iconography.

Marble Total height: 0.471m
Fig. 24-25 Crown to Chin: 0.409m^{12}

This colossal head of coarsely grained white marble, was found on Delos and can probably be connected with two inscriptions referring to the dedication of a statue of Augustus, but the sculpture is so badly mutilated that a positive identification cannot really be made. The overall appearance is extremely weathered, and none of the features which project away from the head, such as the nose, ears, lips, and perhaps even locks of hair, are intact. The eyes are hollow and would have originally been inlaid with another material, and the cuttings show that the right eye was significantly larger than the left.


Although this head cannot be said absolutely to represent the image of Augustus, it does have features in common with other images of the Princeps. The back and sides of the head, for example, betray the remains of even, patterned rows of hair, similar to the treatment on most other images of him. And indeed, the transition from the locks of hair on the back of the neck to the
skin along the side was accomplished by the creation of several parallel wisps of hair curling at a near right angle towards the face, as is done in almost every other image of the emperor. The eyebrows are sharp and linearly rendered. Enough of the facial features remain to determine the sober, dignified air of this idealized, nearly expressionless portrait, which is quite similar to other Augustan images and markedly different from the somewhat earlier "pathetic" portraits found in large quantities on the island.

The arrangement of the forehead locks of hair cannot be determined with certainty but seem to suggest a non-Primaporta type arrangement, although it is difficult to visualize what the actual pattern was like. The forehead is broad, the proportions of the face slim and elongated, and the head inclined to its own right. These features can all be paralleled in the portrait from Samos in Pythagorion,¹⁴ which also has similar dimensions. And, if the association of the Delos head with the inscription is correct, it can be dated to 27 B.C. or shortly after, which may likewise suggest a similar date for the portrait in Pythagorion.
10. Thessaloniki, Museum, no. 1065.

Marble

Fig. 26-30

This standing, larger than lifesize marble statue of Augustus in heroic semi-nudity was found near the site of the ancient Serapeion in Thessaloniki. It has been reconstructed from several fragments and is now missing the left arm from below the shoulder, the left foot, and part of the right foot. The head has also been restored from several fragments, with the most damage visible in the chipped borders of both ears and the missing tip of the nose. Otherwise the head was split into three large pieces and several smaller ones. They have all been restored, however, so that the largest crack runs diagonally from the left side of the scalp through the right eye to the right ear, and another bisects the forehead at the hairline.

The weight of the statue rests on the right leg, with the left leg casually bent behind. The weight leg is supported by a marble tree trunk, and the drapery falls loosely around the lower body and is gathered over the left arm, hanging low over the knees. The carving of the drapery is careless and generalized. The arms are dramatically posed, with the left holding the drapery and the right poised with an emphatic upward pointing gesture. The torso is muscular and powerfully built, and the proportions of the entire body slender and graceful. Like many imperial Roman statues, the back is summarily treated, indicating it was probably intended to be placed in a niche or against a wall.

The hair arrangement and the facial features of this image are again reflective of the Prima porta type, and are certainly dependent on a stereotyped image rather than carved from life. The locks of hair are full and thick across the forehead but fall into the exact mannered pattern as most of the works cited above. The forehead is broad and flat, and drawn together in a slight frown between the gently arched brows. The eyes themselves are rendered in a manner nearly unique in Augustan portraiture. They are quite large and deep set, opened widely and gazing in an upward direction. Their shape is peculiar, with the corners articulated at the bottom of the eyeball rather than in the middle, in an almost bell shape which creates a wide, heaven-directed gaze. This conception of the eyes can be paralleled in only a few other portraits of Augustus, namely on the colossal head from Italica now in the museum in Seville,¹⁵ and, to a lesser extent, in the head from Chiragan (Martres-Tolosane) now in Toulouse.¹⁶ The closest example of eyes which are treated in the same manner comes not from other portraits of Augustus but rather from sculptures such as on the marble head from Kos now in the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul,¹⁷ which may reflect the features of the famous Helios, Colossus of Rhodes, created by Chares of Lindos.¹⁸
The shape of the face on the Thessaloniki Augustus is more square than the angular faces of the Primaporta and Via Labicana Augusti, and again, it is idealized and generalized with little suggestion of the contours that make up the real physiognomy of a human face. The nose is straight and slim, the mouth small and narrow with deeply carved corners, the cheeks thin and smooth. The fuller treatment of the lower part of the face reduces the pointy effect of the chin visible in the Italian sculptures, and creates instead a more stereotypical and less individualized image, well in keeping with the heroic pose and gesture of the sculpture. The ears remain prominent and stick out well away from the head.

The position of the lower body, like the Primaporta statue, is similar to the Doryphoros of Polykleitos, and the arrangement of the drapery reflects standard iconography of the semi-divine imperial ruler, seen first on representations of Divus Julius.

The overall effect of this sculpture is best achieved from a distance and looking up at an angle; when it looms above as a grand and heroic symbol of the emperor's presence, but it loses some of its impact on
too close inspection, when the lack of details and none too careful finish became more obvious. Traces of reddish deposit are visible on parts of the face and hair which suggest the sculpture was originally painted and would have enhanced its visibility from afar.


Marble

Total Height 0.46m

Fig. 31-33

This over lifesize finely-grained white marble head was discovered in a cistern near the sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon, and is now in very good condition in the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul. Only the rim of the right ear has been broken, otherwise the head appears intact. The border of the bust is chipped, but the edge of the garment can be seen on the right, suggesting that once this was a complete statue. The head is markedly turned towards its own left on a long and elegant neck, and a frontal view of the head reveals a distinct asymmetry. The eyes are different, the right more sharply inclined upward, the left smaller and more level. The ears are also different, the left misshapen and placed lower on the head than the right.

This unusual portrait clearly represents Augustus and is modelled on the Primaporta type. The pattern of hair on the forehead conforms exactly to that arrangement, the shape of the face is nearly identical, and comparison of the profile views of the two sculptures reveals that the contours of the face have an almost exact correspondance. Yet the mood and feeling conveyed by the Pergamene head is strikingly different. The hair, while repeating the standard pattern, has locks of hair which have a real sense of thickness and volume. The surface modeling of the face is more varied and lifelike than the strict generalization of his more classicizing images, and the eyes, particularly the brows, have soft and rounded contours, and are inclined upward in a heaven-directed gaze. Additionally, the dramatically posed and twisted neck creates a sense of theatricality totally absent in the dignified and restrained depiction of the Primaporta Augustus, but is done so here in a way which still conveys a sense of nobility and grandeur.

This portrait, more than any other in this survey, shows a successful fusion of Hellenistic ruler iconography and the Primaporta image, one which suggests the dignitas and auctoritas of the ruler while imparting
a sense of warmth and vitality which shows him as one whom the gods have righteously favored.


Marble

Total Height: 0.26 m

Fig. 34-36

Crown to Chin: 0.18 m

This lifesize portrait of unknown provenance, was carved from finely grained white marble which has weathered to gray. Although there are some calcium deposits evident, especially along the right side of the face, it is otherwise well preserved, with the only missing parts those around the back of the neck. The neck itself has been completely severed, as if it had been carelessly chopped away, but the tiny section which is preserved on the right side seems to indicate that the head was once turned to the left. Therefore, this head certainly fit onto a statue or bust. The face itself has been little damaged, except for the tip of the nose and small parts of the lips which are missing. This destroys the profile, but the frontal view is relatively intact. A small section of the back of the left ear has also been broken.

The hair on the forehead clearly falls into the same arrangement as the Primaporta, the classical Augustan pattern, and all three locks on the forehead are full and thick. The rest of the head is carved with short, distinct locks of delicately patterned hair and the sideburns are long and wavy and extend to well below the level of the ear. On the back and along the sides of the head are short patterned curls which adhere closely to the skull itself. The mouth of this sculpture is small in proportion to the face, and it is never wider than any point of the nose. The head is somewhat triangular in shape.

Zsolt Kiss, L'Iconographie des Princes Julio-Claudian au Temps D'Auguste et de Tibère (Varsovie: Éditions

Some scholars have tried to connect this portrait with an inscription from Chalcis recording a dedication, probably a statue, to Gaius Caesar, son of Augustus [IG, XII, 9, no. 940]. But since the hair arrangement is clearly Augustan and the provenance is unknown, it seems more likely that the inscription refers to another sculpture and that this is indeed Augustus.

The whole appearance of the face is slightly pursed, yet somehow delicate. Still, despite the lack of heaviness in the features, it conveys an overall expressionlessness and passivity, and creates the image of a stern and commanding ruler, a man to be taken seriously in the Roman world. The entire treatment of this image is quite generalized and idealized, and does not suggest the artist ever saw his subject.


Marble Total Height: 0.48 m
This lifesize marble portrait bust was found in 1933, with its head built into the late 3rd century A.D. Valerian wall in the southern part of the Athenian Agora, and the bust discovered in a nearby pit, also datable to the 3rd century. Although the head and bust clearly join, several fragments are missing around the borders of the restored pieces. Additional damaged areas include the rims of the ears, the tip of the nose, and part of the upper lip. Several smaller abrasions mar the surfaces of the eyebrows and face, which are otherwise highly polished. The marble is quite white, with overtones of gray, stained in places with what appears to be vegetable rot.

A tenon at the base of the bust shows that it would have fit onto a column and in its original setting would have been exhibited as a bust. The head is turned towards the right shoulder, with eyes level and looking straight ahead. It was initially published as a youthful portrait of Augustus.

The hair is short and close-fitting about the head, and it betrays an academic and mechanical handling which manifests itself in dry, cursory patterning of the individual rows of hair. The forelock arrangement is divided into three distinct groups of hair, related to but not identical with the characteristic Primaporta pattern. Above the inner corner of the right eye a lock of hair curls away from the rest of the tightly grouped, almost schematically rendered bangs. A third section of hair echoes this curvature and circles around the right temple. In treatment and handling the entire cap of hair suggests strict adherence to a dull and academic classicism.

The handling of the face contradicts this perfunctory and cold style of the hair. The crisp, linear, sharp-edged style which manifests itself over and over again in Augustan portraiture is softened here. The forehead is rounder and protrudes more, the brows join in a less sharply linear union of planes, the nose is more aquiline. It is as if here the artist was interested in imparting the impression of a genuine physiognomy, an interest which obviously did not extend to the hair. This individuality of the sitter rather than a stereotypical image, is also conveyed by the profile view, which shows an unusually short upper lip and markedly hooked nose, features not likely to be added by an artist interested in smoothing the blemishes in the actual appearance of the emperor.

Besides the variation in the forelock arrangement, and the less strict classicism, this image departs from Augustan portraiture in other ways. The shape of the head is square rather than triangular, the mouth small, the chin rounder and less pointy, the neck shorter and
stockier with a prominent Adam's apple. The ears are too damaged to determine their original appearance, but in general the entire effect of the sculpture is suggestive of a combination of styles, which might be in keeping with a local artist copying an image rather than sculpting a likeness from life, or with imparting a degree of freedom into an otherwise dull and formulaic style, but it seems more likely to reflect the individual features of a real person. Therefore, it is unlikely that this could be an image of Augustus. In profile, this portrait bears no resemblance to any of the sculptural images or coin types generally recognized as those of Rome's first emperor. The individualized features such as the too short upper lip and the hooked nose surely do not reflect features of Augustus. Rather they seem to reflect the actual appearance of a particular person who was not him. Although, as it was initially published, this could reflect an earlier, nonstereotypical portrait of Augustus, it is difficult to reconcile this physiognomy with any image or description of him.
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The upper square, Ephesus

A. Magistrates' building  B. Double temple of Roma and Julius Caesar (?)  C. Council chamber
D. 'Royal portico'  E. Statues of Augustus and Livia  F. Temple of Augustus
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